

INTERNATIONAL LITERACY ASSOCIATION (ILA)

*Instructions on Completing SPA Program Review Template/Form: **Option A***

For use with: Program-level plans to meet Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) **ILA 2017 Standards**

For use by: Program Report Compilers and SPA Program Reviewers

Educator preparation providers have widely used outcome assessments aligned to standards developed by SPAs to monitor progress of candidates and evaluate programs. The purpose is to ensure that candidates are capable of applying content and pedagogical knowledge and provide evidence for CAEP [Component 1.3](#) (Initial Level Programs) or CAEP [Component A.1.2](#) (Advanced Level Programs). Programs selecting the [SPA Program Review with National Recognition Option A](#) use six to eight key assessments to provide evidence that SPA standards elements/components are met. In their entirety, the assessments and data required for submission should demonstrate the candidates have mastered the SPA standards.

Which Programs Should Submit ILA SPA Reports?

- Graduate reading and/or literacy programs that lead to a Master's degree.
- Graduate programs that lead to a reading/literacy endorsement.

How to Complete the Program Report Template/Form

SPA Program Review is conducted through CAEP's Accreditation Information Management System ([AIMS](#)). A program would request a template ("shell") through AIMS using institutional login information. Instructions on how to request shells are provided on the CAEP [website](#).

COVER SHEET

(Must be completed for initial, revised, and response-to-conditions reports)

Complete the entire section: Numbers 1-16.

**Question 16. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:*

ILA, in alignment with CAEP policy, does not require an 80% pass rate for the program completer cohorts reported taking the state licensure examination(s) in the content field. However, the last three years of candidate performance data on the licensure examination(s) must be reported in Section IV of the SPA report template as evidence for Assessment 1 in initial review reports. Identify whether your state requires such a test.

- Yes
- No

SECTION I. CONTEXT

Provide general information on the program as specified by the directions for this section. Each question that requires a narrative has a specific character limit. There is one attachment.

Note that the table for Candidate Information (question #5) is filled out online. This information must be provided for initial, revised, and response-to-conditions reports.

The Faculty Information (question #6) is provided during initial review. It includes all faculty in the AIMS Manage Faculty Information view. Pertinent faculty information is then imported into each program report.

SECTION II. LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

Using the chart included in this report form, indicate the name, type, and administration point for each of the 6-8 assessments documented in this report. (Note that Section IV of the report form lists examples of assessments that may be appropriate for each type of assessment that must be documented in the program report.)

SECTION III. RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENTS TO STANDARDS

Using the chart included in this report form, indicate which of the assessments listed in Section II provide evidence of meeting specific program standards elements.

**When submitting a revised or response-to-conditions report, if a new assessment replaces one submitted in the initial review report to meet a SPA standard, Section III must be completed.*

SECTION IV. EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

Follow the directions provided in Section IV of the template to develop information on the 6-8 key assessments. The key assessments should be required of all candidates. Assessments scoring guides/rubrics and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards elements/components. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides/rubrics to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards elements/components. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level they are collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements/components [each relating to specific SPA standard(s) indicators], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather than reporting a cumulative score.

For each assessment, attach one document that includes (1) a two-page narrative and (2) assessment documentation. The narrative includes the following:

- a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
- b. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
- c. A brief analysis of the data findings; and
- d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;
- e. The assessment documentation will include the following:
- f. The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
- g. The scoring guide for the assessment; and
- h. Charts that provide candidate data derived from the assessment.

Note:

- a. One assessment is preferably presented as one file;
- b. There is a limit of 20 attachments
- c. Attachment size can be no larger than 2 MB

SECTION V. USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE THE PROGRAM

Describe how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and student learning.

***SECTION VI. FOR REVISED AND RESPONSE-TO-CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY**

Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the conditions and concerns raised in the original recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made.

Specific instructions for preparing a Revised report are available on the CAEP web site at

<http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur/guidelines-for-submitting-revised-spa-pr>

Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions report are available on the CAEP web site at

<http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur/guidelines-for-submitting-response-to-co>

General Guidelines on Documentation

1. Attachments

Sections I and IV include attachments. In Section IV, each attachment should be no longer than the equivalent of seventeen text pages. A program report can include no more than a total of 20 attachments. A single attachment cannot be larger than 2 MB. The files for each attachment should be prepared as Word, Word Perfect, Excel, or PDF documents. AIMS accepts documents that have been created in the newest version of Word and saved with a “.docx” extension.

2. Character Limits

Character limits have been set based on one page being equivalent to 4000 characters. Character counts include spaces, punctuation, numbers, etc.

3. Formatting Instructions

Note that text boxes in Sections I, II, V, and VI are html-based and will not accept any formatting such as bullets, tables, charts, etc. Be sure that your responses are text-only. If you do need to include a table or a graph in a response to a question, then you must separate that into a unique file and attach in Section I. This restriction does not apply to the documentation for Section IV, since these documents are all uploaded as attachments.

NOTE: CAEP staff may require programs to revise reports that are not aligned with the template instructions regarding format, page limits, or number of attachments. Please note that hyperlinks embedded in report documentation will

not be read by reviewers and cannot be used as a means of providing additional information.

Resources on the CAEP website

CAEP has multiple resources on its website to help programs to prepare SPA reports. These are available at <http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-program-review-policies-and-procedur>

SPA-specific program review templates and resources are available at <http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms>

Specific Guidelines for ILA Review

National Recognition Decision Rules

ILA program report reviewers and audit team members decide whether a reading/literacy specialist advanced licensure program provides sufficient evidence to meet ILA standards and criteria for National Recognition. To ensure consistent practices among ILA reviewers/auditors in the analysis of assessment evidence and in reaching National Recognition decisions based on that evidence, ILA adheres to the following CAEP policies:

1. Preponderance of the Evidence: 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 ILA reviewer teams. Program reviewers and auditors weigh the evidence presented in ILA program reports, and when there is a greater weight of evidence in favor, they should conclude that a standard is met or that a program is recognized. Programs and reviewers/auditors use the components to help determine how standards are met. This means that a standard could be met, even though evidence related to one or more components presented in the eight possible assessments is weak. Reviewers and auditors make judgments that “overall” there is/is not sufficient evidence that the standard is met. ILA reviewers and auditors are trained to review evidence and make judgments based on the preponderance of evidence that standards are met.

2. Align Assessments, Rubrics, and Tables to Components of the Standards: *Programs will be required to provide evidence for all the components* of a standard. However, ILA cannot require a program to meet all components of all the standards as a criterion for National Recognition. ILA may identify some components as mandatory, which programs will be required to meet. Mandatory components that must be “met” according to the ILA 2017 standards reviewer rubric are:

- o Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4
- o Standard 2: 2.1, 2.3, 2.4
- o Standard 3: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
- o Standard 4: 4.1, 4.2, 4.3
- o Standard 5: 5.1, 5.2, 5.449

- o Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3

- o Standard 7: 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4—Note: Standard 7 is demonstrated in Section I.2: Context: Description of field and clinical experiences of the CAEP program report. While there may also be evidence of Standard 7 in Assessments 3–8, programs *are not required* to show evidence of Standard 7 in their key assessment system.

In other words, components 2.2, 3.4, 4.4, 5.3, and 6.4 *must be measured* in the program assessment system, but if evidence is found to be at the beginning/unacceptable level, this will not keep that standard from being met based on a preponderance of the evidence.

3. Validity of Assessments and Alignment to ILA 2017 Standards: Because the validity of evidence depends on the alignment of assessments and rubrics with the standards, ILA program reviewers and auditors will apply the following criteria when evaluating and commenting on alignment of standards to candidate assessments and scoring rubrics submitted by reading/literacy specialist preparation programs undergoing review. When reviewers and auditors provide feedback to programs about alignment of standards to assessments and rubrics, feedback should be referenced to the characteristics described ahead. Alignment of the ILA 2017 standards to program assessments and rubrics must demonstrate, at a minimum, the following characteristics.

- o The content of the assessment tasks and the rubrics are the same as the *content* of the Reading/Literacy Specialist Preparation Standards 2017 *components* and the *evidence*.

- o The *cognitive demands* (knowing and understanding) and *skill requirements* of the assessment and related rubrics are the same as described in the ILA Reading/Literacy Specialist Preparation Standards 2017 and components. The assessment tasks and rubric criteria are adapted to the *components* of the ILA 2017 standards.

- o The *level of effort required*, or the *degree of difficulty* of the assessment and rubric are consistent with what the standards required. Does the assessment represent the difficulty of similar tasks typically required of a beginning Reading/Literacy Specialist?

4. Evaluating the Quality of Candidate Assessments: ILA Reading/Literacy Specialist Program Reports must include assessments that taken as a whole, demonstrate candidate mastery of the ILA 2017 standards. These six to eight key assessments must be required of all candidates. Assessments should be aligned with the 2017 standards and components. This means that the concepts in the Reading/Literacy Specialist preparation standards should be apparent in the assessments to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the 2017 standards. Assessments of candidate performance on the Reading/Literacy Specialist standards must demonstrate the characteristics described as the minimal level of sufficient evidence as identified in the ILA 2017 Standards Assessment Rubrics in Part 3 of this Guidelines document.

Because the validity of assessment evidence depends on the quality of assessment tasks and scoring rubrics, ILA program reviewers and auditors will apply the following criteria when evaluating candidate performance assessments submitted by teacher preparation programs for review. When reviewers and auditors provide feedback to programs about their assessments, feedback should be referenced to the characteristics described ahead. Reading/Literacy Specialist preparation program assessments must demonstrate, at a minimum, the following characteristics.

Administration and Purpose of Assessments

- o The point or points when the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit
- o The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate
- o Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are aligned to the Reading/Literacy Specialist Preparation Standards

Informing Candidates

- o The candidates who are being assessed are given a description of the assessment's purpose
- o Instructions provided to candidates about what they are expected to do are informative, clear, and concise
- o The basis for judgment (criterion for success, or what is "good enough") is made explicit for candidates

Content of Assessment

- o Evaluation categories or tasks assess explicitly identified aspects of the Reading/Literacy Specialist standards
- o Evaluation categories or tasks reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards
- o Evaluation categories or tasks clearly describe the proficiencies to be evaluated

5. Evaluating the Quality of Assessment Rubrics: Reading/Literacy Specialist Program Reports must include rubrics that describe program expectations for appropriate candidate performance by defining different levels of candidate proficiencies in each of the components of the Reading/Literacy Specialist Standards that determine whether standards are met or not met. Rubrics for meeting the standards must demonstrate the characteristics described as the acceptable level of sufficient evidence as identified in the ILA 2017 Standards Rubric in Part 3.

Because the validity of assessment evidence depends on the quality of assessment tasks and scoring rubrics, ILA program reviewers and auditors will apply the following criteria when evaluating assessment rubrics submitted by teacher preparation programs seeking review. When reviewers and auditors provide feedback to programs about their rubrics, feedback should be referenced to the characteristics described ahead. Program assessment rubrics must demonstrate, at a minimum, the following characteristics.

- o The basis for judging candidate work is well defined
- 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 candidate with explicit feedback on their performance)

- o Feedback provided to candidates from the rubric is actionable

- 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

6. Course grades: ILA allows course grades as an acceptable assessment of content knowledge (typically as Assessment 2). 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 by CAEP. Following are two sample data tables for using grades:

Examples for Reporting Grades: Alignment Matrix and Brief Course Description

Course Name and Number	SPA Standard/s Addressed by Course	Brief Description of How Course Meets Cited Standards (if course title is unclear)
READ 510: Foundations of Literacy	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4	<i>Course catalog description here</i>
READ 511: Diagnosis and Assessment of Literacy Difficulties	3.1, 3.2, 3.3	<i>Course catalog description here</i>
READ 512: Literacy Clinical/Practicum	2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 5.3	<i>Course catalog description here</i>

Will ILA Accept Grades as One of the Assessments?

All SPAs will accept course grades as one of the 6 to 8 key assessments. Instructions for documenting course grades have been standardized for all SPAs. These instructions are on the CAEP website under the Program Review Policies and Procedures at <http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/grade-policy>

Other resources are available on the ILA website at:

<http://literacyworldwide.org/about-us/accreditation-of-teacher-education>