**Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation**

GUIDELINES ON WRITING AND ACCEPTANCE OF STANDARDS: PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION USING SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION (SPA) STANDARDS

2019

GUIDELINES ON WRITING AND ACCEPTANCE OF STANDARDS: PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION USING SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION (SPA) STANDARDS

Table of Contents

3

GUIDELINES ON WRITING AND ACCEPTANCE OF STANDARDS: PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION USING SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION (SPA) STANDARDS

The program review options available to educator preparation providers (EPPs) are based on CAEP's partnership agreement with the state. States can allow three options for review of individual licensure, certification, and/or endorsement programs, which include Specialty Professional Association (SPA) review with National Recognition, CAEP Evidence Review of Standard 1, and state review. CAEP's Governance Policy (Policy 2.11 Review and Revision of Standards) establishes requirements for the review and acceptance of the SPA Standards through a process undertaken by the SPA Standards Committee of the CAEP Board. Review of specialty licensure data against the SPA Standards is integral to the accreditation review process. EPPs use licensure area program data as partial evidence to meet CAEP Standard 1, particularly CAEP Component 1.3.

In 2017 the SPA Standards Committee,[1] a Standing Committee of the CAEP Board, adopted the *Guidelines for Review with National Recognition Using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards* (hereafter referred to as the "guidelines") for the development, review, and implementation of new and/or revised SPA Standards. The document was revised in 2019 as the *Guidelines on Writing and Acceptance of Standards: Program Review with National Recognition using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards*. The purpose of the guidelines is to advise SPAs, as a companion to any service agreement entered into between CAEP and a SPA, on (1) the preparation or revision of *SPA Standards with National Recognition* for CAEP's review and acceptance; and, (2) the implementation of the standards for SPA review with National Recognition as part of the CAEP accreditation process. CAEP's guidance for EPPs on the three program review options is included in CAEP handbooks for initial- and advanced-level programs.

The SPA review with National Recognition process entails alignment of licensure area program information with national standards from professional associations that have entered into a partnership with CAEP through a service agreement. The review of individual programs within EPPs leads to National Recognition of programs upon meeting the SPA Standards. The goal is for EPPs to ensure that candidates enrolled in a program undergoing review are capable of applying content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcomes assessments in response

---

[1] CAEP's Bylaws establish that the SPA Standards Committee is responsible for reviewing new or revised standards, policies, and procedures developed by specialized professional associations (SPAs) for reviewing programs which provide licensure in professional specialty area studies. The CAEP Board will be informed of the SPA Standards Committee decisions and may seek clarifications on the committee's actions on SPA standards, which shall constitute actions of the board.

to SPA Standards (CAEP Component 1.3). CAEP Accreditation and SPA National Recognition are separate designations achieved by EPPs through two independent processes; however, decision reports from program-level review through a SPA may be used as partial evidence for CAEP Standard 1 (Initial Licensure) and/or Standard A.1 (Advanced Level).

The *Guidelines on Writing and Acceptance of Standards: Program Review with National Recognition using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards* states the purpose and context of Program Review with National Recognition as employed in conjunction with CAEP accreditation and, more broadly, in the practice of education. Part I also provides instructions on principles, formatting, and other features of the SPA Standards along with procedures for developing and reviewing new or revised standards.

In its appendices, the guidelines also provides (a) guidance on the use of evidence to meet the SPA Standards and (b) guidance on implementing SPA Standards by adopting a uniform approach to reviewing evidence provided by programs.

This document provides guidance to SPAs on formatting their standards and review process and guides EPPs with information on the SPA review process and criteria used in the evaluation of evidence. In any section of this document that references, quotes, or provides an interpretation of CAEP bylaws or policy, the bylaws or policy shall supersede the language contained in the guidelines. Furthermore, the CAEP Standards, bylaws, and policies are periodically updated or amended. Any such changes may have a direct effect on procedures that will guide accreditation reviews and decisions. The professional associations that develop and utilize the SPA Standards, as well as EPPs and states, should ensure they stay abreast of such changes, which can be found at CAEP's website (www.caepnet.org).

GUIDELINES ON WRITING AND ACCEPTANCE OF STANDARDS: PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION USING SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION (SPA) STANDARDS

SECTION A. INTRODUCTION

A.1 Purpose

The *Guidelines on Writing and Acceptance of Standards: Program Review with National Recognition using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards* has been created to guide specialty professional associations (SPAs) that seek to have their standards used by CAEP in making such standards more consistent in form and substance; more congruent with the P-12 student standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards) used by states and local school districts; more supportive of teacher standards for state program approval (e.g., state teacher standards); and more closely aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) for teachers and other school professionals. This section also aims to make SPA program standards correspond explicitly with the 2013 *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards 1.0*[2] that were developed to reflect what all beginning teachers should know, be like, and be able to do in order to practice responsibly, regardless of the subject matter or grade level being taught. The intent is to better integrate these standards with performance-based accreditation and accreditation standards.

A.2 Background on standards in accreditation

Like accreditors in law, medicine, engineering, and other professional fields, CAEP uses standards as the foundation for accreditation in P-12 educator preparation. The CAEP Standards for accrediting educator preparation providers (EPPs) – the CAEP Standards for Initial-Level Programs and the CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs – are the focus of evidence gathering, self-study reports, and site visit teams that lead up to final accreditation decisions for initial- and advanced-level programs. These standards describe the profession's view of effective practice.

Working with its affiliated SPAs,[3] CAEP's Board of Directors, through the SPA Standards Committee, reviews standards for initial- and advanced-level programs in specialty licensure

---

[2] https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf

[3] Pursuant to CAEP's Bylaws, CAEP relies on a number of partners in fulfilling its mission (Bylaws Section 4.01 Partnerships). CAEP enters into partnerships with Specialized Professional Associations ("SPA Partnerships") for the development of specialized standards and assistance with reviewing specialty licensure areas for the achievement of National SPA Recognition (Bylaws Section 4.03 Specialized Professional Association [SPA]

areas. These standards are written for different fields of teaching (e.g., special education, secondary mathematics, secondary English, health education) and for other school professionals (e.g., school principals, school librarians and media specialists, school psychologists). Preparation programs are the heart of educator pre-professional growth and professional advancement. They provide the structured opportunities (e.g., course content and field experiences) for individuals preparing to enter various education specialties to learn, practice, and be assessed on what they will need to know and be able to do when they enter their new professional responsibilities.

As CAEP's partners, SPAs have been writing standards for more than three decades. These standards have evolved over time from ones that described courses and experiences candidates[4] should be offered (input-based), to ones that describe what proficient candidates should know and be able to do as they complete their program (outcomes-based). SPA Standards are created by SPAs and remain the work product of SPAs even when used by CAEP. Following acceptance by the SPA Standards Committee, SPA Standards serve as the basis for SPA program reviews which may be carried out in conjunction with the CAEP accreditation process. A SPA review culminates with a national recognition decision; reports from the review and decision may be used by the EPP as partial evidence for CAEP Standard 1 on Content and Pedagogical Knowledge.

A.3 Context for education standards

The context for standards has many facets. Standards exhibit continuing change in both policies and operations. States have adopted standards for their P-12 students, especially since President George H.W. Bush met with the nation's governors at an education summit in 1989, and national goals for education were crafted in 1990. The formation of national education goals was subsequently followed by the development of the Common Core State Standards (CCSSO, 2010). The standards states adopt regarding the achievement of students have a significant impact on the activities of educators, schools, and districts because they are the basis for state assessments, graduation requirements, and the purchase of curriculum materials. State standards for student achievement are also associated, although more loosely, with state standards for teachers and other educators, state program approval of educator preparation programs, and state licensure requirements, including licensure tests.

In writing their standards for teachers and other school professionals, states have been considerably influenced by a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), beginning in the late 1980s, known as the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). The InTASC categories—the learner and learning; specialty field content

---

Partnership). Details on CAEP and SPA structures and policies will be linked to relevant resources, as needed, throughout the document to provide greater clarity.

[4] To avoid confusion in terminology, all references to individuals in preparation programs use the term "candidates," and all references to P-12 pupils use the term "students," or, as in InTASC, "learners."

knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge; applications of that knowledge in instructional practice; and professional responsibilities for initial teaching—adopted by many states, were intended to provide a foundation for state standards that describe what new teachers should know and be able to do. States could adapt them to their own needs and to different teaching assignments. They were written to be congruent with the Core Propositions of the National Board on Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), another group established in the late 1980s. NBPTS Core Propositions are explicated in standards for different student age levels and subjects, which, in turn, serve as frameworks for NBPTS assessments created to identify and certify accomplished teachers and other school professionals.

As an aftermath of the 2001 reauthorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), by 2007-2008 some aspects of standards in education had been questioned. That questioning shifted the context in which accreditation standards were perceived, written, and implemented. For example, there was criticism that there were too many expectations in content standards for schools to cover in the curriculum, and that the standards failed to respond sufficiently to a list of concerns such as a lack of higher order thinking and problem solving, themes that cross academic discipline lines, more individualized learning and collaborative team teaching, more extensive use of technology in education, and formative assessment to improve student learning.

In this same era, criticisms were levied at SPA program standards as well. For example, educator preparation programs (EPPs) indicated that the number of SPA Standards was excessive; faculty and many education reformers questioned the balance of academic and clinical aspects of standards; some states claimed the amount of emphasis on critical thinking, and problem solving, or on collaboration and use of formative assessments in teaching were too limited. Institutional representatives argued that the existing SPA Standards differed from each other in content and form to such an extent that the differences impeded institutional efforts to develop coherent programs and assessment systems across the unit. In addition, there were significant and growing findings from research and the knowledge of practice that could be adapted to each professional specialization, but such findings were frequently ignored.

These criticisms, questions, and opportunities shaped the development of a set of guidelines, which would address concerns around inconsistency through a coherent structure in the development and implementation of the SPA Standards. The guidelines in structuring the SPA Standards for Initial-Level Programs are based on the four key CAEP Standard 1 concepts adapted from the four InTASC categories noted below:

- Category A. The Learner and Learning
- Category B. Content
- Category C. Instructional Practice
- Category D. Professional Responsibility

In the absence of a parallel set of guiding principles for advanced-level programs certifying "other school professionals," SPAs that develop standards in these areas (for instance, for reading specialists, school librarians and media specialists, school psychologists, school and district administrators, school counselors) should be guided by the two overarching goals: (a) the standards must demonstrate a focus on candidates' foundational knowledge base in the specific field and (b) the standards must emphasize effect on student learning.

Advanced-level programs certifying "other school professionals" must have some common attributes such as the following:

- Programs are offered at the graduate level;
- Candidates are expected to develop an ability to apply research and research methods;
- Candidates develop knowledge of learning, the social and cultural context in which learning takes place, and the practices in their professional roles that support learning; and
- Candidates develop positive environments that are supportive of student learning.

Some of the advanced-level program standards certifying "other school professionals" will have a strong component of teaching—for example, those for school librarians and for reading specialists. By contrast, some of the "other school professional" standards will represent specialty roles with important but different responsibilities, such as school principals, district superintendents, and school psychologists. At this time there is little in common across the diverse "other" professionals' work that would support a particular set of principles. Instead, the SPA Standards Committee will broadly interpret the InTASC categories, described in Part B.3 (p.11), as a "general guide" for other school professionals—one that requires flexible interpretation and calls on SPAs to find creative ways to emphasize the most important knowledge and skills.

The following illustrative interpretations will be considered by those SPAs that are adapting the categories in B.3 (p.11) for other school professionals:

- **Category A**, "the learner and learning," would need adjustment for non-teaching positions, but some features of the principle (e.g., knowledge of child development and learning; working with student diversity; or creating supportive learning environments) should be a part of most standards for "other school professionals."
- **Category B**, "content," could be interpreted to encompass both an academic subject and the professional knowledge of the field. The SPA Standards Committee does not anticipate requests for a waiver of this principle since every school professional specialty will have an identifiable base of content knowledge that candidates are expected to master.

- o **Category C**, "instructional practice," would also need adjustment for non-teaching positions. However, understanding assessment and having ability to use it to foster learning would be appropriate in some form for most standards written for "other school professional" preparation programs.
- o **Category D**, "professional responsibility," emphasizes professional learning and ethical practice as well as leadership and collaboration. Those responsibilities would have applications for every professional education position.

While the categories may be flexibly interpreted to accommodate other school personnel, as illustrated above, the underlying issue is whether a literal reading of the principles might cause a distortion of what is important in the SPA's field. If that is the conclusion, then the SPA should submit its case to the SPA Standards Committee, as described above.

A.4 Highlights of the Writing and Acceptance of SPA Standards

This section focuses on three important areas in developing SPA Standards. First, SPA Standards describe and make use of a knowledge base, including current research (empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory) and the wisdom of practice, appropriate for the professionals in their field. Standards draw on developments in P-12 educator standards from states or other SPAs related to their specialty field while also addressing any overlaps in existing national standards in the specialty licensure area. Second, SPA Standards focus on students and creation of environments that will foster student learning. And third, SPA Standards are written to describe what candidates should know and be able to do by the completion of their preparation programs in ways that can be assessed by actual performance.

The guidelines also provide a basis for CAEP-SPA service agreements to ensure the following:

- ● *Creating a Common framework for standards in content and structure*
    - o Part I of the guidelines identifies the four InTASC categories that SPAs will use as a common conceptual framework for developing the content of new or revised standards: (1) The Learner and Learning; (2) Content; (3) Instructional Practice; (4) Professional Responsibility. These are intended to bring greater consistency across SPAs in what is contained in standards, a specification that institutions have frequently requested. The principles draw upon the experience of InTASC and NBPTS, both of which have similar arrangements to structure standards that have common content topics. (Refer to part B.3, Categories for SPA standards, and also part B.2, Intent of the four InTASC categories.)
    - o Part I of the guidelines calls for SPA Standards to address only the most critical topics in the SPA's specialty area. To ensure structural consistency among SPAs, the number of standards were limited to 7, with a maximum of 28 components[5]

---

[5] The components expand upon the standard statement are a conceptual outline for the standard statement, and they provide structure for the standard. Each concept that is a component appears in the language of the standard. The

in total. The objective is to identify the most critical knowledge and skills for SPA Standards, and to ensure that each standard is directed to what is unique or particular for the specialty area. The goal is to create standards that are concise, rigorous, and measurable, rather than ones that will be duplicative and overwhelming in breadth and number. (See Formatting of the SPA Standards in part B.4.d, p.27.)

● *Building on accumulating research consensus*—The strength of research findings has grown because of improved study designs and because of increasingly available longitudinal data systems that states are implementing with the capability to link student and teacher data.

The four InTASC categories are founded on strong consensus from national panels about research on critical topics that can be applied across all specialty areas. These topics include how students learn, child and adolescent development, use of assessment to enhance learning, importance of clinical experiences, and knowledge of standards, curriculum, and assessment-based accountability systems. Such topics have frequently been the focus of research panels at the National Academy of Sciences (2010),[6] the National Academy of Education, as well as the NCATE Report of the Blue-Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning (2010).[7]

These panels are typically comprised of researchers from different disciplines who analyze dozens, or hundreds, of research projects. They examine the relevance and validity of each project with respect to the panel's study topic, to determine whether the researchers' conclusions are sound. The panels sometimes even re-analyze the researchers' original data, and they set aside projects with flawed methodology. The report from each panel represents a consensus of the considered judgments of its members about what conclusions can be taken away from research to date on the study topic.

These guidelines contain narrative on related research following each principle in part B.3, Principles for SPA Standards. In addition, since the language of InTASC standards has been adopted in these guidelines, the InTASC description of its *Model Core Teaching Standards* research base has been excerpted in [Appendix F](#) as supplementary material.

---

components focus on the critical aspects of the SPA Standards so that programs can reasonably accommodate the standards in a pre-service educator preparation program.

[6] National Research Council. 2010. *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.17226/12882.

[7] National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers.* A report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnership for Improved Student Learning. Washington, DC: Author.

- *Strengthening relationship with program review*—Part I of the guidelines also seeks to ensure that development of standards is directly linked with an efficient implementation process. This includes a commitment to conduct program review for national recognition by adequately supporting providers that are preparing reports and reviewers reviewing the reports.

    o SPAs should demonstrate measurability of standards through suggested assessment evidence guidelines and candidate performance assessment rubrics addressing how licensure programs seeking national recognition would provide evidence in their reports through a maximum of eight assessments using either Option 1 or 2 as explained Appendix G. All assessments, taken as whole, must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA Standards. (See part B.6 Adapting InTASC categories for initial- and advanced-level programs, p. 26.)

    o SPA program reviewer decisions on whether standards are met should be based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level. SPAs should clearly explain the basis of determining preponderance of evidence to meet its standards. The decision on whether there is preponderance of evidence to meet a standard may be based on professional judgment of the trained program review teams. (See B.4 Formatting of SPA Standards in part e., p.27.)

- *Providing an advantage to providers to gather program level evidence for accreditation standards*—Use of InTASC language as a guide for teacher education, the SPA Standards can facilitate the work of EPP program coordinators by providing some common undergirding to their compilations of program evidence and reports across multiple disciplines and programs. This is expected to eliminate duplication of effort by providers to conduct program level review (for SPA national recognition) and provider level review (for CAEP national accreditation).

- *Strengthening the profession through consistency*—Language that acknowledges the standards-setting context in education functions best when the profession can speak with a consistent and strong voice across specialty licensure areas. InTASC elaborates on this point in its April 2011 standards (p. 6):

Consistency…ensures a coherent continuum of expectations for teachers from beginning through accomplished practice and sets the conditions necessary to support professional growth along this continuum. It also increases the probability of building aligned systems of teacher development and support that begin with recruitment and preparation and run through induction, ongoing professional development, accomplished teaching, and other leadership roles.

- *Providing an advantage to states*—The shift is advantageous in those states that adopt or adapt to InTASC and/or SPA Standards as guides for educator preparation programs, as it will help align the SPA program review process with state requirements.

A.5 Required components of a SPA Standards application and additional contact information

SPAs will be required to include all the items listed in C.2 (p. 33) as part of the SPA Standards application for review and acceptance by CAEP's SPA Standards Committee. The list of required components in C.2 summarizes points from the guidelines that serve as the basis for the review. SPAs are expected to indicate, on the worksheet included in their application packet, the heading or section and specific page of the submission where each of the guidelines is addressed.

SECTION B. CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF SPA STANDARDS

B.1 Focus of SPA Standards on student learning

One of the key areas of emphasis in developing SPA Standards is to impact student learning. Student learning, however, is not a "standard." It is the focus of instruction, of educator preparation, and of the responsibilities for all professional school personnel. Thus, student learning must not only be the focus of standards and preparation for teachers, but for other school professionals as well. Moreover, that focus must be for all students irrespective of their economic status, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, learning abilities, English language proficiency, levels of literacy, and/or geographic locations.

B.2 Intent of the four InTASC Categories

The four key concepts of CAEP Standard 1 for initial licensure programs are based on the InTASC categories and standards released in April 2011 and have been created as the primary guide for writing SPA Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs. They are adapted to standards and performance-based accreditation, responsive to the insistence of the profession on focus and conciseness in standards and aligned with National Board Certification standards (also known as the National Board Professional Teaching Standards, or NBPTS) guidelines so that the profession speaks with a consistent voice. They draw on the strongest knowledge base that can be assembled at this time and address the essential components of educator preparation. More specific details follow:

- The four InTASC categories that form the basis on which the SPA Standards are developed and the components[8] are structured to describe and make use of the

---

[8] The components expand upon the standard statement; they are a conceptual outline for the standard statement and they provide structure for the standard. Each concept that is a component appears in the language of the standard. The components focus on the critical aspects of the SPA Standards so that programs can reasonably accommodate the standards in a pre-service educator preparation program.

knowledge base, including empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice for their areas of expertise. SPAs should follow and make appropriate use of developments in P-12 student and educator standards adopted by states (such as state applications of the Common Core State Standards, and/or College and Career Readiness Standards), or by other SPAs in fields closely related to their own. Second, SPA Standards should focus on students and creation of environments that will foster student learning. And third, SPA Standards should specify major aspects of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates should achieve as they complete their preparation program.

- The intent of the four InTASC categories and the goal for CAEP's acceptance of the SPA Standards for Initial-Licensure Programs are to identify what is most critical for well-prepared beginning P-12 professionals in each specialty area to know and be able to do. Standards writers should think at a high conceptual level about what best characterizes the special features of their field. They should describe knowledge and skills that can actually be achieved by candidates during the course of their preparation, and adequately sampled in the assessments for program reports.

- The four categories also serve as a concept-driven structure or organizing framework. They tap the legacy of the NBPTS and InTASC standards, which were written for a wide variety of specialty fields, but always in ways that make the common underlying principles or core propositions obvious and clear. CAEP seeks a similar effect in establishing the guidelines so that providers will find a consistency that helps them achieve coherence across the educator licensure and certification programs they offer. This attribute is discussed more fully in part B.4, Formatting of SPA Standards (p.25). Part B.5 (p.29) provides additional details about adaptation of the principles for other school professionals.

- The four categories as well as the SPA Standards are crafted to b**e** aligned with the four key CAEP Standard 1 concepts adapted from the four InTASc categories, as mentioned in Section A.3 above. (See Appendix F for a side by side display that illustrates this alignment for the four InTASC categories.) The categories are also influenced by current state trends that place greater emphasis on knowledge and skills that equip educators to create and support nurturing learning environments; promote collaboration among faculty, families, and administrators; encourage collaboration among P-12 students; use assessment to inform and motivate learning; offer opportunities for interdisciplinary instruction; make use of media and technical literacy; and provide more differentiated teaching. CAEP expects that each SPA will incorporate these trends into their deliberations and drafting of teacher and other school professional preparation standards.

B.3 Developing SPA Standards

The four InTASC categories from the *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0* (CCSSO, 2013) include The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility. SPA Standards writers are encouraged to review the supporting statements on each of the 10 standards in the InTASC *Model State Standards* (2013) publication.

B.3.a. InTASC Category A: The Learner and Learning

SPA Standards should address the substance of three InTASC standards for The Learner and Learning as appropriate for candidate preparation in the specialty area:

- *Learner Development*. The candidate understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
- *Learning Differences*. The candidate uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
- *Learning Environments.* The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Category A addresses candidates' knowledge of the ways children and adolescents learn and develop, and the relationship of students' cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical development to learning. Standards in specialty professional areas describe candidates' understanding of how students differ in their learning patterns and how instructional opportunities must be adapted to diverse learners. The standards cover candidates' understanding of language acquisition; cultural influences on learning; exceptionalities; diversity of student populations, families, and communities; and inclusion and equity in classrooms and schools.

This category also guides SPAs toward standards that describe candidates' abilities to create, in their specialty field, effective and supportive learning environments centered in student learning, content knowledge, and community values. Such standards should describe candidates' understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a productive learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, a safe and supportive climate, and active engagement in learning. The SPA Standards should also include promotion of learners' acceptance of responsibility for their own learning. They should describe, for the SPA's specialty field, candidates' abilities to develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity; that demonstrates classroom behaviors consistent with fairness and the belief that all students can learn; and that adapts instruction or services appropriately

for all students, including interventions for students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels.

Although it is important for candidates to be prepared to address the three areas of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments, the approach for preparing other school professionals in each area may vary. For example, educational leaders, such as principals, need to be prepared to establish learning environments that encourage teachers and other school professionals to foster and enhance learner development; they should know and appreciate learner differences (NASP, 2008).[9] Programs preparing school librarians must ensure that candidates know how to guide instructional design by collaborating with classroom teachers on all aspects of the lesson planning and implementation, including adoption of assessment strategies (2017).[10]

School psychologists need to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to work with school administrators, teachers, and others within and outside the schools, such as families, to improve and individualize instruction, and create a safe and a positive school climate (NASP, 2008). The goal is to enhance the educational, developmental, and mental health functioning of all students. Creating positive environments that are conducive to learning increase students' performance in reading, writing, and mathematics (Hanson, Austin, & Lee-Bayha, 2004;[11] Spier, Cai, & Osher, 2007;[12] Spier, Cai, Osher, & Kendziora, 2007[13]). Regardless of their positions, it is an expectation that all professionals within schools positively impact students through various means. Candidates who work in multidisciplinary teams that address individual differences in evaluation of skills and designing interventions can produce substantial positive impact on student outcomes (Forness, 2001).[14]

Category A is also critical for the work of other school professionals such as reading specialists and literacy coaches who must have both knowledge of the *Learner and Learning* and also the ability to use that knowledge in designing, implementing, and evaluating instruction that is challenging, engaging, and meets the needs of the diverse learners with whom they work. In order to address this category, candidates must be able to design instruction that integrates multiple learning modalities for a range of students, those experiencing difficulties as well as those who demonstrate proficiency and advanced aptitude. Other school professionals must

---

[9] National Association of School Psychologists. (2008). *Ready to learn, empowered to teach: Excellence in education for the 21st Century*. Bethesda, MD: Author.
[10] American Association of School Librarians. (2017). *National school library standards for learners, school librarians, and school libraries*. Chicago: American Library Association.
[11] Hanson, T. L., Austin, G. A., & Lee-Bayha, J. (2004). *Ensuring that no child is left behind: How are student health risks and resilience related to the academic progress of schools?* Los Alamitos, CA: WestEd.
[12] Spier, E., Cai, C., & Osher, D. (2007, December). *School climate and connectedness and student achievement in the Anchorage School District*. Unpublished report, American Institutes for Research.
[13] Spier, E., Cai, C., Osher, D., & Kendziora, D. (2007, September). *School climate and connectedness and student achievement in 11 Alaska school districts*. (Unpublished report). American Institutes for Research.
[14] Forness, S. R. (2001). Special education and related services: What have we learned from meta-analysis? *Exceptionality, 9*, 185–197.

also be able to work collaboratively with and facilitate the work of their teacher colleagues to ensure classroom learning experiences are developmentally appropriate and challenging, to provide for individual differences through the use of various print and digital materials, to design environments that promote group interaction, active engagement, and learning motivation.

The concepts of *Category A* are drawn from research on learning, growth and development, and on environments that are conducive to effective teaching and learning. For example, an NRC report (2000) concludes that a classroom environment must be centered in learners, knowledge, assessment, and the community. To achieve those qualities, teachers must give attention to what is taught (information and subject matter), why it is taught (for understanding), and what competence or mastery looks like. A National Academy of Education (NAE, 2005)[15] conclusion is that learning communities should provide people with a feeling that members matter to each other and to the group, and a shared belief that members' needs will be met through their commitment to work together. Research indicates that candidates' own learning about effective learning environments can be enhanced when they have observed and analyzed many examples of student work, classroom artifacts, and videotapes of teaching.

A clear research consensus concludes that (1) student preconceptions about how the world works must be engaged in order for students to grasp new concepts and information; (2) student competence requires a deep foundation of factual knowledge and a strong structural framework; and (3) strategies can be taught that allow students to monitor their own understanding and progress in problem solving. *How People Learn II* (2018)[16] provides extended text on these three "key findings" together with corresponding "implications for the enterprise of teaching and teacher preparation." The conclusions in a section on "Teachers and Teaching" follow:

- Teachers need expertise in both subject matter content and in teaching.
- Teachers need to develop understanding of the theories of knowledge (epistemologies) that guide the subject-matter disciplines in which they work.
- Teachers need to develop an understanding of pedagogy as an intellectual discipline that reflects theories of learning, including knowledge of how cultural beliefs and the personal characteristics of learners influence learning.
- Teachers are learners, and the principles of learning and transfer for student learners apply to teachers.
- Teachers need opportunities to learn about children's cognitive development and children's development of thought (children's epistemologies) to know how teaching practices build on learners' prior knowledge.

---

[15] Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. (Sponsored by the National Academy of Education). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass. pp. 64 and 401.

[16] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2018. *How people learn II: Learners, contexts, and cultures.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved May 26, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.17226/24783.

- Teachers need to develop models of their own professional development that are based on lifelong learning, rather than on an "updating" model of learning, in order to have frameworks to guide their career planning.

In addition, there is an expectation that these three key findings about learning are not simply generic conclusions, but ones to be applied for each specialty field. A report from the National Research Council provides extensive illustrative applications in the fields of history, mathematics, and science.[17]

- For example, ". . . history is 'counterintuitive.' . . . people doing history are looking at things differently from the way we handle them for practical daily living . . . in history the past is not given, and we cannot hold what we are saying up against the real past to see whether it matches. The inferential discipline of history has evolved precisely because, beyond the reach of living memory, the real past cannot play any direct role in our accounts of it. History depends on the interrogation of sources of evidence, which do not of themselves provide an unproblematic picture of the past." (pp. 33 and 35) ". . . if we say of a particular lesson that one of its purposes is 'to teach students about evidence,' we are thinking of where we want the students to arrive, not how they may actually be operating (p. 41)."

- In mathematics, "there is surely no single best instructional approach," but identifying approaches that engage students' preconceptions and build on existing knowledge is possible. These include (1) "Allowing students to use their own informal problem-solving strategies, at least initially, and then guiding their mathematical thinking toward more effective strategies and advanced understandings; (2) encouraging math talk so that students can clarify their strategies to themselves and others, and compare the benefits and limitations of alternate approaches; and (3) designing instructional activities that can effectively bridge commonly held conceptions and targeted mathematical understandings (p. 223)."

- In science, "… everyday experiences often reinforce the very conceptions of phenomena that scientists have shown to be limited or false, and everyday modes of reasoning are often contrary to scientific reasoning…Force, for instance, is seen as a property of bodies that are forceful rather than an interaction between bodies…Students believe objects to 'be' a certain color, and light can either allow us to see the color or not. The notion that white light is composed of a spectrum of colors and that the specific colors absorbed and reflected by a particular object give the object the appearance of a particular color is not at all apparent in everyday experience" (p. 399). In science, learning science as a process of inquiry "involves observation, imagination, and reasoning about the phenomena under study. It includes the use of tools and procedures, but in the context of authentic inquiry (p. 405)."

Similar factors are also applicable to the work of other school professionals. For instance, in the school library, learners are provided structured opportunities to "(1) acquire new knowledge by thinking critically and solving problems; (2) operate in a global society by interacting with and acknowledging the perspectives of others; (3) work with others to achieve common goals; (4)

---

[17] National Research Council (NRC). 2005. *How students learn: History, mathematics, and science in the classroom*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved May 26, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.17226/10126.

collect, organize, and share resources; (5) harness curiosity and employ a growth mindset to explore and discover; and (6) follow ethical and legal guidelines while engaging with information (AASL, 2018[18], p. 28)."

Other consensus panel reports place strong emphasis on learning and development, calling for coursework on child and adolescent development that is tightly linked to clinical experiences, with rich and systematic observation of children, child case studies, and analyses of student work and learning (NAE, 2005, pp. 118, 119), and also adapted to each age level of teaching[19] (NICHHD and NCATE, 2008[20], pp. 30, 31). Two excerpts illustrate the need to apply these research findings for each specialty field:

- . . . teachers need to understand children's development and how it influences, and is influenced by, their learning. A foundation of knowledge about child development is essential for planning curriculum; designing, sequencing, and pacing activities; diagnosing student learning needs; organizing the classroom; and teaching social and academic skills (NAE, 2005, p. 88).

- Research has demonstrated that children can be taught [metacognitive] strategies, including the ability to predict outcomes, explain to oneself to improve understanding, note failures to comprehend, activate background knowledge, plan ahead, and apportion time and memory…The teaching of metacognitive activities must be incorporated into the subject matter that students are learning. These strategies are not generic across subjects and attempts to teach them as generic can lead to failure to transfer. Teaching metacognitive strategies in context has been shown to improve understanding in physics, written composition, and heuristic methods for mathematical problem solving. And metacognitive practices have been shown to increase the degree to which students transfer to new settings and events (NRC 2000[21], pp 18, 19).

Research also demonstrates that a variety of educational professionals trained in a multitude of assessment and intervention techniques are needed to address the educational, social, socioeconomic, and mental health problems that students increasingly present in the schools (Adelman & Taylor, 2010).[22] Although the particular training needed by each type of professional may vary, strong preparation of each is needed, along with an emphasis on the

---

[18] American Association of School Librarians. (2018). *National School Library Standards for Learners, School Librarians, and School Libraries*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
[19] National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, NIH, DHHS. (2007). *Child and adolescent development research and teacher education: Evidence-based pedagogy, policy, and practice*. Washington, DC: Author.
[20] National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers. A report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnership for Improved Student Learning*. Washington, DC: NCATE
[21] Bransford, John D., Ann L. Brown & Rodney Cocking (editors). (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. National Academy Press, Washington, DC.
[22] Adleman, H.S. & Taylor, L. (2010). Creating successful school systems requires addressing barriers to learning and teaching. *The F. M. Duffy Reports, 15*(3), 1-11. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/publications/duffyreport.pdf.

need to work collaboratively to solve problems in an effective manner. Research on school psychology reveals the following:

- School psychologists, for example, have extensive preparation in assessment, progress monitoring, instruction, child development and psychology, consultation, counseling, crisis response, program evaluation, and data collection and analysis.

- School psychologists are expected to apply this expertise within the schools, including general and special education.

- School psychologists have extensive knowledge in school systems and relevant laws (NASP 2010a, 2010b).[23]

Additionally, studies have indicated that increased access to school libraries and professional school librarians helps increase students' reading scores. Collaboration between school librarians and classroom teachers as well as co-teaching models are positively correlated to higher performance among students in reading and language arts (Library Research Service, n.d.).[24] School librarians should be prepared to address diversity, inclusion, and equity in schools by offering virtual access to all resources, and especially offering physical access to marginalized students as a way to provide necessary opportunities to access print and digital resources and to benefit from adult instruction and guidance (Dickinson, G., Gavigan, K., and Pribesh, S. 2008).[25]

B.3.b. InTASC Category B: Content

SPA Standards should address the substance of two InTASC standards for Content as appropriate for candidate preparation in the specialty area:

- *Content Knowledge.* The candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
- *Application of Content.* The candidate understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

---

[23] National Association of School Psychologists. (2010a). *Model for comprehensive and integrated school psychological services*. Adopted by the NASP Delegate Assembly, March 2010.

   National Association of School Psychologists. (2010b). *Standards for the credentialing of school psychologists*. Adopted by the NASP Delegate Assembly, March 2010.

[24] Library Research Service. (n.d.) *School libraries impact studies*. Location unknown: Author. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from https://www.lrs.org/data-tools/school-libraries/impact-studies/.

[25] Dickinson, G., K. Gavigan, and S. Pribesh. (2008). Open and Accessible: The relationship between closures and circulation in school library media centers. *School Library Media Research, Vol. 11*. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from http://www.ala.org/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume11/Dickinson.

The term "content knowledge" has two meanings. First—and certainly for teacher preparation at the initial and advanced levels—content can be defined as the subject matter of discipline(s) that teachers are being prepared to teach at the elementary, middle, and/or secondary levels. Second, content can refer to the professional field of study (e.g., special education, early childhood education, school psychology, reading and literacy, technology, school librarians, or education leadership). The second definition would always pertain to preparation for "other school professional" positions, but could in some cases (for example, special education), also be part of content knowledge for teacher preparation standards.

This category guides SPAs toward standards that describe the subject content knowledge candidates are expected to acquire in their field and apply in their teaching. The SPA Standards should also encourage candidates to make content knowledge accessible to learners through multiple means, including those available through the internet and technology, and to encourage critical reasoning, problem solving, creativity, and communication in the SPA's specialty field.

The concepts of this category draw from research that associates critical thinking and problem solving with deep knowledge of a specific subject content area and that links students' content learning with their growth and development. For example, a report from the National Research Council[26] on learning states

- Superficial coverage of all topics in a subject area must be replaced with in-depth coverage of fewer topics that allows key concepts in that discipline to be understood…there must be a sufficient number of cases of in-depth study to allow students to grasp the defining concepts in specific domains within a discipline (NRC, 2000, p. 20).

- A key finding in the learning and transfer literature is that organizing information into a conceptual framework allows for greater 'transfer;' that is, it allows the student to apply what was learned in new situations and to learn related information more quickly…And as concepts are reinforced, the student will transfer learning beyond the classroom, observing and inquiring… (NRC, 2000, p. 17).

- Before a teacher can develop powerful pedagogical tools, he or she must be familiar with the process of inquiry and the terms of discourse in the discipline, as well as understand the relationship between information and the concepts that help organize that information in the discipline. But equally important, the teacher must have a grasp of the growth and development of students' thinking about these concepts (NRC, 2000, p. 20).

---

[26] National Research Council (NRC). 2000. *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Expanded Edition. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.17226/9853.

B.3.c. InTASC Category C: Instructional Practice

The SPA Standards should address the substance of three InTASC standards for Instructional Practice as appropriate for candidate preparation in the specialty area:

- *Assessment.* The candidate understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
- *Planning for Instruction.* The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. Further, candidates preparing as other school professionals, in addition to being able to plan appropriate instruction, can support teachers in planning instruction to facilitate student learning.
- *Instructional Strategies.* The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways. Further, candidates preparing as other school professionals, in addition to being able to use a variety of instructional strategies, can collaborate with teachers to assist them in utilizing appropriate instructional strategies.

This InTASC category guides SPAs toward standards that describe what candidates should learn and be able to apply in a particular field or discipline relative to the integration of assessment, planning, and instructional strategies so that P-12 students will meet explicit learning objectives.

SPA Standards should describe knowledge that candidates should have. It includes knowledge of a range of assessments and their appropriate use to measure student growth, to monitor and analyze student learning, to provide explicit feedback for continuous development, and to make appropriate adjustments to instruction.

SPA Standards also should describe what candidates must understand about effective teaching strategies to impart the specialized knowledge of the SPA's subject area or about effective professional practice. This has been labeled "content pedagogy," or "pedagogical content knowledge" (Shulman, 1986)[27], and refers to the particular content or skills that teachers or other school professionals must know in order to be successful in their chosen field. For teachers, it includes multiple forms of representation of ideas, analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, appropriate applications of technology, and demonstrations to help P-12 students learn the discipline. For other school professionals, it may include such topics as knowledge of learning and the social and cultural context in which it takes place; planning and

---

[27] Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*(2), 4-14.

instruction; data gathering, interpretation, and evaluation; use of technology and information literacy; and applications of research.

The concepts underlying this category draw from research on pedagogical content knowledge as well as research on candidate preparation to teach with a standards-based curriculum and experience from recent trends in standards implementation. Research consensus reports indicate that pedagogical content knowledge is "well beyond the content knowledge of a discipline." Pedagogical content knowledge requires understanding of how students typically struggle when they attempt to master a domain, and an understanding of instructional strategies that will help them learn (NAE, 2005, p. 48).

Research panels have frequently examined understanding of assessments and how they can be used to enhance learning. For example

- Instruction in how students learn and how learning can be assessed should be a major component of teacher pre-service and professional development programs. This training should be linked to actual experience in classrooms in assessing and interpreting the development of student competence. To ensure that this occurs, state and national standards for teacher licensure and program accreditation should include specific requirements focused on the proper integration of learning and assessment in teachers' educational experience (NRC, 2001, p. 309).[28]

- Individuals acquire a skill much more rapidly if they receive feedback about the correctness of what they have done…One of the most important roles for assessment is the provision of timely and informative feedback to students during instruction and learning so that their practice of a skill and its subsequent acquisition will be effective and efficient (NRC, 2001, p. 87).

- The use of frequent formative assessment helps make students' thinking visible to themselves, their peers, and their teacher. This provides feedback that can guide modification and refinement of thinking…(A)ssessments must test deep understanding rather than surface knowledge (NRC, 2000, p. 19).

The knowledge base for the Instructional Practice category draws from longitudinal data derived from research conducted in New York City schools,[29] which identified features of teacher preparation programs that are associated with student learning gains. These include: (1) teacher preparation focusing on the work of the classroom and providing opportunities for teachers to study what they will be doing (Boyd et al. 2009, p. 26), and (2) teacher preparation in the curriculum used in New York City (Boyd et al. 2009). These findings indicate that candidate knowledge and skills associated with standards-based curricula should be an

---

[28] National Research Council (NRC). 2001. *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.17226/10019.

[29] Boyd, D., Grossman, P. L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *31*(4), 416-440.

important feature of SPA Standards. There are examples from state teacher standards that already recognize this relationship. Ohio, for example, aligns teacher instructional goals and activities with school and district priorities and Ohio's academic content standards. North Carolina aligns teacher instruction with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

This research supports the expectation that SPA Standards should describe what candidates need to know and be able to do so their P-12 students will learn the content of common core and/or college and career readiness standards, or of state P-12 standards. SPA Standards should also describe ways these standards are matched with curricula, instruction, assessment, and intended student learning.

B.3.d. InTASC Category D: Professional Responsibility

SPA Standards should address the substance of two InTASC standards for Professional Responsibility as appropriate for candidate preparation in the specialty area:

- *Professional Learning and Ethical Practice.* The candidate engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.
- *Leadership and Collaboration.* The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

This professional responsibility category guides SPA Standards toward descriptions of professional practices for the specialty field that are necessary by program completion. The standards should focus on knowledge and skills that are feasible for candidates to achieve during the course of their preparation, rather than on ones they will develop over a career. InTASC characterizes its standards as ones for "professional practice" in which individuals progress from beginning to accomplished teachers by demonstrating the degree of sophistication in the application of the knowledge and skills (see section B.2, above). SPA expectations for appropriate evidence in program review, then, address candidates' preparation and understanding, but should respect the reality that candidates may have limited opportunities to interact directly with families and community members to demonstrate actual performance of professional practices in this respect due to the constraints of student teaching placements.

SPA Standards should describe candidates' learning to be reflective practitioners who evaluate the effects of their practice on a regular basis, and also plan for and seek out opportunities to grow professionally. They describe expectations for candidates' readiness to engage in professional education experiences such as reading, questioning, creating, and incorporating new information into their practice. Standards should describe candidates' abilities to interpret

findings from educational research and assess their significance for practice in the specialty field. Standards should describe candidates' perceptions of themselves as part of the discipline-specific profession, working together on committees, and participating in education projects related to education and to their content area. As appropriate to the specialty field, standards should describe what candidates should understand and be ready to apply as they enter professional life about professional ethics, the equitable treatment of students, and acting on the belief that all students can learn.

In addition, the SPA Standards should address candidates' preparation to collaborate with school colleagues and families, and to make use of resources in the larger community, to enhance students' learning. As appropriate for the specialty, standards should describe candidates' understanding of methods to work with families and to engage them productively in the work of the school; the collaborative roles of other school professionals; and their preparation to work with such colleagues constructively to enhance student learning. Standards should describe candidates' capacities to identify opportunities for collaboration and their preparation to serve in leadership roles or as members of teams, as appropriate to their skills and the task to be performed.

References to the knowledge base address attributes of developing professionals, legal and ethical responsibilities, and collaboration. In the knowledge base for Principle A, The Learner and Learning, one of the conclusions from the NRC report *How People Learn* is that educators

> "…need to develop models of their own professional development that are based on lifelong learning, rather than on an 'updating' model of learning, in order to have frameworks to guide their career planning (NRC 2000, p. 242)."

A National Academy of Education report concludes that any professional program should help candidates begin to see themselves as developing professionals with a clear vision of ultimate goals and responsibilities, rather than simply as students whose primary goal is to get good grades (NAE 2005, p. 76). This report further explains

> "Being a professional involves understanding the social and legal obligations of one's job, including making decisions in the best interest of the client, based on profession-wide research and standards of practice. This commitment to practice based on what is known by the profession as a whole, rather than only one's own personal experience, is linked to a concept of 'evidence-based practice,' which requires of professionals that they be aware of the current knowledge base in their field (NAE 2005, pp. 15-18)."

State standards for educators are explicit about educators taking responsibility for continuous and purposeful professional development, valuing lifelong learning, and striving to improve and advocate for the profession. State standards are especially explicit about ethical principles, legal codes of professional conduct, honesty, integrity, fair treatment, and respect for others.

Educators' performances as collaborators and co-teachers with other professionals, parents, and the community, and their responsibilities to encourage collaboration in learning environments among students are also addressed in research and in state standards. An excerpt from an NAE report states

> "To be successful, learning communities should provide people with a feeling that members matter to each other and to the group, and a shared belief that members' needs will be met through their commitment to work together (NAE 2005, p. 64)."

For other school professionals, such responsibilities can take various forms of collaboration. School librarians have additional professional responsibilities that must be in place before outstanding teaching and learning can occur: (1) Librarians must advocate for twenty-first century literary skills and integrate the use of emerging technologies when teaching; (2) Librarians must be familiar with a wide range of children's, young adult, and professional literature in multiple formats and languages to support reading for pleasure, reading for information, and reading for lifelong learning; (3) Librarians must use a variety of strategies to promote leisure reading and model personal enjoyment of reading in order to promote habits of creative expression and lifelong reading; (4) Librarians must develop a collection of reading and information materials in print and digital formats that support the diverse developmental, cultural, social, and linguistic needs of P-12 students and their communities; (5) Librarians must evaluate and select print, non-print, and digital resources using professional selection tools and evaluation criteria to develop and manage a quality collection designed to meet the diverse curricular, personal, and professional needs of students, teachers, and administrators; (6) Librarians must organize school library collections according to current library cataloging and classification principles and standards; (7) Librarians must facilitate access to information in print, non-print, and digital formats. They develop solutions for addressing physical, social, and intellectual barriers to equitable access to resources and services; and (8) Librarians must apply best practices for planning library policies and procedures, budgeting, and evaluating human, information, and physical resources (AASL/ALA, 2010)[30].

The Building Level Standards for Education Leadership (ELCC, 2011)[31] emphasize candidates' ability to (1) design and support a collaborative process for developing and implementing a school vision; (2) articulate a school vision of learning characterized by respect for students and their families and community partnerships; (3) develop a comprehensive plan for communicating the school vision to appropriate school constituencies; (4) formulate plans to steward school vision statements; (5) develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes; (6) create school-based strategic and tactical goals; (7) collaboratively develop implementation plans to achieve those goals; (8) develop a school

---

[30] *ALA/AASL Standards for the Initial Preparation of School Librarians.* (2010). Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org.aasl/files/content/aasleducation/schoollibrary/2010_standards_with_rubrics_and_statements_1-31-11.pdf

[31] *Educational Leadership Program Recognition Standards*. (2011). National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Retrieved from http://npbea.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/ELCC-Building-Level-Standards-2011.pdf

improvement plan that aligns to district improvement plans; (9) identify strategies or practices to build organizational capacity that promote continuous and sustainable school improvement; (10) design a transformational change plan at the school-building-level; (11) design a comprehensive, building-level professional development program; (12) develop a school plan to monitor program development and implementation of school goals; (13) construct an evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of school plans and programs; and (14) interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement of school vision and goals for educators in the community and other stakeholders.

B.4 Formatting SPA Standards

The SPA guidelines reflect EPPs' insistence on consistency across SPA program standards, as required by CAEP's agreements with SPAs, so that similar topics are covered along with a sharp focus on common program level expectations that can be attained across P-12 licensure and certification programs offered by a provider. Use of common terminology and structure can help providers establish cross-program coherence through adoption of SPA Standards.

It is possible to recognize the uniqueness that distinguishes each SPA's field, while simultaneously displaying the result through a commonly conceived structure or organizing framework. Evidence from experience of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) suggests that these two goals can be attained simultaneously. The standards from NBPTS have a similar appearance. They contain introductory material that presents the core propositions, describes use of those propositions in board standards, and summarizes the particular set of standards in a commonly formatted one or two-page text that is often excised for stand-alone use. Each set of standards is developed with the five NBPTS core propositions serving as an overall template, yet there is considerable variation. For example, one specialty area will have several standards under the core proposition for content knowledge, while another area has one standard for content but several that explicate the proposition for managing and monitoring student learning. Still, in both situations, the commonalities are evident and the advantage for board applicants and individuals who advise them is visible and clear.

Expectations on formatting SPA Standards

a. SPA Standards should be written around the four INTASC categories described in part B.3, above, as a structure or organizing framework. CAEP expects that concepts identified in the components of each principle may be elaborated as a separate standard, or embedded, grouped, or treated in some other manner, as each SPA determines. If a SPA chooses not to incorporate one or more of these components, then their representatives should advise the SPA Standards Committee a year in advance of the scheduled date for their submission, following the procedure described in part B, item 5, (p. 29). It is recommended that SPAs refer to examples of the SPA Standards available on CAEP's website.

b. The term "Standards" should describe the primary level, and "components" should be used as the term for the next level. There will be no additional layers (such as "indicators" or "sub-components") below that.

c. Standards should be written so that each concept that is to be a component appears in the language of the standard.

d. The number of SPA Standards and components must be sufficiently limited that standards can be sampled in 6 to 8 program report assessments. There is a numerical limit of 7 standards and an overall limit of 28 components. The intent is to restrict the number of individual topics included in SPA Standards so that faculty can reasonably accommodate the standards in preparation programs. The intent is also for SPAs to maintain a focus on the key components of standards for the specialty area.

e. A SPA should require programs to provide evidence for all the components of a standard. The SPA may identify some required components, which should be clearly identified as "Required Components" when the standards are drafted. Programs must meet the "Required Components," if specified by a SPA.

f. To further align the SPA Standards with the SPA program review process, SPA Standards writers should remember that reviewer decisions on whether specific standards are met are based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level. "Preponderance of evidence" means an overall confirmation that candidates meet standards based on the professional judgments of the SPA reviewer teams and made on the strength or quality of evidence. SPAs should clearly identify the basis for determining "preponderance of evidence" for a program to meet the standards.

g. Standards should be limited to the special knowledge and skills that candidates should acquire and demonstrate in the SPA's field within the scope of the principles. "SPA-specific knowledge" is something that is not generic to all SPAs; SPA Standards should reflect the principles as uniquely interpreted for a particular SPA. For example, an NRC report on science standards[32] applies this idea to science in the following:

Focusing on core ideas requires eliminating ideas that are not central to the development of science understanding. Core ideas should be both foundational in terms of connection to many related scientific concepts and have the potential for sustained exploration at increasingly sophisticated levels across grades K-8.

There may be instances in which a feature of standards is not literally unique to a single SPA but might characterize standards for a group of SPAs, such as those preparing standards for secondary teachers, or for early childhood/elementary teachers.

h. Standards should be related to the principles and limited to what candidates who are completing preparation programs must know and be able to do.

---

[32] National Research Council. 2007. *Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K-8.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Executive Summary p. 4 and Chapter 11, p. 13. Retrieved May 27, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.17226/11625.

i. SPA Standards and components should include supporting explanations that will be part of the complete SPA Standards document disseminated to programs, and that elaborate on the meaning of the SPA's standards. The supporting explanation for each standard and component should provide guidance regarding the scope and focus of the standard component by describing how the standard appears in practice—what's important for candidates to know, understand, and do when they are acting in ways that meet the standard. For example, the supporting explanation for a component statement such as *Candidates administer formative and summative assessments regularly to determine students' competencies and learning needs* would describe what candidates know and understand about formative and summative assessments, and how they use this knowledge to determine students' competencies and learning needs. Unlike a discussion of the knowledge base, the supporting explanation is not a discussion about assessment or its importance, but rather a series of statements about what candidates would be seen doing when they are acting in ways that meet the component statement. The supporting explanation is a related series of statements following the general form of candidate/action (e.g., candidates collect data, candidates assess digital literacy, candidates employ knowledge of). Clarity in this area is essential for planning educator preparation programs, developing program assessments that are well-aligned with the standards, and developing rubric performance criteria.

j. SPA Standards should include candidate performance assessment rubrics to describe SPA expectations for appropriate candidate performance, and to guide reviewer judgments by defining different levels of candidate proficiencies in the SPA Standards that determine whether standards are met or not met. Candidate performance assessment rubrics for SPA Standards must demonstrate the characteristics described as the minimal level of sufficient evidence as identified in the SPA Evaluation Tool for Programs ([Appendix D](#), p. 79).

k. SPA Standards should include assessment evidence guidelines that will be part of the complete SPA Standards document disseminated to programs. It is important that SPAs provide adequate guidance to programs seeking National Recognition on how the proposed standards can be met using a minimum of six and a maximum of eight assessments; guidance to programs and program reviewers on assessment evidence; and examples of candidate actions that would demonstrate that the standard is met.

l. SPA Standards should make clear distinctions on types of education professionals for whom they are written: initial teaching license, advanced teaching, or other school professionals.

B.5 Requesting a special programmatic standard

SPA Standards can have up to seven candidate performance standards that are written around the principles in these guidelines, as set out in the formatting paragraphs in B.4.d. However,

there may be state activities, federal laws and policies, credentialing requirements, research findings, or circumstances that arise uniquely in a specialized professional association's field. For example, research makes clear that clinical experiences provide an essential opportunity for candidates to practice and demonstrate their proficiencies as professional educators.[33] SPAs whose programs require such experiences that are different from the institutional norm—by their variety of placements, qualifications of supervisors, or the sequence of experiences—may elect to make an explicit case to the SPA Standards Committee for a standard on field and clinical experiences that would be taken into account in reaching national recognition judgments. This is a programmatic standard and may be included as an eighth standard.

If a SPA determines that a programmatic field and/or clinical standard is necessary for its specialty, then

- o The SPA's case should be constructed around the language of CAEP Standard 2, *Clinical Partnerships and Practice.*
- o The SPA's case should describe the clinical and field experience expectations for the settings or the nature of such experiences.
- o The SPA's case should detail how the expectations for clinical and field experiences of candidates in the SPA's field are sufficiently different from the "norm" for educator preparation to justify their status as a programmatic standard.

---

[33] For example, *Knowing What Students Know (*NRC, 2001), recommends that teacher education and professional development include instruction in how students learn and how learning can be assessed. The report further recommends that preparation programs integrate learning about assessment with actual classroom experience, "…this training should be linked to actual experience in classrooms in assessing and interpreting the development of student competence. To ensure that this occurs, state and national standards for teacher licensure and program accreditation should include specific requirements focused on the proper integration of learning and assessment in teachers' educational experience (p. 309)."

Another example is found in *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do* (NAE, 2005, op.cit.). This excerpt emphasizes how coursework and classroom experience can reinforce each other, "A key element for successful learning is the opportunity to apply what is being learned and refine it . . . . Many teacher educators argue that student teachers see and understand both theory and practice differently if they are taking coursework concurrently with field work. Research on the outcomes of teacher education efforts lends support to this idea that carefully constructed field experiences can enable new teachers to reinforce, apply, and synthesize concepts they are learning in their coursework (p. 401)."

An AERA consensus panel report (Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. [Eds.]. [2005]. Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; Washington, DC, US: American Educational Research Association) also noted the conflict for candidates when field experiences and program coursework give different messages. The following is excerpted from a section on "what we have learned" about research on methods courses and field experiences (from the executive summary, p. 15):

> "Across content areas and across elementary-and secondary-school settings, the studies document that prospective teachers often feel conflict among the messages they receive from differing university instructors, field-based teacher educators, and school settings. It is also the case that prospective teachers resist coherent messages when they find it difficult to engage in recommended practices. When field placements reinforce and support the practices advocated by the teacher education program, individuals may still resist changing their own beliefs or practices because they are personally uncomfortable with the competing beliefs and practices."

A statement of the SPA's rationale constituting such a "case" must be submitted to the SPA Standards Committee one year prior to submitting its new or revised standards for final review and acceptance. *If the SPA Standards Committee accepts a SPA's request for a programmatic field and clinical standard, then the information provided by the institution under the context section of the program report will constitute the evidence used by SPA reviewers to determine that the standard has been met*. A field and clinical standard accepted by the committee may be in addition to the limit of seven standards that these guidelines set in the B.4.d formatting paragraphs; that is, it can be an eighth standard. However, the total number of components may still not exceed 28.

SPA writing standards for other school professionals may seek a programmatic standard in addition to a programmatic field and clinical standard because of state activities, national legislation or credentialing requirements, research findings, or circumstances that arise uniquely within a SPA's field. In such a situation the SPA may make a case explaining to the SPA Standards Committee why a programmatic standard is believed to be necessary and *must submit its case one year in advance of the scheduled submission of its new or revised standards*.

The year-in-advance procedure is the same as that described above and the same as that called for in B.6.c on "standard for field and clinical experiences." Note, however, that the guidelines seek fairness across SPAs in the application of limits while still restraining unnecessary burdens on institutions and program faculty.

SPAs that write standards for other school professionals and choose to include an additional programmatic standard, should count that additional programmatic standard within the limit of seven candidate performance standards permitted in formatting guideline B.4.d.

B.6 Adapting InTASC categories for initial- and advanced-level programs

The four InTASC categories have been crafted with a perspective focused on student learning, and with CAEP's commitment to flexibility of interpretation. These categories can serve as the structure or organizing framework for most SPA Standards.

In those instances where, under part B.4, item a, the categories have no explicit provision for an attribute that is important for a specialty field or where the categories have a provision that a SPA finds incongruent with its field, then

- The SPA may make a case to the SPA Standards Committee clarifying the basis of incongruity of a particular category that may warrant departure from general expectations. The explanation should include a rationale and documentation (research and practice-based evidence) explaining why those features are incongruent with its specialty field.

- Any SPA that identifies such an incongruent feature of the principles should notify the SPA Standards Committee no less than one year prior to the date on which the SPA is to submit its new or revised standards for review and acceptance. The SPA Standards Committee will consider each case on its individual merit, will consider possible implications for SPAs in other specialty fields, and will provide a decision regarding acceptance of the proposed SPA Standards (which may be a notice of acceptance, recommended revisions, requests for clarification or additional information, or notice that the Committee has declined to accept the standards) at a regularly scheduled SPA Standards Committee meeting. (See also part C.2, List of required components of a SPA Standards application, p. 33.)

These provisions for flexible adaptation of the InTASC categories pertain to developing all SPA Standards for initial-level programs, regardless of the level or type.

For SPA Standards for Advanced-Level Programs, the SPA Standards Committee will expect greater depth or breadth, in addition to a SPA's unique area-specific emphases. For example, there may be less emphasis on content knowledge with more emphasis on data literacy, ability to use research, and collaboration as key standards expectations associated with CAEP Standard A.1 for Advanced Level Programs. For SPA reports, the assessments and candidate performance assessment rubrics may differ from those used with initial standards.

B.7 Adapting InTASC categories for other school professional preparation programs

CAEP has not created a parallel set of principles for "other school professionals." CAEP is aware, however, of several factors that shape the context in which standards for these professionals are written. CAEP expects that such standards will be guided by two overarching goals: (a) the standards must focus on candidates' foundational knowledge base in the specific field and (b) they must emphasize the effect on student learning.

There are some common attributes of other school professionals. These include

- Programs are offered at the graduate level;
- Candidates are expected to develop an ability to apply research and research methods;
- Candidates develop knowledge of learning, the social and cultural context in which learning takes place, and the practices that support learning in their professional roles; and
- Candidates develop positive environments that are supportive of student learning.

Within the "other school professional" SPA Standards are some that have a strong component of *teaching*—for example, those for school librarians and for reading specialists. By contrast, some of these other standards represent specialty roles with important but different responsibilities, such as school principals, district superintendents, and school psychologists.

At this time there is little in common across the diverse "other" professionals' work that would support a particular set of principles. Instead, the SPA Standards Committee will interpret the principles described in part B.3 (p.13) as a "general guide" for "other school professionals," but one that requires flexible interpretation and calls on SPAs to find creative ways to emphasize the most important knowledge and skills.

The SPA Standards Committee provides the following illustrative interpretations for consideration by those SPAs that are adapting the principles in B.3 (p.12) for "other school professionals":

- Category A, "the learner and learning," would need adjustment for non-teaching positions, but some features of the principle (e.g., knowledge of child development and learning; working with student diversity; or creating supportive learning environments) should be a part of most standards for other school professionals.
- Category B, "content," could be interpreted to encompass both an academic subject and the professional knowledge of the field. The SPA Standards Committee does not anticipate requests for a waiver of this principle since every school professional specialty will have an identifiable base of content knowledge that candidates are expected to master.
- Category C, "instructional practice," would also need adjustment for non-teaching positions. However, understanding assessment and having ability to use it to foster learning would be appropriate in some form for most standards written for other school professional preparation programs.
- Category D, "professional responsibility," emphasizes professional learning and ethical practice, as well as leadership and collaboration. Those responsibilities would have applications for every professional education position.

While the principles may be flexibly interpreted to accommodate other school personnel, as illustrated above, the underlying issue is whether a literal reading of the principles might cause a distortion of what is important in the SPA's field. If that is the conclusion, then the SPA should submit its case to the SPA Standards Committee, as described above.

B.8 SPA Standards application package

B.8.a Supplemental document (optional)
CAEP encourages SPAs to write a separate, elaborated, and comprehensive qualitative description of good preparation programs. Such a document might describe appropriate curricula, field and clinical experiences, qualifications of faculty involved in clinical practices, relationships with school and district partners, use of technology, important information from the educator preparation knowledge base, appropriate forms or examples of assessments, or other topics important for preparation of professional educators in the specialty field. A SPA supplemental document could serve as a more comprehensive guide for faculty who have

responsibilities to develop and implement programs that prepare candidates as professional educators.

B.8.b Guidelines for evidence

SPAs should provide explicit suggestions and examples that could guide licensure and licensure programs to develop strong assessments to gather evidence to meet the SPA Standards. To ensure consistency in the format of reviewing, programs are expected to provide evidence in their program reports using no more than eight assessments (refer to Appendix G). All assessments, taken as whole, must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA Standards.

While CAEP encourages institutions to seek performance evidence about program completers, high quality evidence of this type may be difficult for providers to obtain. "High quality" is used here to signify evidence of P-12 student achievement, or perhaps structured observation evaluations—but not graduates' self-reports that cannot be compared with other data. As states install longitudinal student and school performance data systems, the potential for attaining solid evidence of graduates' performance will increase.

Although professional dispositions will be reviewed during the EPP accreditation process, SPAs may include guidelines for evidence related to dispositions only when dispositions are specifically unique to the SPA. The SPA should be prepared to provide a rationale to that effect in such cases.

B.8.c Diversity and digital learning

As appropriate for the specialty field, SPAs must address CAEP's themes of diversity and digital learning through their standards. Standards must describe how knowledge and skills candidates need to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners. Standards must specify appropriate and effective integration of technology and digital literacy to support student learning.

SECTION C. PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING AND REVIEWING NEW OR REVISED SPA STANDARDS

C.1 SPA process for developing or revising standards

In accordance with CAEP's Governance Policy, every seven years, specialized professional associations are expected to revisit their standards or provide a rationale for not changing them. Note that information on the SPA processes for developing new or revised standards, as well as the resulting standards, are among the items to be submitted for review (refer to item 2 of the C.2 List of required components of a SPA standards application, and items C.1.a through C.1.d, below).

C.1.a Soliciting and responding to comments

In developing new or revised program standards, SPAs are expected to invite and respond to comments about their current specialty program standards from CAEP, other specialized professional associations, P-12 school-based practitioners, institutions, and states.

C.1.b Drawing on developments in the SPA's field

In preparing program standards, SPAs should draw on current developments in standards from their specialty field and related fields that are found in their current standards for P-12 students, or in standards for teachers and other school professionals, prepared by states or by national professional organizations.

C.1.c Using the knowledge base

SPAs should describe and make use of their knowledge base—including empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory and the wisdom of practice—appropriate for their area of expertise. Explicit research (including current research) references must be provided as a part of the submission of standards to the SPA Standards Committee, together with a summary of how the references were used in the standards.

C.1.d Developing consensus

SPAs are asked to provide evidence of the processes used to develop consensus for their standards, such as distribution of drafts through web-based and other means to secure input from practitioners, higher education faculty, state education agencies, and other groups as appropriate. Submissions to the SPA Standards Committee should include a description of the process(es) used to gather input from various constituencies; a summary of the constituencies from whom input was solicited; samples of any form(s) used; a summary of respondents' responses and their input; and an overview of how the input was used by the SPA in the final standards development. Refer to C.2.(4.d).

C.2 List of required components of a SPA Standards application

The 11 items described below are components of a SPA submission for review. The items pertain to both new and revised standards submitted for consideration. See the following section, C.3 of these guidelines, for the related "Worksheet" that the SPA Standards Committee uses to conduct its review of these items. In addition, an outline for preparing an application for acceptance of SPA Standards (Appendix A) provides SPAs with a succinct list of the headings, order of presentation, and all items required for a complete application. Before completing the standards review and acceptance application, SPAs should be thoroughly familiar with and understand the complete details about each section and item which are contained in the *Guidelines on Program Review with National Recognition Using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards, 2018*, particularly Section C. Procedures for Developing and Reviewing New or Revised SPA Standards.

INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

1. **Title page**—A title page with the following information
   - Name of the professional association
   - Program(s) and level(s) included in the program standards
   - The website for obtaining the full copy of the professional association's program standards
   - The name, postal address, telephone number and email for contact persons who can answer questions related to the SPA submission

2. **Brief introduction to the program standards for SPA Standards Committee use** — SPAs are asked to provide a brief introduction to the program standards for SPA Standards Committee use (which may be similar to an introduction to the program standards prepared for institutions).

STANDARDS—Including principles, formatting, proposed waivers, and programmatic standards

3. **The SPA Standards—**SPAs are asked to provide a complete copy of the text of new or revised standards, components, and supporting explanations, and in Section 8 candidate performance assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines that will be disseminated to programs.

   Standards—The SPA Standards focus on students and creation of environments that will foster student learning. SPA Standards are written to describe what candidates should know and be able to do by the completion of their preparation programs in ways that can be assessed by actual performance. SPA Standards should be written around the four InTASC categories described in part B.3, above, as a structure or organizing framework. Standards must be written so that each concept that is to be a component appears in the language of the standard. Standards must be limited to the special knowledge and skills that candidates should acquire and demonstrate in the SPA's field within the scope of the principles.

   Components—The components expand upon the standard statement; they are a conceptual outline for the standard statement; they provide structure for the standard. Each concept that is a component appears in the language of the standard. The components focus on the critical aspects of the SPA Standards so that programs can reasonably accommodate the standards in a pre-service educator preparation program.

   Supporting Explanations—Supporting explanations elaborate on the meaning of the SPA's standards. The supporting explanations should provide guidance regarding the scope and focus of the standard component by describing how the standard appears in practice—what's important for candidates to know, understand, and do when they are acting in ways that meet the standard.

SPAs are asked to provide standards which are written around the four InTASC categories and which use the categories to form "a structure or organizing framework" (Guidelines, B.4.a) as follows: For teachers, the content of the SPA Standards introductory material and the principles and supporting explanations focus on student learning in some obvious way (Guidelines, B.1). For other school professionals, the content of the SPA Standards introductory material and the principles and supporting explanations focus on creating supportive environments for student learning, as appropriate to the specialty field (Guidelines, B.7). The categories explicitly appear in the structure of the proposed SPA Standards. The content of the standards clearly reflects the categories:

- Standards and components are included but with no additional layers of specificity (Guidelines, B.4.b). If any additional layers of description are included, they are provided as explanations, not as requirements for evidence.
- SPA Standards are written so that each concept that is to be a component appears in the language of the standard (Guidelines, B.4.c).
- The number and complexity of standards and components are limited to be no more than 7 standards and 28 components total—and are sufficiently limited to be comprehensively evaluated in 6 to 8 assessments (Guidelines, B.4.d).
- The standards are limited to the special knowledge and skills that candidates should acquire and demonstrate in the SPA's field (Guidelines, B.4.g). For example, education foundations and generic pedagogy would not be unique to a SPA's field.
- Standards are related to the principles and limited to what education professionals who are completing preparation programs must know and be able to do (Guidelines, B.4.h).
- The SPA Standards make clear distinctions on types of education professionals for whom they are written: initial teaching credential, advanced teaching, or other school professionals (Guidelines, B.4.g and B.4.h).
- The SPA Standards include supporting explanations that can assist program reviewers and program faculty (Guidelines, B.4.i). The supporting explanations elaborate on the meaning of the SPA's standards by describing how the standard appears in practice—what's important for candidates to know, understand, and do when they are acting in ways that meet the standard (Guidelines B.4.i).
- The SPA submission should identify any "dispositions," stated in terms of candidate behavior, that appear in the standards and explain why these cannot appropriately be examined during the accreditation process.

4. **Statement on development of the standards**—SPAs are asked to provide a brief overview of the processes the SPA used to develop the new or revised standards.

   a. Explain how, throughout the standards development process, the SPA invited, and responded to, comments about their current specialty program standards from CAEP,

other specialized professional associations, P-12 school-based practitioners, institutions, and states (Guidelines, C.1.d).

b. Describe how the SPA has drawn on related professional standards and developments in the field and elsewhere that have influenced its views about program standards (Guidelines, C.1.a and C.1.b).

c. Discuss the knowledge base(s) upon which the program standards are founded (Guidelines, C.1.c).

d. Describe how consensus was developed by reporting each of the following five items:

1. a description of the process(es) used to gather input from various constituencies;
2. a listing of the constituencies from whom input was solicited;
3. samples of any form(s) used;
4. a summary of respondents' responses and their input; and
5. an overview of how the input was used by the SPA in the final standards development, including an explanation of how critiques and differences of opinion were resolved (Guidelines, C.1.d).

5. **Potential duplication and/or overlaps in standards**—The SPAs must provide a written analysis of commonalities and differences with other SPA standards or existing professional or accreditation standards indicating areas of duplication and/or overlap (Guidelines, C.2.4). Evidence of discussions with specialty organizations whose approved program standards may be duplicated and/or overlapped must be provided, together with an explanation of why the duplication exists or cannot be avoided.

As appropriate for the specialty field, the SPA Standards Committee must pay attention to CAEP's cross-cutting theme on diversity (Guidelines, B.8.c). SPA Standards should describe the knowledge and skills candidates need to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.

As appropriate for the specialty field, the SPA Standards Committee must pay attention to CAEP's cross-cutting theme on technology and digital learning (Guidelines, B.8.c). SPA Standards specify appropriate and effective integration of technology and digital literacy in instruction to support student learning.

6. **Analysis of differences from current standards**—SPAs preparing new or revised program standards for review and acceptance are asked to provide a written analysis of the extent to which the revised program standards differ from current standards.

7. **Candidate performance assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines**—SPAs are asked to provide candidate performance assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines that will be part of the complete SPA Standards document disseminated to programs. It is important that SPAs provide adequate guidance to programs seeking National Recognition on how the proposed standards can be met using 6 – 8 assessments; guidance to programs and program reviewers on assessment evidence; and, examples of candidate actions that would demonstrate that the standard

is met. Candidate performance assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines will be reviewed by the SPA Standards Committee to determine the measurability of the standards and their component parts.

8. **Candidate performance assessment rubrics**—SPAs provide candidate assessment performance rubrics to describe SPA expectations for appropriate candidate performance, and to guide reviewer judgments by defining different levels of candidate proficiencies in the SPA Standards that determine whether standards are met or not met. SPAs will apply the *Sufficient* level of evidence as identified on the SPA Evaluation Tool for Programs (Guidelines, Appendix D). SPA candidate performance assessment rubrics must demonstrate, at a minimum, the following characteristics:
   • The basis for judging candidate work is well defined.
   • Each proficiency level is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with the category (or indicator) or with the assigned task.
   • Proficiency level descriptions represent a distinct developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with explicit guidelines for evaluating candidate performance and candidates with explicit feedback on their performance).
   • Proficiency level descriptions provide feedback to candidates that clearly indicate what actions candidates must take to move to the next higher level of performance.
   • Proficiency level attributes are defined in terms of performance-based and observable actions. NOTE: If a less actionable term is used such as "engaged", criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator.

9. **Assessment evidence guidelines**—SPAs provide assessment evidence guidelines that will be part of the complete SPA Standards document disseminated to programs. Assessment evidence guidelines will address these aspects:
   • Specify how the new or revised standards can be assessed using Option 1 or 2 as outlined in Appendix G.
   • Describe how program reviewers are trained to review evidence and make judgments. Describe guidance provided to programs and program reviewers on evaluating assessment evidence. Guidance for reviewers should be provided to assure consistency in program reviews. Reviewer decisions on whether standards are met must be based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level; and decisions on national recognition must be based on preponderance of evidence that standards are met (Guidelines, B.4.f). The use of "Preponderance of Evidence" means an overall confirmation of candidate performance on the standards in the strength or quality of evidence. SPA decisions will not require that every component be met.
   • National recognition will not require that every component of all standards be met. However, programs will be expected to provide evidence for all components so that reviewers can weigh the evidence for the standard as a whole. When there is a greater strength or quality of evidence in favor, they should conclude that a

standard is met or that a program is recognized. The components are used by programs and reviewers to help determine how standards are met. This means that a standard could be met overall, even though evidence related to one or more components is weak. Program reviewers make judgments that "overall" there is/is not sufficient evidence that the standard is met. The SPA clearly specifies the components that must be met for national recognition.

In addition to the preponderance of evidence policy, guidance for reviewers and programs may address topics such as identification of required components or standards; explanation of the rubric performance levels; how to evaluate alignment among standards, assessments, and rubrics; decision criteria; or how to evaluate quality of assessment evidence.

- SPAs must provide examples of candidate actions that would each provide sufficient evidence that a standard component is met. Each example should be aligned closely with the content and complexity of the component expectations and should assist programs in crafting assessments that would include these or similar actions. Unlike specification of assessment tasks (e.g., create a lesson plan) each example should describe actions a candidate might take to demonstrate that the component is met in its entirety.

10. **SPA updates to CAEP on special scenarios**—SPAs provide documentation of any SPA requests and SPA Standards Committee actions a year in advance of the SPA's standards submission. These requests and actions fall into three categories:

- SPAs will update the SPA Standards Committee in accord with provisions under B.6 and B.7, *Adapting principles for different SPA programs,* and provide information on any subsequent SPA action following those adaptations.

- If a SPA considers it necessary to include a field and/or clinical programmatic standard, it will propose its evidence-based findings to the SPA Standards Committee to include such a standard in accord with provisions under B.5, *Standard on field and clinical experiences*. Again, the submission would include the committee's input and any subsequent SPA action following that decision.

- A SPA that writes standards for other school professionals and believes that special conditions for their field can only be adequately addressed through a programmatic standard (i.e., different from those that fall under the field and clinical experiences standard in B.5) will inform the committee and seek input regarding such conditions. Here, too, the SPA standards submission would include the SPA Standards Committee's input, and any subsequent SPA action following that decision. Refer to Appendix B for timeline of such submissions.

PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STANDARDS—including responsibilities to provide training for program faculty and for reviewers, as well as resources related to program review that SPAs make available.

11. **Training and resources**—SPAs provide a description of training and assistance for institutions and the media resources they make available.

   • **Training for program faculty**—A description of SPA training and assistance available to institutions seeking national recognition of their programs. The SPA should indicate how such assistance may be accessed, together with required charges, if any.

   • **Resources provided by SPAs**—A description or list of media resources   provided by SPAs (print, web-based, other) that are intended to assist programs in the interpretation of standards and report preparation. Include citations for sources where appropriate.

   • **Information on SPA procedures for selection, training, and evaluation of program reviewers and representation of diversity within the profession**—SPA standards submissions must include information on SPA procedures for quality assurance in the selection, training, and evaluation of individuals who will conduct program reviews.

   SPAs must provide a profile of reviewers over the past three years as evidence for addressing diversity in reviewer selection. It is important that specialty program reviewers represent the diversity within their professions and those they serve. SPAs also must describe procedures in place for recruiting and training so that reviewers represent racial, ethnic, and gender diversity; geographic diversity (i.e., those from as broad a spectrum of states and regions as possible); and diverse roles (i.e., university faculty, P-12 teachers, school administrators, and other school professionals) as reflected in their profession.

12. **SUPPORTING MATERIALS (Optional)—The SPA Standards Committee encourages SPAs to provide explicit suggestions and examples that could guide institutions toward stronger assessment evidence.**

C.3 The Worksheet for review of proposed, new, and revised standards

The table that comprises the bulk of section C.3 is a "Worksheet for review of proposed, new and revised standards." The worksheet repeats the titles for items that comprise the SPA standards submission that were described in section C.2. However, the worksheet adds detailed information about specific topics and criteria that structure the review. For that reason, SPA standards writing committees may wish to use the worksheet as a guide for self-assessment of their own standards.

Please note that the worksheet includes a column in which SPAs must insert page references to the points in their submissions that correspond with areas that the SPA Standards Committee will review. Page references are required wherever there is a reference to a provision in the Guidelines, Section B or Section C—*unless the guideline is not applicable* to the standards being presented (e.g., if the SPA had not requested a waiver, there is no need to describe the result).

The completed worksheet that each SPA submits is the primary guide for review, which is provided as follows.

CONDUCT OF THE STANDARDS REVIEW
Section C.4.c of the *Guidelines for Writing and Acceptance of SPA Standards* states that the SPA Standards Committee will review specialty organization submissions to determine ● The overall conformance of the specialty organization standards with SPA Standards Committee guidelines; ● The SPA Standards Committee decision to accept, or accept with modifications, or to ask for re-submission of the specialty organization standards*;* ● Any modifications needed to bring the specialty organization submission into conformance with SPA Standards Committee guidelines; and ● Whether unique ideas or special features are in the specialty organization submission that might be useful for wider adaptation or adoption in performance-based program review.

Please complete the following

Association Name: _____

        ☐ **Standards are for initial teaching license**
        ☐ **Standards are for advanced teaching**
        ☐ **Standards are for other school professionals**

Item with guidelines reference and Review Criteria	Pages	SPA Standards Committee audit team review and decisions
1. Title page		
2. Brief introduction to the program standards for SPA Standards Committee use		
3. The SPA Standards **The SPA has provided a copy of the complete standards including standard statements, component statements, and supporting explanations for each component.** **3.A. Are the SPA Standards written around the four InTASC categories and the categories form "a structure or organizing framework" (Guidelines, B.4.a) as identified below?** **i**. For teachers, the content of the SPA Standards introductory material and the principles and supporting explanations *focus on student learning* in some obvious way (Guidelines, B.1).		

ii. For other school professionals, the content of the SPA Standards introductory material and the principles and supporting explanations focus on *creating supportive environments for student learning*, as appropriate to the specialty field (Guidelines, B.7). **iii.** The categories explicitly appear in the structure of the proposed SPA Standards. **iv.** The content of the standards clearly reflect the principles.		
3.B. Has the SPA included standards and components without additional layers of specificity? (Guidelines, B.4.b) If any additional layers of description are included, they are provided as explanations, not as requirements for evidence?		
3.C. Are the SPA Standards written so that each concept that is to be a component appears in the language of the standard? (Guidelines, B.4.c)		
3.D. Are the number and complexity of standards and components limited to no more than 7 standards and 28 components total—and are sufficiently limited to be comprehensively evaluated in 6 to 8 assessments? (Guidelines, B.4.d)		
3.E. Are the standards limited to the special knowledge and skills that candidates should acquire and demonstrate in the SPA's field? (Guidelines, B.4.g). For example, education foundations and generic pedagogy would not be unique to a SPA's field.		
3.F. Are the standards related to the principles and limited to what education professionals who are completing preparation programs must know and be able to do? (Guidelines, B.4.h)		
3.G. Do the SPA Standards make clear distinctions regarding types of education professionals for whom they are written: initial teaching credential, advanced teaching, or other school professionals? (Guidelines, B.4.g and B.4.h)		

3.H. Do the SPA Standards and components include supporting explanations that can assist program reviewers and program faculty? (Guidelines, B.4.i) The supporting explanations elaborate on the meaning of the SPA's standards by describing how the standard appears in practice—what's important for candidates to know, understand, and do when they are acting in ways that meet the standard (Guidelines, B.4.i).		
3.I. Does the SPA identify any "dispositions" stated in terms of candidate behavior that appear in the standards and explain why these cannot be appropriately examined during the accreditation process (Guidelines, B.8.b)?		
4. Statement on development of the standards **The SPA Standards application:** **4.i.** Does the SPA provide a brief overview of the processes used to develop the new or revised standards? **4.ii.** Does the SPA explain how, throughout the standards development process, it invited and responded to comments about the current specialty program standards from CAEP, other specialized professional associations, institutions, and states? **4.iii.** Does the SPA describe how it has drawn on related professional standards and developments in the field and elsewhere that have influenced its views about program standards? **4.iv.** Does the SPA discuss the knowledge base(s) upon which the program standards are founded? **4.v.** Does the SPA describe how consensus was developed by reporting each of the following five items: a description of the process(es) used to gather input from various constituencies; a summary of the constituencies from whom input was solicited; samples of any form(s) used; a summary of respondents and their input; and an overview of how the input was used by the SPA in the		

final standards development, including an explanation of how critiques and differences of opinion were resolved?		
5. Potential duplication and/or overlaps in standards **Does the SPA submission include a written analysis of commonalities and differences with other SPA program standards or other accreditation agency standards (such as CACREP, NASM) indicating areas of duplication and/ or overlap?** (Guidelines, C.2.4) ● Does the SPA identify and address potential duplication or overlap with standards of other SPAs and/or accreditation agencies, along with an explanation of why the duplication exists or cannot be avoided?		
5.A. As appropriate for the specialty field, SPAs are strongly encouraged to address CAEP's cross-cutting theme on diversity. (Guidelines, B.8.c) ● Do the SPA Standards describe the knowledge and skills candidates need to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners?		
5.B. As appropriate for the specialty field, SPAs are strongly encouraged to address CAEP's cross-cutting theme on technology and digital learning. (Guidelines, B.8.c) ● Do the SPA Standards specify appropriate and effective integration of technology and digital literacy in instruction to support student learning?		
6. Analysis of differences from current standards Does the SPA describe how the revised program standards differ from the SPA's current standards?		
7. Candidate performance assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines **7.A. Do the SPA Standards include candidate performance assessment rubrics that guide program reviewer judgments and assist program reviewers and program faculty (Guidelines, B.4.j and Appendix C) as reflected in the following?**		

i. The candidate performance assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines define how program reviewers will review and make decisions on standards. ii. The assessment evidence guidelines clearly articulate which components are essential for program reviewers to determine that a preponderance of evidence exists that program candidates meet a standard. iii. The candidate performance assessment rubrics are clear to a non-SPA reader. iv. The candidate performance assessment rubrics demonstrate the following characteristics (Appendix C): o Each proficiency level is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with the category (or indicator) or with the assigned task. o Proficiency level descriptions represent a developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with explicit guidelines for evaluating candidate performance and candidates with explicit feedback on their performance). o Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. [NOTE: If a less actionable term is used such as "engaged," criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator.]		
7.B. Do the SPA Standards include assessment evidence guidelines that guide program reviewer judgments and that can assist program reviewers and program faculty (Guidelines, B.4.k) as indicated below? **i.** The assessment evidence guidelines provide adequate guidance to programs seeking National Recognition on how the proposed standards can be met using a minimum of six and a maximum of eight assessments. **ii.** The assessment evidence guidelines provide guidance to programs and program reviewers on assessment evidence.		

iii. The assessment evidence guidelines provide examples of candidate actions that would demonstrate that the standard is met.		
7.C. Do the SPA assessment evidence guidelines explain how reviewer decisions on whether standards are met based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level, and decisions on national recognition are based on preponderance of evidence that standards are met? ([Guidelines, B.4.f](#)) See explanation below. i. The use of "Preponderance of Evidence" means an overall confirmation of candidate performance on the standards in the strength or quality of evidence. ii. SPA decisions will not require that every component be met. National recognition will not require that every component of all standards be met. iii. Program reviewers weigh the evidence presented in SPA program reports, and when there is a greater strength or quality of evidence in favor, they should conclude that a standard is met or that a program is recognized. iv. The components are used by programs and reviewers to help determine how standards are met. This means that a standard could be met overall, even though evidence related to one or more components is weak. v. Program reviewers make judgments that "overall" there is/is not sufficient evidence that the standard is met. vi. The candidate performance assessment rubrics and guidance for reviewers in the assessment evidence guidelines developed by the SPA for use by program reviewers clearly address i-v. vii. The SPA explains how program reviewers are trained to review evidence and make judgments based on the preponderance of evidence that standards are met. viii. The SPA clearly specifies the components that must be met for national recognition.		

7.D. Does the SPA require programs to provide evidence for all of the components of a standard? ([Guidelines, B.4.e](#)) i. The SPA may identify some components as mandatory; these components are clearly identified as "Required Components" with an accompanying rationale. ii. The SPA Standards do not require programs to meet all components of all standards as a criterion for National Recognition.		
8. Decision on Waivers Does the SPA provide documentation of any waiver requests submitted one to two years prior to the formal standards review and subsequent action of the SPA Standards Committee?		

9. Training and resources
   The SPA Standards application includes documentation of the following:
 	
9.A. Training for program faculty
  i. Description of the training and assistance available to institutions and indicate how such assistance may be accessed, together with required charges, if any.		

9.B. Resources provided by SPAs **i.** Description or list of media resources provided by SPAs (print, web-based, other) that are primarily intended to assist programs in the interpretation of standards and report preparation.		
9.C. Does the SPA provide information on SPA procedures for selection, training, and evaluation of program reviewers and representation of diversity within the profession? **i.** Description of SPA procedures for quality assurance in the selection, training, and evaluation of individuals who will conduct program reviews. **ii.** Description of procedures in place for recruiting and training so that reviewers represent racial, ethnic, and gender diversity; geographic diversity (i.e., those from as broad		

a spectrum of states and regions as possible); and diverse roles (i.e., university faculty, P-12 teachers, school administrators, and other school professionals) as reflected in their profession. **iii.** Profile of reviewers over the past three years demonstrating diversity in selection of reviewers.		
9.D. Submitting supporting materials (optional): Does the SPA provide explicit suggestions and examples that could guide institutions toward stronger assessment evidence?		

C.4 Conduct of the SPA Standards Committee review

The SPA Standards Committee has developed the following outline for the review it undertakes of SPA Standards submissions.

C.4.a CAEP staff responsibilities

CAEP staff will receive standards application packets from SPAs, ensure all the required parts of an application packet are included, and guide SPAs to prepare the standards application for review based on the instructions provided in the guidelines.

C.4.b SPA presentations and Committee questions

During the SPA Committee meeting at which the SPA Standards submission is being considered, a time will be set aside when a SPA representative or representatives will be available via call-in to answer any questions the committee has about the SPA's submission. Such time will be determined by the committee chair and CAEP staff and communicated to the SPA whose standards are under consideration. Should there be no need for the call-in, the SPA will be notified promptly. Absence of such discussion does not in any way communicate automatic acceptance of the SPA's standards. SPAs who believe that they have significant new information that may have an impact on their standards and which was not communicated with its standards submission may request a call-in conference. The SPA should notify CAEP staff immediately and a call-in time for consultation with the committee will be scheduled.

C.4.c Committee review, decisions, modifications, and identified features

The SPA Standards Committee will review specialized professional association submissions to determine

- o The overall conformance of the SPA Standards with relevant policies and the guidelines.
- o A decision to accept, accept with modifications, or to ask for re-submission of the SPA Standards.
- o Any modifications needed to bring the SPA submission into conformance with policy and guidelines, especially those under section B, on standards.
- o Areas for consideration to alert the SPA of areas or items in the standards application packet that should be considered in the future, but which would not keep the SPA Standards from being accepted at that time.
- o Identification of unique ideas or special features in the specialty organization submission that might be useful for wider adaptation or adoption in performance-based program review.
- o The conditions under which a re-submission will be considered.

C.4.d Optional provision for comments on preliminary draft standards

At the request of specialty organizations that are preparing new or revised program standards under CAEP performance-based accreditation, the SPA Standards Committee will provide interim comments on preliminary draft standards if these documents are submitted in a timely manner for the committee meeting one year prior to the scheduled review.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Outline for Preparing a SPA Standards Review and Acceptance Application

SPAs should use the specific headings and subheadings in this outline when preparing the application and follow the same order of presentation. A response to each of the bulleted items in the outline is required and SPAs should use this list to ensure that the application is complete before submitting it to CAEP. *The SPA Standards Committee is unable to review standards approval applications that are incomplete*. Moreover, this outline should be used by SPAs to ensure that only material directly supporting the components below is submitted with the application.

INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

1. **Title page**

2. **Brief introduction to the program standards for SPA Standards Committee use**

STANDARDS—Including principles, formatting, proposed waivers, and programmatic standards

3. **The SPA Standards**

A copy of the complete standards
- Include the standard statements.
- Include the component statements.
- Include the supporting explanations for each component.
- Verify that the SPA Standards explicitly identify the types of education professionals for whom they are written, initial teaching credential, advanced teaching, or other school professionals.
- Explain how the SPA Standards are written around the four CAEP principles and insure the principles form a structure or organizing framework.
- Explain how the standards are limited to the special knowledge and skills that candidates should acquire and demonstrate in the SPA's field.
- Verify that the application includes standards and components but no additional layers of specificity.
- Verify that the SPA Standards are written so that each concept that is to be a component appears in the language of the standard.
- Verify that the SPA Standards and components include supporting explanations that can assist program reviewers and program faculty in understanding the intent of the standards by providing guidance regarding the scope and focus of the standard component by describing how the standard appears in practice—what candidates will know, understand, and do when they are acting in ways that meet the standard.

- Verify that the number and complexity of standards and components are limited to no more than the seven (7) standards and 28 components total and are sufficiently limited to be comprehensively evaluated in 6 to 8 assessments.
- Identify any "dispositions," stated in terms of candidate behavior, that appear in the standards and explain why these cannot be appropriately examined during the accreditation process.

4. **Statement on development of the standards**
   - Provide a brief overview of the processes the SPA used to develop the new or revised standards.
   - Explain how, throughout the standards development process, the SPA invited, and responded to, comments about its current specialty program standards from CAEP, other specialized professional associations, institutions, and states. Lengthy raw data, tables, and comments should be placed in an appendix to the report if included.
   - Describe how the SPA has drawn on related professional standards and developments in the field and elsewhere that have influenced its views about program standards.
   - Discuss the knowledge base(s) upon which the program standards are founded. Extensive reference lists may be placed in an appendix to the report.
   - Describe how consensus was developed by reporting each of the following five items: (1) a description of the process(es) used to gather input from various constituencies; (2) a summary of the constituencies from whom input was solicited; (3) samples of any form(s) used; (4) a summary of respondents and their input; and (5) an overview of how the input was used by the SPA in the final standards development, including an explanation of how critiques and differences of opinion were resolved. Lengthy instruments and supporting examples of raw data should be placed in an appendix to the report if included.

5. **Potential duplication and/or overlaps in standards**
   - Include an analysis of commonalities and differences with existing SPA Standards.
   - Provide explicit evidence of discussions with specialty organizations whose approved program standards may be duplicated and/or overlapped, together with an explanation of why the duplication exists or cannot be avoided.
   - Discuss how the standards describe the knowledge and skills candidates need to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.
   - Discuss how the standards specify appropriate effective integration of technology and digital literacy in instruction to support student learning.

6. **Analysis of differences from current standards**
   - Describe the extent to which the revised program standards differ from current CAEP-approved program standards.

7. **Candidate performance assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines**
   Candidate performance assessment rubrics

- Include candidate performance assessment rubrics to describe SPA expectations for appropriate candidate performance, making certain that qualitative distinctions are made among performance levels.
- Describe how the included SPA rubrics meet the level of sufficient evidence as identified on the SPA Evaluation Tool for Programs (Guidelines, Appendix C).

Assessment evidence guidelines
- Specify how the new or revised standards can be assessed within the policy of 6 to 8 assessments.
- Describe how reviewer decisions on whether standards are met are based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level, and how decisions on national recognition are to be based on preponderance of evidence that all standards are met.
- Describe guidance provided to programs and program reviewers on evaluating the quality of candidate assessments, rubrics, and evidence.
- Provide examples of candidate actions that would demonstrate that the standard is met.

8. Decisions on waivers
- Provide documentation of any SPA requests submitted a year in advance of the SPA standards submission and subsequent action of the SPA Standards Committee.

PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STANDARDS—including responsibilities to provide training for program faculty and for reviewers, and also resources related to program review that SPAs make available

---

9. Training
Training for program faculty
- Describe the training, assistance, and resources that are primarily intended to assist programs in the interpretation of standards and report preparation, and indicate how such assistance may be accessed, together with required charges, if any.

Information on SPA procedures for selection, training, and evaluation of program reviewers and representation of diversity within the profession
- Provide information on SPA procedures for quality assurance in the selection, training, and evaluation of individuals who will conduct program reviews.
- Describe procedures in place for recruiting and training so that reviewers represent racial, ethnic, and gender diversity; geographic diversity (i.e., those from as broad a spectrum of states and regions as possible); and diverse roles (i.e., university faculty, P-12 teachers, school administrators, and other school professionals) as reflected in their profession.
- Provide a profile over the past three years of demonstrating diversity in selection of reviewers.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS—The SPA Standards Committee encourages SPAs to provide explicit suggestions and examples that could guide institutions toward stronger assessment evidence (Guidelines, B.8.a)

APPENDIX B: Tentative Timeline for Revisiting SPA Standards

Year		SPA Task	CAEP/ SPASC Task
3-7 years prior to standards review and acceptance		SPA · draws on developments in standards from their specialty field and related fields that are found in standards for P-12 students, or in standards for teachers, prepared by states or by national professional organizations · makes use of the knowledge base, including current research and the wisdom of practice, appropriate for their area of expertise. · follows the SPA Standards Committee framework or guidelines for program standards development when developing its program standards.	
Two years prior	**Summer** **(July-August)**	2-year out formative review – SPA may · send draft (new/revised) standards to CAEP and request feedback. · request delay in presenting revised standards to the SPA Standards Committee. Documents must be submitted to CAEP by July 1.	At SPA Standards Committee Meeting · The Committee offers formative feedback to the SPA on current/new standards for SPA consideration.
One year prior	**Summer** **(July-August)**	1-year out review – SPA may · send draft (new/revised) standards to CAEP and request feedback. · request delay in presenting revised standards to the SPA Standards Committee. Documents must be submitted to CAEP by July 1.	At SPA Standards Committee Meeting · The committee offers formative feedback to the SPA on current/new standards for SPA consideration.

	Fall **(October)**		SPA Standards Committee offers feedback to the SPA on draft new/revised standards for SPA consideration.
Year of submission	**Spring Review** **(March-April)**	SPA sends final version of the new/revised standards to CAEP. Documents must be submitted to CAEP by February 1.	CAEP notifies all constituents that a SPA is scheduled to present new/revised standards, and solicits feedback on the new/revised standards. Feedback is sent directly to the SPA.
	Fall Review **(July-August)**	SPA sends final version of the new/revised standards to CAEP. Documents must be submitted to CAEP by July 1.	CAEP Staff disseminates the final version of the standards among the SPA Standards Committee members.
	Spring **(online) / Fall** **(face-to-face)** **Meeting**	· SPA presents new / revised standards to the SPA Standards Committee · SPA includes all earlier formative feedback as an appendix to the presented standards.	SPA Standards Committee reviews the final version of the standards, offers feedback, and recommends acceptance/revision of the standards. Standards may be accepted with modifications.

APPENDIX C— EVALUATION TOOL FOR ASSESSMENTS USED IN SPA PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION

This is an adaptation of the CAEP Evaluation Tool for EPP Created Assessments. It has been adapted for SPA review purposes only. Essentially the same instrument used at the EPP level is recommended for use at the program level.

The purpose of this review is to provide programs in specialty licensure areas with feedback on assessments used to meet SPA Standards with the ultimate goal of receiving National Recognition and generating evidence to meet CAEP Component 1.3.

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL	SPA SUFFICIENT LEVEL	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL
Use or purpose are ambiguous or vague	1. ADMINISTRATION AND PURPOSE (informs relevancy) • The point or points when the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit • The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate • Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are tagged to SPA Standards	Purpose of assessment and use in candidate monitoring or decisions are consequential
• Limited or no basis for reviewers to know what information is given to respondents • Instructions given to respondents are incomplete or misleading • The criterion for success is not provided or is not clear	2. INFORMING CANDIDATES (informs fairness and reliability) • The candidates who are being assessed are given a description of the assessment's purpose • Instructions provided to candidates about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous • The basis for judgment (criterion for success, or what is "good enough") is made explicit for candidates	• Candidate progression is monitored and information used for mentoring • Candidates are informed how the instrument results are used in reaching conclusions about their status and/or progression

	3. CONTENT OF ASSESSMENT (informs relevancy)	
• Category or task link with SPA Standards is not explicit • Category or task has only vague relationship with content of the standards being informed • Category or task fails to reflect the degree of difficulty described in the standards • Evaluation categories or tasks not described or ambiguous • Many evaluation categories or tasks (more than 20% of the total score) require judgment of candidate proficiencies that are of limited importance in SPA Standards	• Evaluation categories or tasks assess explicitly identified aspects of SPA Standards • Evaluation categories or tasks reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards • Evaluation categories or tasks unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated • When the standards being informed address higher level functioning, the evaluation categories or tasks require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, & apply). For example, when a standard specifies that candidates' students "demonstrate" problem solving, then the category or task is specific to students' application of knowledge to solve problems • Most evaluation categories or tasks (at least those comprising 80% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards	• Almost all evaluation categories or tasks (at least those comprising 95% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards
	4. SCORING RUBRIC (informs reliability and actionability)	
• Rating scales are used in lieu of rubrics; e.g., "level 1= significantly below expectation"… "level 4 = significantly above expectation." • Levels do not represent qualitative differences and provide limited or no feedback to candidates specific to their performance. • Proficiency level attributes are vague or not defined, and may just repeat from the standard or component	• The basis for judging candidate work is well defined • Each proficiency level is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with the category (or indicator) or with the assigned task • Proficiency level descriptions represent a developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with explicit guidelines for evaluating candidate performance and candidates with explicit feedback on their performance) • Feedback provided to candidates is actionable • Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. NOTE: If a less actionable term is used such as "engaged," criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator	• Higher level actions from Bloom's taxonomy are used such as "analysis" or "evaluation"

EVALUATION TOOL CHECKLIST

Item Category	Below Adequate	SPA Adequate Level	Above Adequate	
1. **ADMINISTRATION AND PURPOSE:** Point when instrument is administered in the program; its purpose and standards addressed (informs relevance). Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are tagged to SPA Standards.				
2. **INFORMING RESPONDENTS:** Information given to respondent before and at the administration of the instrument (informs fairness and reliability); basis for judging candidate performance is explicit.				
3. **CONTENT OF ASSESSMENT:** Evaluation categories explicitly linked with standards, reflect degree of difficulty in standards, and unambiguously describe proficiencies to be evaluated; when standards include higher level functioning, the evaluation categories explicitly require higher levels of intellectual behavior; most evaluation categories require judgment of consequential candidate proficiencies (informs relevancy).				
4. **SCORING:** Basis for judging candidate work is well defined; each proficiency level is qualitatively defined by criteria aligned with the category; proficiency descriptions represent a developmental sequence from level to level and are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms; feedback for candidates is actionable (informs reliability and actionability).				
OVERALL – How would you rate this assessment?				
Provide a rationale for your overall rating:				

APPENDIX D: GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF BENCHMARKED LICENSURE TEST DATA AS EVIDENCE OF CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Strong content knowledge is necessary, but not sufficient, for well-prepared teachers. State licensure test results are included in program review as one form of subject content evidence and should be judged by reviewers in that light. Program review with national recognition requires at least one additional measure of subject content knowledge because of the fundamental importance that subject content has in teacher preparation.

CAEP does not state a definitive pass rate as a requirement for program review; however, SPAs may establish specific requirements related to completer pass rate on state licensure examinations as a threshold condition for national recognition. If a SPA requires a specific pass rate in licensure examinations as a precondition for National Recognition, programs are required to provide evidence to fulfill the requirement.

SPA reviewers should note that when state licensure examinations are submitted as evidence of preparation, there must be an indication of the content of those examinations and how well they are aligned with SPA Standards. "Alignment" may be attained if assessments that are comprised of content similar to the specialty standards demonstrate the same complexity as the standards; are congruent in the range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates are expected to exhibit; and call for an appropriate level of difficulty consistent with the standards.

Compilers of program reports for all SPAs should note that programs are expected to delineate the relationship of the content (or test specifications) of the state test and the SPA Standards when they are using data from state licensure examinations to meet SPA Standards on candidates' content knowledge.

Program reports provided by institutions in any state that uses benchmarked licensure tests should include the following data:

- The average scores of completing candidates in the program provided at the cohort level
- The range of scores for candidates completing the program
- Category data or sub-area scores for any SPA that makes use of such subdivisions of the licensure test.

The following guidelines are offered to assist programs in their interpretation of benchmarked data as an indicator of subject content knowledge:

- Reviewers can be assured that benchmarked assessments are aligned with some or all of the SPA content knowledge standards. Appendix F identifies Praxis II licensure tests that are currently benchmarked, indicates the states that use the benchmarked tests,

and includes excerpts from the statements made by panels of SPA representatives about the areas of alignment and the areas not aligned with SPA Standards.

• The benchmark number should serve as a performance standard established by a SPA's content area experts to represent their collective judgment of how much is enough for a new teacher sufficiently knowledgeable for classroom service in the specified area.

• Program review with National Recognition is a process by which CAEP, in collaboration with its specialized professional associations (SPAs), assesses the quality of programs offered by educator preparation providers. It is not an evaluation of individual candidates enrolled in the programs. Program reports should contain evidence that the program has been successful in preparing most or all candidates to reach the SPA specified benchmark level, if any.

• Assessment 1 provides the state qualifying or passing score requirement to help reviewers understand the link between pass rates and benchmark scores.

• Because licensure tests are prepared in accordance with joint AERA/NCME/APA test standards, bias review and validity studies are routinely conducted as part of the test development process.

• When program report licensure data, such as mean scores or the lower end of range scores, are below the SPA specified benchmark level, a close look at other data is warranted to assure that program candidates are performing at levels anticipated in specialty professional standards. Examples of "other data" might include

  • the proportion of candidates that fall below the benchmark level;
  • what the institution is doing to lift the performance of low-scoring candidates;
  • information about candidate knowledge contained in the second program report assessment; and
  • information from category data or sub-area scores indicating areas of stronger or weaker performance.

APPENDIX E: GUIDELINES FOR FORMATTING COURSE GRADES

SPAs will use the guidelines specified in this document to determine whether the program's use of course grades provides acceptable evidence of content knowledge.

Programs will not be required to use grades as a content assessment, but if they choose to do so they must follow the guidance provided below.

1. Guidelines on documenting course grades

SPA program review option with National Recognition accepts grades in SPA-specific content courses as evidence. Grades can be used for Assessment #1 (if there is no state licensure test), Assessment #2, or one of the optional assessments.

Acceptable documentation required for programs using course grades is as follows:

- The courses used as an instrument to assess candidates' content knowledge in a specific area of specialization must align with the appropriate SPA Standards for content knowledge and must be required of all candidates in the program.
- The documentation of course grades-based evidence must include curriculum requirements, including the course numbers and titles of required courses: (a) For baccalaureate programs, documentation must be consistent with course listings provided in the Program of Study submitted in Section I of the program report; (b) If course grades are used as an assessment for a graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution, the assessment must include the advising sheet that is used by the program to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution. The advising sheet must include specific information on required coursework and remediation required for deficiencies in the content acquirement of admitted candidates.
- The grade evidence must be accompanied by the institution's grade policy or definitions of grades.
- Grade data must be disaggregated by program level (e.g., baccalaureate and post baccalaureate), grade level (e.g., middle grade and secondary), licensure category (e.g., history or social studies), and program site.
- Syllabi cannot be submitted.

1.a Format for Submission of Grades as a Course-Based Content Assessment

The following format is required for submission of grades as a course grade-based assessment under Section IV of the program report:

Part a. *Description of the assessment*. Provide a brief description of the courses and a rationale for the selection of this particular set of courses. Provide a rationale for how

these courses align with specific SPA Standards as well as an analysis of grade data included in the submission. (Limit to two pages.)

If course grades are used as an assessment for a graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution, the report must include the advising sheet that is used by the program to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution.

Part b. *Alignment with SPA Standards*. This part must include a matrix that shows alignment of courses with specific SPA Standards (see example below). Brief course descriptions should be included if the course title does not identify the course content.

A graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution must show alignment between the SPA Standards and the program's advising sheet that is used to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution.

Part c. *Grade Policy and Minimum Expectation.* The program must submit grading policies that are used by the institution or program and the minimum expectation for candidate grades (e.g., all candidates must achieve a C or better in all selected coursework).

Part d. *Data table(s).* Data tables must provide, at minimum, the grade distributions and mean course grades for candidates in the selected courses. [NOTE: The "n" in the data table/s for each year or semester must be relatively consistent with the numbers of candidates and completers reported in Appendix G. Large inconsistencies between the two data sets must be explained in a note included with the data table(s).]

If course grades are used as an assessment for a graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution, the program may provide data on candidates' grade point average across all courses listed on program advising sheet or transcript analysis form.

Please refer to the example below on formatting grades.

Example: Alignment Matrix and Course Description

SPA Standard/s Addressed by Course	Course Name & No.	Brief Description of How the Course Meets Cited Standards (if course title is unclear)
NCTE 3.5	**Young Adult Literature 203**	
NCTE 3.6	**English 105**	

Example: Data Tables

Example 1. Candidates' Grades in Required Mathematics Courses Secondary Math Education Candidates Baccalaureate Program						
	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	Average course grade and (range)*	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Average course grade and (range)	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Average course grade and (range)	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
Math 101	3.75 (3.0–3.9)	100	3.75 (3.0–3.9)	100	3.75 (3.0–3.9)	100
Math 203	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100
Math 305	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100

*A = 4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0

Example 2. Mean GPA in Science Major Courses for Candidates admitted to MAT Program Secondary Science Education Candidates		
Academic Year	GPA (mean, range)*	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
2013-2014	3.75 (3.0– 3.9)	100
2014-2015	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100
2015-2016	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100

*A = 4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0

2. Guidelines on Transcript Analysis for Using Grades as Evidence for Content Knowledge

A transcript analysis process may be used as the additional assessment of content knowledge for candidates enrolled in Initial-Licensure/Post-Baccalaureate Programs or for documenting grades from external programs. The institution needs to provide sufficient information so that reviewers can determine if the course work is aligned with the discipline-specific standards. However, the documentation requirements include

a) Description of the transcript analysis process including when it occurs, who does the analysis, etc.
b) Description of policies used by the program in evaluating the transcript including the following:
   - Currency of preparation: Is there a limit to when course work must have been completed?
   - Other related degrees: How are degrees in related fields addressed?
   - Minimum grade requirements: What earned grade (e.g., C or better) is required for the program?
   - Alignment clarification: What process is used for making decisions if course titles are not clearly aligned with the standards?
   - Additional useful evidence from program's data could show completer rates for candidates who have gone through this review.
c) Description of the process used to ensure that candidates who do not meet the requirements are required to remediate deficiencies.

d) The form used to complete the transcript analysis. If not clear, provide a separate matrix that delineates the alignment between the transcript analysis form and the discipline specific content standards.

e) Data on the number of candidates for whom a transcript analysis was done, how many candidates required remediation in each discipline, and number of candidates, if any, who received waivers from the process and number of completers over a continuous three-year span.

APPENDIX F—RESOURCES RELATED TO INTASC STANDARDS

Since the text of the Principles in the Guidelines adopts the InTASC language from its *Model Core Teaching Standards*, the research base referenced by InTASC is appropriate to repeat here as well.

The committee drew upon a range of resources in revising the standards. This included key research literature, the work of states that had already updated their standards, and additional and current key resources such as books and documents related to 21st century learning.

In addition to the above, the committee members themselves—teachers, teacher educators, researchers, state policy leaders—were selected to assure expertise across a range of topics important to the update process. Their expertise was another key resource in the development of the revised standards.

On the issue of research, InTASC commissioned a review of the literature to capture the current evidence base during the standards-writing process. Periodic research updates were given to the committee as the standards work was under way and additional focus areas were added to the review as the committee identified the key ideas grounding its work. The literature review can be found at the InTASC website (https://ccsso.org/resource-library/literature-review-intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-2011).

The CCSSO website includes summary statements describing what is known and where there are gaps in the research. The Council considers the research base a work in progress and seeks feedback on its website.

Alignment of 2013 CAEP Standard 1 Key Concepts and 2013 InTASC Categories/Standards

CAEP Standard 1: Key Concepts	InTASC Categories and Standards
The learner and learning-Including learning differences, the context of diverse cultures, and creating effective learning environments	**InTASC Category: Content** **Standard #4: Content Knowledge.** The candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. **Standard #5: Application of Content.** The candidate understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
Content knowledge-Including deep content knowledge, critical thinking, and collaborative problem solving, and instructional applications of that knowledge in the content field.	**InTASC Category: Learner and learning** **Standard #1: Learner Development.** The candidate understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. **Standard #2: Learning Differences.** The candidate uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that allow each learner to meet high standards. **Standard #3: Learning Environments.** The candidate works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive

	social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. **InTASC Category: Instructional practice** **Standard #6: Assessment.** The candidate understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. **Standard #7: Planning for Instruction.** The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. **Standard #8: Instructional Strategies.** The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection.
Instructional practice-Including assessment and data literacy and use of assessment to advance learning + Ability to apply technology standards instruction	**InTASC Category: Content** **Standard #5: Application of Content.** The candidate understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues. **InTASC Category: Instructional practice** **Standard #6: Assessment.** The candidate understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. **Standard #7: Planning for Instruction.** The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas,

	curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. **Standard #8: Instructional Strategies.** The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection.
Professional responsibilities-Including professional and ethical practice and collaboration with colleagues.	**InTASC Category: Professional responsibilities** **Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice.** The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner. **Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration.** The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.
College and career readiness preparation	**InTASC Category: Learner and learning** **Standard #1: Learner Development.** The candidate understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. **Standard #2: Learning Differences.** The candidate uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure

	inclusive learning environments that allow each learner to meet high standards. **Standard #3: Learning Environments.** The candidate works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. **InTASC Category: Instructional practice** **Standard #6: Assessment.** The candidate understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. **Standard #7: Planning for Instruction.** The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. **Standard #8: Instructional Strategies.** The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection.
Diversity and equity-Preparing for teaching in America's diverse classrooms	**InTASC Category: Learner and learning** **Standard #1: Learner Development.** The candidate understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

	Standard #2: Learning Differences. The candidate uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that allow each learner to meet high standards.
	Standard #3: Learning Environments. The candidate works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
	InTASC Category: Content
	Standard #4: Content Knowledge. The candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
	Standard #5: Application of Content. The candidate understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
	InTASC Category: Instructional practice
	Standard #6: Assessment. The candidate understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
	Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

	Standard #8: Instructional Strategies. The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection.

APPENDIX G: GUIDELINES ON ASSESSMENTS FOR SPA PROGRAM REPORTS

Programs selecting the SPA Review Option with National Recognition can select from two ways of submitting evidence to address SPA Standards:

Option 1 involves the use of a minimum of six and a maximum of eight assessments to provide evidence that SPA Standards are met. Five are defined as part of the reporting requirements: (1) a licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment; (2) content-based assessment; (3) assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction; (4) assessment of student teaching; and (5) assessment of candidate effect on student learning. While a sixth assessment is a required part of the program report and the focus of this assessment may be the institution's choice, in practice some SPAs have specified a sixth, and even a seventh or eighth assessment. Institutions may, at their discretion, submit a seventh and/or eighth assessment that they believe will further strengthen their demonstration that standards are met.

Option 2 involves the validity and reliability studies of assessments conducted by the program in lieu of other program report evidence requirements. Given that the validity and reliability of assessments (content in relation to standards, consistency with other evidence, success in subsequent employment, etc.) is integral to standards and performance-based national recognition review that systematic examination of validity is essential. It would, by definition, directly address SPA Standards. It would permit programs with appropriately prepared faculty to formulate a task as part of accreditation that is meaningful for them, while, not unimportantly, helping to advance the research base for educator preparation. It is an option that might lend itself to joint participation across programs within an institution. It is probably not an option that every institution has the capacity to execute; moreover, it would require a different kind of selection and/or training of reviewers. Before a program could choose this option, it must receive approval from CAEP and the appropriate SPAs.

APPENDIX H: GUIDELINES ON SPA PROGRAM REVIEW DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

During every review cycle, each program report will be assigned electronically to a SPA-appointed team of reviewers, who have been recruited and trained by the appropriate specialty organization through CAEP's accreditation management system. One of these reviewers, preferably with extensive review experience, will be the "lead" reviewer. Each reviewer submits an independent report in the system. The lead reviewer prepares the Team Report in consultation with other members on the team, using the responses submitted by each team member and is responsible for submitting the Team Report electronically. The Team Report is a draft response to the program report, which is audited by a SPA-appointed Audit Committee and submitted as the Audit Report. The Audit Report becomes the Final Recognition Report that is sent out to programs. The following decisions may result from the SPA program review process:

a) **Nationally Recognized:** The decision made when a program has met the SPA professional standards. A program receiving this decision is recognized through the next accreditation cycle. Nationally recognized programs are listed on the CAEP website.

   To maintain the Nationally Recognized status and to start gathering evidence for the upcoming accreditation visit, programs selecting the SPA review option are required to submit an initial review report three years prior to the CAEP site visit.

Criteria for National Recognition
- The program substantially meets standards.
- The benchmark on state licensure examination(s), if set by a SPA and if applicable to the provider in a state requiring state licensure examinations, is met.
- National recognition status attained by a program for an accreditation cycle, through a three year out review, will be valid through the semester and year of the provider's next CAEP accreditation visit in 5-7 years. To retain the national recognition status attained in the earlier accreditation cycle, a program report must be submitted for initial review no earlier than 3 years prior to the next scheduled CAEP accreditation visit.
- The national recognition status attained by a program will be contingent upon the provider's accreditation status. It will expire if and when the accreditation of the provider expires.

b) **Nationally Recognized with Conditions:** The decision made when a program has substantially met the standards of a specialized professional association, but sufficient weaknesses or issues remain preventing the program from receiving full national recognition. A program receiving this decision is considered conditionally recognized for the subsequent *24 months*. If the program does not submit acceptable information within the designated timeframe, the decision reverts to *Not Nationally Recognized*. A

program will have a maximum of two opportunities within the 24 months' timeframe (as specified on the report) to meet SPA Standards and receive National Recognition.

Criteria for National Recognition with Conditions

The program generally meets standards; however, a *Response to Conditions* report must be submitted within *24 months* to remove the conditions. Conditions could be based on one or more of the following:
- Insufficient data to determine if standards are met;
- Insufficient alignment among standards or scoring assessments or scoring guides;
- Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides;
- Insufficient number of SPA Standards met; and
- The benchmark on state licensure examination(s), if set by a SPA and if applicable to the provider in a state requiring state licensure examinations, is not met.

The program will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*.

c) **Further Development Required:** This decision is applicable for programs undergoing program review for the very first time and denotes that the program has not met SPA criteria for *National Recognition*. The program will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*.

Criteria for Further Development Required

- The standards that are not met are critical to a quality program and more than a few in number OR are few in number, but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate.
- The program will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*.
- The benchmark on state licensure examination(s), if set by a SPA and if applicable to the provider in a state requiring state licensure examinations, is not met.

d) **National Recognition with Probation:** This decision is applied to programs that received a decision of Nationally Recognized during the previous review cycle. The decision denotes that the program report submitted during the current review cycle has not met SPA criteria for *National Recognition.* The program will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition.* If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*.

Criteria for National Recognition with Probation (applicable to programs that received a decision of Nationally Recognized during the previous review cycle)

- The standards that are not met are critical to a quality program and more than a few in number OR are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate. To remove probation, the program may submit a revised report addressing unmet standards within *24 months*, or the program may submit a new program report for National Recognition.
- The program will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.
- The benchmark on state licensure examination(s), if set by a SPA and if applicable to the provider in a state requiring state licensure examinations, is not met.
- The program will be listed on the CAEP website as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the decision through date assigned to the program expires. At that point, if the program is still *Recognized with Probation*, its status will change to *Not Nationally Recognized*, and the program's name will be removed from the website.

e) **Not Nationally Recognized.** This decision applies to a program that has not met SPA criteria for *National Recognition* within the designated timeframe of *24 months* since its submission for initial review. If the program chooses to continue to seek National Recognition, it must submit a completely new report.

Programs that are going through SPA program review for the first time will have a maximum of two opportunities to submit reports before a final recognition decision is applied. This will allow new programs the opportunity to receive feedback and make changes in their programs without receiving a "Not Nationally Recognized" decision the first time a program report is submitted. It will also allow the program review process to be more collaborative between the SPAs and the program faculty. National Recognition decision choices discussed above also apply to programs offered by providers that continue to seek CAEP accreditation and that may have been recognized in the past but are not currently recognized.

f) Extensions in 24 months timeline. Considering the importance of program review evidence through SPAs in meeting CAEP accreditation standards (1/A.1), the Committee recognizes that SPAs may grant extensions to programs regarding the 24-month timeline as deemed fit and in consultation with CAEP staff.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The steps followed in the SPA decision-making process regarding the national recognition of programs include:

- When the three-reviewer team finds evidence that the program meets the SPA Standards, their consensus decision results in National Recognition by the SPA.

- Reviewer decisions on whether specific standards are met will be based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level. "Preponderance of evidence" means an overall confirmation that candidates meet standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence. This will be based on the professional judgments of the SPA reviewer teams.
- A low enrollment program is defined as a program that has under 10 candidates over three cycles of data reported. If a state requires programs to submit SPA reports or if a program chooses to submit a SPA report despite low enrollment, the program must be given a fair review. Reviewer decisions, in this case, will be based on the required evidence provided by the program and the quality and alignment of the assessments used to meet SPA Standards.
- If a program has low enrollment and seeks to pursue SPA program review option, the provider may provide aggregated data for everyone included in the third cycle. Programs with no enrollment cannot submit SPA reports and should report the status to the state.
- Reviewers must note that a SPA cannot require a program to meet all components of all the standards as a criterion for National Recognition. A SPA may identify some components as mandatory, which programs will be required to meet. *Programs, however, will be required to provide evidence for all the components* of a standard.
- If the evidence fails to show the program meets the SPA Standards, the consensus decision may result in conditional national recognition, further development required, or nationally recognized with probation. Programs will receive the Recognition Report that will provide feedback on the aspects needing improvement or revision in order for the program to receive full National Recognition. To meet the specified conditions and/or to make the recommended revisions, programs will be required to submit a Response to Conditions or a Revised Report with data from a minimum of one application of all assessments that have been revised to meet SPA expectations.
- Team Reports that are prepared in response to program reports by the Lead Reviewer will specify the basis for decisions applied to a program. These reports will identify areas for improvement found in the program report.
- The primary responsibility of the SPA Audit Committee is to consider the Team Reports that provide feedback to programs, especially if the three-reviewer team is unable to arrive at a consensus decision. Auditors may need to obtain additional information from the review team to make a decision on whether the program is eligible for National Recognition. Auditors will also edit any additional errors or concerns they notice on the Team Report.
- The SPA audit team recommends National Recognition decisions.

Upon completion of the review process, programs will be notified that the response to their program reports can be accessed through CAEP's electronic information management system. State departments are also notified about the publication of the SPA Recognition Reports.