

**CROSSWALK OF NAEYC EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM
STANDARDS AND ACCREDITATION CRITERIA WITH OTHER
ACCREDITING / ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS
2008**

**The Connecticut State Department of Education
Bureau of Early Childhood Education**

**To obtain copies of the supporting documents of this Crosswalk,
Or for questions on this report, contact:**

Harriet Feldlaufer, Chief
Bureau of Early Childhood Education
Connecticut State Department of Education
165 Capitol Avenue, Room 300
Hartford, CT 06106
harriet.feldlaufer@ct.gov

This report is available online at <http://www.sde.ct.gov>

Crosswalk of NAEYC Early Childhood Program Standards and Accreditation Criteria With Other Accrediting / Assessment Systems

**Prepared for the Connecticut State Department of Education:
Bureau of Early Childhood Education**

Introduction and Background

In 2006, the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE) entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Connecticut Community Colleges. This MOA provided funds to Connecticut Charters-a-Course (CCAC) to facilitate the completion of crosswalks between the revised accreditation system of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the other accreditation / assessment systems, listed below, currently used to measure quality in School Readiness funded programs.

1. American Montessori Society (AMS);
2. Head Start¹;
3. New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Independent Schools (NEASC Independent); and
4. New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Public Elementary Schools (NEASC Public).

The purpose of the crosswalk was to compare the other systems to the new NAEYC Early Childhood Program Standards and Accreditation Criteria (NAEYC Standards and Criteria) in order to determine the necessity and utility of the Connecticut Preschool and Readiness Standards, or Plus Standards. Plus Standards were developed in response to C.G.S. Section 10-16p(a)(5) that established NAEYC and Head Start as appropriate measures of quality preschool programming, and allowed the Commissioner of Education in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Services to establish other quality criteria. In considering approval of other accreditation systems as a measure of quality, Plus Standards for each of the other systems were created through a review process assessing other system criteria to NAEYC criteria. When criteria in the other systems were not comparable, Plus Standards were created to bring the other system's criteria up to the NAEYC quality level. Plus Standards were approved by SBE in 1999 (NEASC Independent and AMS) and 2000 (NEASC Public). School Readiness programs could then choose among other systems, meet that system's threshold and also meet Plus Standards to fully comply with the SBE quality measure. NAEYC's newly defined standards, criteria and system features became effective for programs September 16, 2006, invalidating the Plus Standards based upon the previous NAEYC accreditation system.

This crosswalk uses the current NAEYC Standards and Criteria as its base (or stem) to compare with other systems' standards and criteria. As a criteria crosswalk, the intended purpose was to assess comparability in performance criteria, not the operational system design features such as reliability of evaluators, research base of criteria, and scoring threshold. In accordance with the MOA, this crosswalk covers the criteria specific to preschool children only.

¹ Head Start was not included in the original MOA but added to a continuation MOA.

Processes and Procedures

- Each system was informed of the study and confirmed use of the appropriate comparison documents.
- A preliminary set of comparisons for AMS, NEASC Public, and NEASC Independent was completed by CCAC staff members. Representatives from each accrediting / assessment system then had an opportunity to review the preliminary comparisons and provide input on matches to criteria.
- CCAC worked with SDE to create technical review teams for each of the accrediting / assessment systems. Members were purposefully selected for diversity of role and expertise (see Attachment A). Reviewers included current and former program administrators, evaluators for systems, SDE staff, and consultants in the field.
- Each review team member was given a binder of resource documents specific to their assigned accrediting / assessing system. These included the preliminary set of comparisons done by CCAC staff members including system representative input, as well as master copies of the other system’s criteria.
- Eight half-day meetings were held during which technical review teams met to analyze comparability of criteria. Teams also conducted business via email and independent group meetings.
- Reviewers worked to find criteria from each system to match each NAEYC criterion. Reviewers utilized a 4-point rubric in their assessment (see Table 1).
- Reviewer consensus determined ratings of 1 or 2 were acceptable matches while ratings of 3 or 4 were unacceptable as matches. Other system criteria for which there was no NAEYC criteria match were tracked.
- At the concluding meeting, technical review teams presented their findings (see sample comparisons in Appendixes A – D) and discussed considerations for Plus standards (see Results).

Table 1 Criteria Comparability Rubric

1 Equivalent Match Clearly stated specific practice / policy is evident	2 Comparable Match Meets the spirit of the criteria but not the wording
3 Questionable Match Perhaps meets in part but identified practice / policy is minimal, not specific enough	4 Unacceptable Match Insufficient direction to practice / policy

Results

Table 2 shows findings of other system’s criteria comparability by each NAEYC Standard. Column “a” represents the number of NAEYC criteria for which matches were found in the other system over the total applicable NAEYC criteria for each Program Standard. Column “b” converts the raw data to percentages. A threshold was set at 80% matching to define comparability of standards. The determination of comparability based on this threshold is presented in Column “c”.

Key Findings

1. Head Start Performance Standards are comparable to NAEYC’s Standards and Criteria.
2. AMS, NEASC Public, and NEASC Independent Standards and Criteria were not comparable to NAEYC Standards and Criteria.

Table 2 Criteria Comparability Findings by NAEYC Standard

NAEYC Standard	American Montessori Society			Head Start			NEASC Independent			NEASC Public		
	a	b	c *	a	b	c *	a	b	c *	a	b	c *
	# of Matches	% Matching	Comparable to NAEYC	# of Matches	% Matching	Comparable to NAEYC	# of Matches	% Matching	Comparable to NAEYC	# of Matches	% Matching	Comparable to NAEYC
1 - Relationships	18/32	56%	No	32/32	100%	Yes	5/32	16%	No	4/32	13%	No
2 - Curriculum	22/70	31%	No	70/70	100%	Yes	3/70	4%	No	10/70	14%	No
3 – Teaching	24/55	44%	No	51/55	93%	Yes	5/55	9%	No	23/55	42%	No
4 - Assessment of Child Progress	6/25	24%	No	24/25	96%	Yes	3/25	12%	No	8/25	32%	No
5 – Health	5/27	19%	No	24/27	89%	Yes	0/27	0%	No	0/27	0%	No
6 – Teachers	6/14	43%	No	12/14	86%	Yes	4/14	29%	No	9/14	65%	No
7 – Families	6/27	22%	No	25/27	93%	Yes	2/27	7%	No	8/27	30%	No
8 - Community Relationships	6/18	33%	No	18/18	100%	Yes	1/18	6%	No	2/18	11%	No
9 – Physical Environment	17/44	39%	No	42/44	95%	Yes	2/44	5%	No	0/44	0%	No
10 - Leadership & Management	21/51	41%	No	51/51	100%	Yes	19/51	37%	No	25/51	49%	No

* A threshold was set at 80% to define comparability of standards.

Other Findings

3. Head Start Performance Standards exceeded the 80% threshold for all 10 NAEYC Program Standards with the lowest match for Standard 6 (Teachers) at 86%.
4. With the exception of Head Start Performance Standards, no other system's criteria reached the 80% threshold on any single standard. Only two cases were reported of a system reaching even 50% or higher in a single standard.
5. NEASC Public criteria fell well below the 80% threshold for all NAEYC Program Standards. Standard 6 (Teachers) had the most criteria matches at 65%.
6. AMS criteria fell well below the 80% threshold for all NAEYC Program Standards. Standard 1 (Relationships) had the most criteria matches at 56%.
7. NEASC Independent's criteria fell well below the 80% threshold for all NAEYC Program Standards. Standard 10 (Leadership & Management) had the most criteria matches at 37%.
8. Only NAEYC identifies *required criteria* which programs must meet at all times, and publishes a threshold (meet 80% of the criteria on which they are assessed for each standard).
9. Systems had criteria for which NAEYC had no match. Some criteria for which there was no match were from systems not originally designed for early childhood settings and would not be applicable (for example, NEASC Independent has a Standard related to Residential Settings). Portions of Head Start Performance Standards relevant to its grant status had no match with NAEYC, such as Part 1305 - Eligibility, Recruitment, Selection, Enrollment, and Attendance; and all home-based, family or combination-option related standards. There were 31 AMS criteria which had no NAEYC match often due to broad wording, including 13.6P - Classroom has appropriate storage space for teacher materials; and 13.36P - Teacher uses appropriate record keeping system.

Discussion

The responsibility for quality and accountability in early childhood education is shared across many sectors, from policy makers to program staff. Accreditation of early childhood programs plays a significant role in assessing quality and addressing accountability. Multiple accreditation systems exist for early childhood programs and these systems vary greatly.

The intent of the system is one consideration. For example, Head Start's assessment system is a mandatory function of the federal grant funding, while NAEYC's is an independent and voluntary accrediting system. (Note: States, communities or other entities may mandate NAEYC Accreditation as a grant function, such that a program's decision to accept said funding determines the compliances; yet the NAEYC system itself remains independent and is ultimately categorized as voluntary to programs.) In addition, some systems are not specifically designed for early childhood settings. The purpose or intent of the system can influence the content as well as the implementation of the system.

Other considerations are the design elements – how the system is structured and operationalized. While criteria may be deemed comparable from system to system, the manner in which criteria and standards are assessed may vary greatly. For example, if a system's criteria are strong yet the system does not set a rigorous threshold for meeting the criteria, and / or evaluators are not trained to reliability, and / or the accreditation decision is subjective, the system quality can be significantly compromised. Table 3 outlines characteristics for accreditation systems considered essential by the technical review teams. As programs, state agencies, and policy makers assess accreditation systems in an effort to ensure

program quality for young children, the purpose of the accreditation system and the features outlined below must be considered. Only after such thorough consideration can we be certain that an appropriate bar for quality is being set.

Table 3 Technical Review Teams Determination of Essential Features for Accreditation Systems

<p>Pre-Visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Self-study portion utilizing all involved parties: stakeholders, administration, families, Board, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Self-study portion includes program improvement plans <p>Qualifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All staff must meet a minimum qualifications level per position <input type="checkbox"/> Each staff member has a professional development plan <p>Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Early childhood specific <input type="checkbox"/> Research / evidence-based <input type="checkbox"/> Written operationally and / or guidance on operationalizing criteria to acceptable evidence levels is available <input type="checkbox"/> Timely revisions based on research; includes public comment period prior to final publication <p>Scoring and Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluators trained to reliability <input type="checkbox"/> On-going testing for evaluator reliability <input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing evaluator training <input type="checkbox"/> Objective scoring <input type="checkbox"/> Scoring includes measures by stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Scoring includes observed and rated classroom practice <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment allows for a degree of program response to clarify or add to evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Threshold for successful scoring decision is publicly known <input type="checkbox"/> Appeals process <p>Post Visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Unannounced visits <input type="checkbox"/> Annual reporting <input type="checkbox"/> Complaint process <input type="checkbox"/> Variance from threshold measure results in revocation of accreditation <input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation term includes appropriate interim quality control checks

Currently, Connecticut’s Standards for Preschool and Readiness Programs outline Plus Standards which must be met by programs receiving School Readiness funds that are accredited by AMS, NEASC Public, or NEASC Independent systems. These Plus Standards were created in an effort to set an even bar for the determination of quality across School Readiness Programs. The start of the new NAEYC accreditation system in 2006 made the current Plus Standards invalid for this purpose, as they were based upon the previous NAEYC accreditation system. This current crosswalk highlights the

great disparity between the current NAEYC accreditation and the AMS, NEASC Public, and NEASC Independent systems. This disparity, as well as the questions related to comparability of the systems (purpose and assessment of compliance), make the creation of new Plus Standards inadvisable at this juncture.

More work is needed to assess the comparability of system design features and to answer fundamental questions which will inform policy decisions related to accreditation / assessment systems. The criteria, the system intent, and the system design elements must *all* support quality and accountability.

Policy Recommendations to the Commissioner of Education for the State Board of Education

1. Uphold C.G.S. Section 10-16 p(a)(5) which establishes NAEYC and Head Start as appropriate measures of quality preschool programming, at this time.
 - a. Establish a process to assess other accreditation / assessment systems to ensure comparability, beginning at the standards and criteria level, and including system design features.
2. Revise School Readiness policy, eliminating alternate accreditation / assessment systems and Plus Standards as measures of quality.
3. Create a timetable for School Readiness funded programs currently operating under other accreditation / assessment systems to achieve NAEYC accreditation or Head Start.

Summary

Technical review teams compared criteria from accreditation systems currently used to measure quality in School Readiness funded programs to NAEYC Early Childhood Program Standards and Accreditation Criteria (NAEYC Standards and Criteria). The following system criteria were considered: American Montessori Society; Head Start; New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Independent Schools; and New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Public Elementary Schools. This crosswalk showed that Head Start Performance Standards are comparable to NAEYC's Standards and Criteria; however, AMS, NEASC Public and NEASC Independent do not show comparability to NAEYC Standards and Criteria at the criteria level. More information is necessary to assess other factors that impact the systems. Significant questions remain regarding system features related to the intended purpose and design of the system and the assessment of criteria employed by the various systems. More work is needed to assess the comparability of system design features and to answer fundamental questions which will inform policy decisions related to accreditation / assessment systems.

Attachment A
Technical Review Team Members

Deb Adams, Consultant
State Department of Education

Yemi Onibokun, Consultant
State Department of Education

Carol Annette, Facilitator
Gateway Community College

Karen Rainville, Executive Director
CAEYC

Jose Colon-Rivas, Executive Director
City of Hartford: Mayor's Office for Young Children

Gerri Rowell, Consultant
State Department of Education

Anne Marie Davidson, Consultant
State Education Resource Center (SERC)

Chris Sacerdote, Educational Assistant
Three Rivers Community College Child
Development Center

Harriet Feldlaufer, Bureau Chief
State Department of Education

Conni Smith, Consultant
State Education Resource Center (SERC)

Mary Guertin, Head Start Director
Thames Valley Council for Community Action
(TVCCA)

Andrea Urbano, Consultant
Independent

Michelle Levy, Consultant
State Department of Education

Anne Wakelin, Director
Town of Windsor Montessori School

Teresa Messervy, Director
TVCCA Head Start

Grace Whitney, Director
Head Start Collaboration Office

Crosswalk project staffed by CCAC Staff:
Deb Flis, Director of Accreditation and Quality Initiatives, and
Margaret Gustafson, Quality Initiative Specialist

Attachment B Source List

- American Montessori Society. *Standards Checklist and Verification*. New York: American Montessori Society.
- American Montessori Society. *Standards for American Montessori Society Schools*. New York: American Montessori Society.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children. 2005. *Early Childhood Program Standards and Accreditation Criteria*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Independent Schools. (2005). *Manual for School Evaluation – 2005 Pilot Edition*. Bedford, MA: New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Independent Schools.
- New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Public Elementary Schools. (2005). *Standards for Accreditation for Elementary Schools*. Bedford, MA: New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Public Elementary Schools.
- State of Connecticut: State Board of Education. (1999). Connecticut's Standards for Preschool and Readiness Programs: Montessori. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut: State Board of Education.
- State of Connecticut: State Board of Education. (1999). Connecticut's Standards for Preschool and Readiness Programs: NEASC: New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Independent Schools. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut: State Board of Education.
- State of Connecticut: State Board of Education. (2000). Connecticut's Standards for Preschool and Readiness Programs: NEASC: New England Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Public Elementary Schools. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut: State Board of Education.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services: Administration on Children, Youth and Families. 2003. *Head Start Program Performance Standards and Other Regulations*. Washington DC: United States Department of Health and Human Services: Administration on Children, Youth and Families.

Appendix A: NAEYC / AMS Criteria Comparison Example

NAEYC Number	NAEYC Accreditation Criterion	AMS #	AMS Accreditation Criterion
Standard 2	The program implements a curriculum that is consistent with its goals for children and promotes learning and development in each of the following areas: social, emotional, physical, language, and cognitive.		
2.A.	Curriculum: Essential Characteristics		
2.A.01	The program has a written statement of philosophy and uses one or more written curricula or curriculum frameworks consistent with its philosophy that address central aspects of child development.	9.1	9.1 The school mission statement, educational goals and philosophy are defined in print.
2.A.02	A clearly stated curriculum or curriculum framework provides a coherent focus for planning children’s experiences. It allows for adaptations and modifications to ensure access to the curriculum for all children.	9.2	9.2 The school mission statement, educational goals and philosophy are appropriate to the needs of the school population and in harmony with Montessori’s descriptions of the nature of the child, the needs of the family, the prepared environment, and the needs of the staff
2.A.03	The curriculum guides teachers’ development and intentional implementation of learning opportunities consistent with the program’s goals and objectives.	9.2	9.2 The school mission statement, educational goals and philosophy are appropriate to the needs of the school population and in harmony with Montessori’s descriptions of the nature of the child, the needs of the family, the prepared environment, and the needs of the staff
2.A.04	The curriculum can be implemented in a manner that reflects responsiveness to family home values, beliefs, experiences, and language		
2.A.05	Curriculum goals and objectives guide teachers’ ongoing assessment of children’s progress.		
2.A.06	The curriculum guides teachers to integrate assessment information with curriculum goals to support individualized learning.	10.13	10.13 The school requires each directing teacher to provide a description of the systems used for child observation, record-keeping and planning for individuals and groups.
2.A.07	The curriculum guides the development of a daily schedule that is predictable yet flexible and responsive to individual needs of the children. The schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> provides time and support for transitions. <input type="checkbox"/> includes both indoor and outdoor experiences. <input type="checkbox"/> is responsive to a child’s need to rest or be active. 	10.12	10.12 The school requires each directing teacher to provide a schedule of a typical day by major time blocks.
2.A.08	Materials and equipment used to implement the curriculum reflect the lives of the children and families as well as the diversity found in society, including gender, age, language, and abilities. <p>Materials and equipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> provide for children’s safety while being appropriately challenging. <input type="checkbox"/> encourage exploration, experimentation, and discovery. <input type="checkbox"/> promote action and interaction. <input type="checkbox"/> are organized to support independent use. <input type="checkbox"/> are rotated to reflect changing curriculum and accommodate new interests and skill levels. <input type="checkbox"/> are rich in variety. <input type="checkbox"/> accommodate children’s special needs. 	12.6	12.6 Curriculum support materials are available in each classroom environment

Appendix B: NAEYC / Head Start Criteria Comparison Example

NAEYC Number	NAEYC Accreditation Criterion	Head Start PS Number
Standard 2	The program implements a curriculum that is consistent with its goals for children and promotes learning and development in each of the following areas: social, emotional, physical, language, and cognitive.	1304.5; 1304.21 (c) (1)
2.A.	<i>Curriculum: Essential Characteristics</i>	
2.A.01	The program has a written statement of philosophy and uses one or more written curricula or curriculum frameworks consistent with its philosophy that address central aspects of child development.	1304.5 (a) (5)
2.A.02	A clearly stated curriculum or curriculum framework provides a coherent focus for planning children’s experiences. It allows for adaptations and modifications to ensure access to the curriculum for all children.	45 CFR 1304.21 (a) (1) (i); 45 CFR 1304.21 (c) (1) (i)
2.A.03	The curriculum guides teachers’ development and intentional implementation of learning opportunities consistent with the program’s goals and objectives.	1304.21 (c) (1)
2.A.04	The curriculum can be implemented in a manner that reflects responsiveness to <input type="checkbox"/> family home values, beliefs, experiences, and <input type="checkbox"/> language.	45 CFR 1304.21 (a) (1) (i); 45 CFR 1304.21 (a) (1) (iii)
2.A.05	Curriculum goals and objectives guide teachers’ ongoing assessment of children’s progress.	1304.21 (c) (2)
2.A.06	The curriculum guides teachers to integrate assessment information with curriculum goals to support individualized learning.	45 CFR 1304.21 (c) (1) (i)
2.A.07	<p>The curriculum guides the development of a daily schedule that is predictable yet flexible and responsive to individual needs of the children. The schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> provides time and support for transitions. <input type="checkbox"/> includes both indoor and outdoor experiences. <input type="checkbox"/> is responsive to a child’s need to rest or be active. 	45 CFR 1304.21 (a) (3) (ii); 45 CFR 1304.21 (c) (1) (vii); 45 CFR 1304.23 (c) (3)
2.A.08	<p>Materials and equipment used to implement the curriculum reflect the lives of the children and families as well as the diversity found in society, including <input type="checkbox"/> gender, <input type="checkbox"/> age, <input type="checkbox"/> language, and <input type="checkbox"/> abilities.</p> <p>Materials and equipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> provide for children’s safety while being appropriately challenging. <input type="checkbox"/> encourage exploration, experimentation, and discovery. <input type="checkbox"/> promote action and interaction. <input type="checkbox"/> are organized to support independent use. <input type="checkbox"/> are rotated to reflect changing curriculum and accommodate new interests and skill levels. <input type="checkbox"/> are rich in variety. <input type="checkbox"/> accommodate children’s special needs. 	45 CFR 1304.21 (a) (4) (i); 45 CFR 1304.53 (b) (1) (ii and v)

(Note: To reduce excess space, only the Head Start Performance Standards reference number is included.)

Appendix C: NAEYC / NEASC Independent Criteria Comparison Example

NAEYC Number	NAEYC Accreditation Criterion	NEASC Indep. Number	NEASC Independent Accreditation Criterion
Standard 2	The program implements a curriculum that is consistent with its goals for children and promotes learning and development in each of the following areas: social, emotional, physical, language, and cognitive.	Stand 4	Standard 4 (Program): The school provides a comprehensive program of intellectual, aesthetic, and physical activities that stems from the school's beliefs about teaching and learning, is appropriate to support its mission, and is consistent with the needs of the range of students admitted. 7.c. The school has curricular and extra-curricular programs in place which specifically and effectively address intellectual and developmental needs of children in the Early Childhood Program and are consistent with the school's stated mission.
2.A.	<i>Curriculum: Essential Characteristics</i>		
2.A.01	The program has a written statement of philosophy and uses one or more written curricula or curriculum frameworks consistent with its philosophy that address central aspects of child development.	1, 4	Schools are required to have a written curriculum that is consistent the mission and beliefs about teaching and learning. Standard 1 (Mission): There is congruence between the school's stated mission and core values and its actual program, policies, planning, and decision-making at both the operational and governance levels. Standard 4 (Program): The school provides a comprehensive program of intellectual, aesthetic, and physical activities that stems from the school's beliefs about teaching and learning, is appropriate to support its mission and core values, and is consistent with the needs of the range of students admitted.
2.A.02	A clearly stated curriculum or curriculum framework provides a coherent focus for planning children's experiences. It allows for adaptations and modifications to ensure access to the curriculum for all children.	4.b.	4.b. The school programs demonstrate consideration for the appropriate intellectual, social, physical, aesthetic, emotional and ethical development of students in all aspects of school and student life.
2.A.03	The curriculum guides teachers' development and intentional implementation of learning opportunities consistent with the program's goals and objectives.	4.a., 4.g.	4.a. Professional development time is used for faculty to discuss issues of teaching and learning. 4.g. The school recognizes developmental levels of children and takes them into consideration in planning programs and teaching methodologies.
2.A.04	The curriculum can be implemented in a manner that reflects responsiveness to family home values, beliefs, experiences, and language.	5, 5.a., 5.c., 5.e.	Standard 5 (Experience of the Students): The school actively considers individual students and has developed plans, policies, programs, and pedagogy to nurture, support, and encourage all students to reach their potential and to participate in the life of the school. 5.a. The school recognizes differences within the student body such as gender, learning style or ability, race, age, ethnicity, family background, socio-economic status, sexual orientation, and religious practice, and actively responds to students' and adults' positive or negative experiences. 5.c. Time is made available on a regular basis for teachers to learn ways in which their cultural backgrounds help or hinder their ability to plan together to work with students, parents, and other adults in the community. 5.e. There is a process in place to see how the school's programs need to change to reflect the diversity of cultural experiences and to identify adults and/or students who will need additional support to function effectively in a pluralistic environment.
2.A.05	Curriculum goals and objectives guide teachers' ongoing assessment of children's progress.	5.d.	5.d. There is a procedure in place to assess and report on how individual students are meeting the goals of the program with regard to both personal and academic growth.
2.A.06	The curriculum guides teachers to integrate assessment information with curriculum goals to support individualized learning.	5.g.	5.g. There is a process in place to identify students who might benefit from a modification of the program.
2.A.07	The curriculum guides the development of a daily schedule that is predictable yet flexible and responsive to individual needs of the		

	<p>children. The schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides time and support for transitions. • includes both indoor and outdoor experiences. • is responsive to a child's need to rest or be active. 		
2.A.08	<p>Materials and equipment used to implement the curriculum reflect the lives of the children and families as well as the diversity found in society, including gender, age, language, and abilities.</p> <p>Materials and equipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide for children's safety while being appropriately challenging. • encourage exploration, experimentation, and discovery. • promote action and interaction. • are organized to support independent use. • are rotated to reflect changing curriculum and accommodate new interests and skill levels. • are rich in variety. • accommodate children's special needs. 	6.c.	6.c. There are instructional materials and equipment in sufficient quality, quantity, and variety to give effective support to the aims and methods of the program.

Appendix D: NAEYC / NEASC Public Criteria Comparison Example

NAEYC Number	NAEYC Accreditation Criterion	NEASC Public Number	NEASC Public Accreditation Criterion
Standard 2	The program implements a curriculum that is consistent with its goals for children and promotes learning and development in each of the following areas: social, emotional, physical, language, and cognitive.		
2.A.	<i>Curriculum: Essential Characteristics</i>		
2.A.01	The program has a written statement of philosophy and uses one or more written curricula or curriculum frameworks consistent with its philosophy that address central aspects of child development.	1.2; 2.1	1.2. The school has a set of measurable academic and social expectations that are used to evaluate the success of the mission statement; 2.1. The school's written curriculum is aligned with the school's stated expectations for students' academic and social and developmental needs.
2.A.02	A clearly stated curriculum or curriculum framework provides a coherent focus for planning children's experiences. It allows for adaptations and modifications to ensure access to the curriculum for all children.	1.2; 2.2; 2.4; 3.1	1.2. The school has a set of measurable academic and social expectations that are used to evaluate the success of the mission statement; 2.2. Each curriculum learning area clearly articulates learning standards which support the school's stated expectations; 2.4. Effective curriculum coordination and articulation takes place within the school as well as with all receiving and sending district schools; 3.1. Classroom instruction embodies the school's beliefs about teaching and learning, reflects current research on effective teaching strategies and is designed to enable all students to meet the school's expectations for academic achievement.
2.A.03	The curriculum guides teachers' development and intentional implementation of learning opportunities consistent with the program's goals and objectives.	2.1; 2.2; 2.4; 3.1	2.1. The school's written curriculum is aligned with the school's stated expectations for students' academic and social and developmental needs; 2.2. Each curriculum learning area clearly articulates learning standards which support the school's stated expectations; 2.4. Effective curriculum coordination and articulation takes place within the school as well as with all receiving and sending district schools; 3.1. Classroom instruction embodies the school's beliefs about teaching and learning, reflects current research on effective teaching strategies and is designed to enable all students to meet the school's expectations for academic achievement.
2.A.04	The curriculum can be implemented in a manner that reflects responsiveness to <input type="checkbox"/> family home values, beliefs, experiences, and <input type="checkbox"/> language.	3.2	3.2. Instruction addresses the individual needs of students, enables all students to have successful experiences and promotes independent life-long learning.
2.A.05	Curriculum goals and objectives guide teachers' ongoing assessment of children's progress.		
2.A.06	The curriculum guides teachers to integrate assessment information with curriculum goals to support individualized learning.	3.2; 4.4	3.2. Instruction addresses the individual needs of students, enables all students to have successful experiences and promotes independent life-long learning; 4.4. The identified learning standards for each curricular learning area are the basis for assessing each student's progress
2.A.07	The curriculum guides the development of a daily schedule that is predictable yet flexible and responsive to individual needs of the children. The schedule		
	<input type="checkbox"/> provides time and support for transitions.		
	<input type="checkbox"/> includes both indoor and outdoor experiences.		
	<input type="checkbox"/> is responsive to a child's need to rest or be active.		

2.A.08	<p>Materials and equipment used to implement the curriculum reflect the lives of the children and families as well as the diversity found in society, including <input type="checkbox"/> gender, <input type="checkbox"/> age, <input type="checkbox"/> language, and <input type="checkbox"/> abilities.</p> <p>Materials and equipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> provide for children's safety while being appropriately challenging. <input type="checkbox"/> encourage exploration, experimentation, and discovery. <input type="checkbox"/> promote action and interaction. <input type="checkbox"/> are organized to support independent use. <input type="checkbox"/> are rotated to reflect changing curriculum and accommodate new interests and skill levels. <input type="checkbox"/> are rich in variety. <input type="checkbox"/> accommodate children's special needs. 	3.3	3.3. Appropriate instructional materials and services are available for all programs including those for students identified with special needs and students whose abilities present unique needs.
--------	---	-----	--