



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

GUIDELINES ON PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION USING SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION (SPA) STANDARDS

January 2017

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION USING
SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION STANDARDS5

PART I: WRITING AND APPROVAL OF SPA STANDARDS

Table of Contents

<u>Section A. Introduction</u>	6
<u>A.1 Purpose</u>	6
<u>A.2 Background on standards in accreditation</u>	6
<u>A.3 Context for education standards</u>	7
<u>A.4 Highlights of the <i>Writing and Approval of SPA Standards</i></u>	8
<u>A.5 Submission “checklist” and additional contact information</u>	11
<u>Section B. Concepts and content of SPA standards</u>	11
<u>B.1 Principles focus SPA standards on student learning</u>	11
<u>B.2 Intent of the principles</u>	11
<u>B.3 Principles for SPA standards</u>	12
a. <u>Principle A. The Learner and Learning</u>	13
b. <u>Principle B. Content</u>	18
c. <u>Principle C. Instructional Practice</u>	19
d. <u>Principle D. Professional Responsibility</u>	21
<u>B.4 Formatting SPA standards</u>	24
<u>B.5 Requesting a special programmatic standard</u>	29
<u>B.6 Adapting principles for initial and advanced teacher preparation program</u>	31
<u>B.7 Adapting principles for other school professional preparation programs</u>	32
<u>B.8 Review of the SPA standards application package</u>	33
<u>B.8.a Supplemental document</u>	33
<u>B.8.b Evidence</u>	33
<u>B.8.c. Diversity and digital learning</u>	34
<u>Section C. Procedures for developing and reviewing new or revised standards</u>	34
<u>C.1 SPA process for developing new or revised standards</u>	34
<u>C.1.a Soliciting and responding to comments</u>	34
<u>C.1.b Drawing on developments in the SPA’s field</u>	35
<u>C.1.c Using the knowledge base</u>	35
<u>C.1.d Developing consensus</u>	35

<u>C.2 Checklist for components of SPA standards submission</u>	35
<u>C.3 The Worksheet for Review of Proposed, New and Revised Standards.....</u>	40
<u>C.4 Conduct of the SPA Standards Committee review.....</u>	53
<u>C.4.a CAEP staff review.....</u>	53
<u>C.4.b SPA presentations and Committee questions.....</u>	53
<u>C.4.c Committee review, decisions, modifications, and identified features.....</u>	53
<u>C.4.d Optional provision for comments on preliminary draft standards.....</u>	53
<u>Section D. SPA Standards Committee.....</u>	54
PART II: EVIDENCE USED IN PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION	
<u>Section A. Policy on SPA specification of assessments for program reports</u>	56
<u>Section B. Policy on SPA program review decisions based on preponderance of evidence at the standards level</u>	57
<u>Section C. Policies and procedures for use of benchmarked licensure data</u>	58
<u>C.1 Policies on benchmarked licensure test data as evidence</u>	58
<u>C.2 Reviewers' use of benchmarked licensure test data as evidence of content knowledge.....</u>	59
<u>Section D. Using and documenting course grades as an assessment of candidate content knowledge</u>	60
<u>D.1 Documenting course grades</u>	61
<u>D.2.a Format for Submission of Grades as a Course-Based Content Assessment</u>	61
<u>D.2.b. Transcript Analysis for Using Grades as Evidence for Content Knowledge.....</u>	62
<u>Section E. Minimum data collections for program reports</u>	63
<u>Section F. Review of programs identified as Advanced Level for CAEP accreditation purposes</u>	64
<u>Section G. Review of endorsement and add-on programs.....</u>	64
PART III: CONDUCTING PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION	
<u>Section A. Program review: Goals and process</u>	66
<u>A.1 Goals for program review.....</u>	66
<u>A.2 The program report document</u>	66

<u>A.3 SPA program report review and response</u>	67
<u>Section B. National Recognition decision-making process</u>	70
<u>Section C. SPA responsibilities related to program review</u>	71
<u>Section D. Shared CAEP responsibilities related to program review</u>	72
<u>Section E. Policies on training and diversity of SPA program reviewers</u>	72

APPENDICES:

<u>APPENDIX A—SPA STANDARDS SUBMISSION DATES AND TIMELINES</u>	73
<u>APPENDIX B—RESOURCES RELATED TO INTASC STANDARDS</u>	77
<u>APPENDIX C—PROGRAM REVIEW UNDER STATE PARTNERSHIPS</u>	80
<u>APPENDIX D—SPA EVALUATION TOOL FOR ASSESSMENTS USED IN CAEP PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION</u>	82
<u>APPENDIX E—EXAMPLE: INTERPRETING BENCHMARKED DATA AS AN INDICATOR OF SUBJECT CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</u>	85
<u>APPENDIX F—EXAMPLES FOR FORMATTING GRADES</u>	86

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION USING SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION (SPA) STANDARDS

The *Guidelines for Program Review with National Recognition Using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards* (henceforth referred to as the *Guidelines*) have been adopted by the SPA Standards Committee (SPASC) and will be used by specialized professional associations (SPAs) for the development, review, and implementation of their new and/or revised standards beginning 2017. The purpose of the Guidelines is to advise SPAs when they prepare new or revised initial or advanced teacher preparation standards and structure the implementation of the standards as teacher preparation programs adopt them for program review with National Recognition as part of the CAEP accreditation process.

The introductory part (Part I: *Writing and Approval of Initial and Advanced SPA Standards*) of the *Guidelines* states the purpose and context of Part I as employed in accreditation and, more broadly, in the practice of education. It also provides instructions on principles, formatting and other features of SPA standards along with procedures for developing and reviewing new or revised standards complete the document.

Part II, *Evidence used in Program Review with National Recognition*, provides guidance on the use of evidence to meet SPA standards. The purpose of this section is to guide programs on designing program level outcomes-based assessments that can be used to collect evidence of candidates' content and pedagogical content knowledge for meeting SPA standards.

Part III, *Conducting Program Review with National Recognition*, provides guidance to SPAs about their responsibilities in implementing SPA standards by adopting a uniform approach to reviewing evidence provided by programs. Training of new and continuing reviewers, as well as training programs to interpret SPA standards and expectations form the basis of a success SPA review process.

PART I: WRITING AND APPROVAL OF INITIAL AND ADVANCED SPA STANDARDS

SECTION A. INTRODUCTION

A.1 Purpose

Part I, *Writing and Approval of Initial and Advanced Standards*, has been created to make specialty professional association (SPA) program standards more consistent in form and substance; more congruent with P-12 student standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards) in state accountability systems; 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 Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards) and to better integrate with performance-based accreditation and accreditation standards.

A.2 Background on standards in accreditation

Like accreditors in law, medicine, engineering and other professional fields, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) writes standards as the foundation for preparation in its professional domain—educators in P-12 schools. CAEP’s standards for educator preparation providers (EPPs) are the focus of evidence gathering, institutional reports, and visiting examiner teams that lead up to final accreditation decision. These standards describe the profession’s view of effective practice.

Through its affiliated [SPAs](#),¹ CAEP also adopts standards for initial and advanced preparation programs in specialty licensure areas. These standards are written for different fields of teaching (e.g., elementary, special education, secondary mathematics) and for other school professionals (e.g., principals, librarians, school psychologists). Preparation programs are the heart of educator pre-professional growth and professional advancement. Programs 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. SPA program standards are the basis for the CAEP/SPA program review, and the process leading to decisions that a program meets standards and should receive national recognition.

¹ Details on CAEP and SPA structures and policies will be linked to relevant resources, as needed, throughout the document to provide greater clarity of information.

CAEP's affiliated SPAs have been writing standards for more than three decades. These standards have evolved over time from ones that described courses and experiences candidates² should be offered, to ones that describe what proficient candidates should know and be able to do as they complete their program. Some associations have linked their candidate preparation program standards with their own national standards for P-12 students.

A.3 Context for education standards

The context for standards has many facets, and exhibits 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 the national education goals has been subsequently followed by the development of the Common Core Standards as well as the College and Career Readiness Standards. The state standards have wide authority over the activities of educators, schools, and districts because they are the basis for state assessments, graduation requirements, and purchase of curriculum materials. State student standards are also associated, although more loosely, with state teacher standards, 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, beginning in the late 1980s, known as the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). InTASC Principles for state teacher standards, 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.

By 2007 and 2008, and partly during the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Federal law, 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

² 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."

learning and collaborative team teaching, more extensive use of technology in education, and formative assessment to improve student learning.

In this changed contextual setting, 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, while reformers saw the EPPs' claim as sidestepping solid academic content. Institutional representatives said that the existing SPA standards differed from each other in content and form and those differences impeded institutional efforts to develop coherent programs and assessment systems. 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 this section, which addresses *Writing and Approval of SPA Standards*. The *Guidelines* are formed around the four CAEP Principles intended to guide SPA standards for initial and advanced teacher preparation, and, with flexible interpretation, for “other school professionals” as well (see section I, part B.5 below, on “Adapting principles for different SPA programs”). The Principles include:

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

A.4 Highlights of Part I-*Writing and Approval of SPA Standards*

This section focuses on three areas. First, SPA standards describe and make use of the 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. 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:

- *Create a Common framework for standards*—The *Guidelines* identify the four principles that SPAs will use as a common structural organizing framework for writing new or revised standards—(A) The Learner and Learning; (B) Content; (C) Instructional Practice; (D) 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, Principles for SPA standards, and also part B.2, Intent of the Principles).

- *Build 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 principles 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, the National Academy of Education, and the NCATE Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning.

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.

The *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 A as supplementary material.

- *Focus on the most critical knowledge and skills*—The *Guidelines* call for SPA standards to address only the most critical topics in the SPA's specialty area. There can be up to seven standards, and up to 28 components³ in total. The

³ Components are sub-indicators of the standard that elaborate upon and further define the different aspects of the standard. SPAs use the components as evidence categories that are addressed by the programs and reviewed by the SPA review team to arrive at a decision on the national recognition status. The components within each standard clarify its most important features.

concept 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 perceived by program faculty as overwhelming in breadth and number. (See Formatting of SPA standards in part B.4.d, p.27)

- *Strengthen relationship with program review*—The *Guidelines* are written to function in concert with the CAEP/SPA program review process:
 - EPPs are asked to provide evidence in their program reports from no more than eight assessments. Option A (refer to Part II, Section B, p. 52) for teacher education programs requires five specific assessments: state licensure assessment, content knowledge assessment, unit or planning evidence, classroom skills evidence, and evidence of effects on P-12 student learning. At a minimum (in Option B) programs must include the state licensure test, if there is one in the discipline, and an assessment of candidate impact on P-12 student learning. Option A for Other School Professional programs requires a sixth assessment focusing on the unique demands of the specialty area. All assessments, taken as whole, must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. Each SPA may continue to require a sixth assessment, but no additional ones, beyond the five in the report template. (See part B.6 *Adapting principles for initial and advanced teacher preparation programs*, p.30).
 - SPA program reviewer decisions on whether standards are met will be based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level. The decision on whether there is preponderance of evidence to meet a particular standard will be based on professional judgment of the trained program review teams. (See Formatting of SPA standards in part B.4.e, p.27).
- *Provide an advantage to educator preparation programs*— Use of InTASC language as a guide for teacher education SPA standards can facilitate the work of program coordinators by providing some common undergirding to their compilations of program evidence and reports across multiple disciplines and programs.
- *Strengthen 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. 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.

- *Provide 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 Submission “checklist” and additional contact information

The submission checklist in part C.2 details the items that SPAs are to include with new or revised standards prepared for review and approval. Corresponding with the changes noted in the Highlights section (A.4) are changes in the checklist (Refer to part C.2, p.11). CAEP has prepared a program standards coversheet checklist with these same items that is to be reproduced and attached to each SPA submission. The coversheet lists all the materials that the SPASAC needs and summarizes points from the *Guidelines* that serve as the basis for the review. SPAs are requested to indicate, on the coversheet, the heading or section and specific page of the submission where each of the guidelines is addressed.

SECTION B. CONCEPTS AND CONTENT OF SPA STANDARDS

B.1 Principles focus SPA standards on student learning

The SPA Standards Committee has adopted principles for SPA standards grounded in the belief that the purpose of education is student learning. Student learning, however, is not a “standard.” It is the focus of teaching, of teacher preparation, and of the responsibilities for all professional school personnel. Thus, student learning must be the focus of standards and preparation for teachers and for other school professionals. 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 principles

The four CAEP principles and components are identical to the InTASC categories and standards released in April 2011 and have been created as the primary guide for SPA standards writing. 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 specifically:

- CAEP principles and components describe and make use of the knowledge base, including empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the

wisdom of practice for their area 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 focus on students and creation of environments that will foster student learning. And third, SPA standards need to specify major aspects of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates should achieve as they complete their preparation program.

- The intent of the principles, and the goal for SPA standards, is to identify what is most critical for well-prepared beginning teachers to know and be able to do. Standards writers need to 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 principles also serve as a concept-driven structure, or organizing framework. They tap the legacy of the NBPTS and InTASC standards. Both of these organizations have written standards 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 so that EPPs will find a consistency that helps them achieve coherence across the programs they offer. This attribute is discussed more fully in part B.4, *Formatting of SPA standards* (p.24). Part B.5 (p.29) provides additional details about adaptation of the principles for other school professionals.
- The principles as well as SPA standards are crafted to be aligned with the components of CAEP standards. (See Appendix A for a side by side display that illustrates this alignment for the CAEP principles.) The principles 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 Principles for SPA Standards

The following four CAEP principles have been adapted from InTASC categories in their 2011 publication, *Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue*: The Learner and Learning (CAEP Principle A), Content (CAEP Principle B), Instructional Practice (CAEP Principle C), and Professional Responsibility (CAEP Principle D). SPA standards writers are encouraged to review the supporting statements on each of the ten standards in the InTASC *Model State Standards* publication.

The following items are intended to guide the structure and content of SPA standards and are detailed below.

CAEP Principle A. The Learner and Learning

SPA standards under this principle 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.

Principle 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.

The principle 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. 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)⁴.

School librarians, for example, support student learning by addressing the four strands of learning, namely, skills, dispositions in action, responsibilities, and self-assessment strategies that are identified in the 2007 American Association of School Librarians' *Standards for the 21st Century Learner* (AASL, 2010). 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.

School psychologists need to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to work with school administrators, teachers, 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, 2004⁵; Spier, Cai, & Osher, 2007⁶; Spier, Cai, Osher, & Kendziora, 2007⁷). Regardless of their positions, it is an expectation that all professionals within schools positively impact students through various means. Working in multidisciplinary teams that address individual differences in evaluation of skills and designing interventions produce substantial positive impact on student outcomes (Forness, 2001⁸).

Principle 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 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 principle, candidates must be able to design instruction that integrates multiple learning modalities for a range of students,

⁴ National Association of School Psychologists. (2008). *Ready to learn, empowered to teach: Excellence in education for the 21st Century*. Bethesda, MD: Author.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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.

⁸ Forness, S. R. (2001). Special education and related services: What have we learned from meta-analysis? *Exceptionality*, 9, 185–197.

those experiencing difficulties as well as those who demonstrate proficiency and advanced aptitude. Other school professionals must 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 *Principle 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 Education⁹ 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 (2005). 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 them 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* (1999¹⁰) 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" are the following:

- 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) in order to know how teaching practices build on learners' prior knowledge.
- 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.

⁹ *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What teachers should learn and be able to do*; John Bransford, Linda Darling-Hammond, editors, sponsored by the National Academy of Education, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 2005, p. 64 and p. 401.

¹⁰ Bransford, J., Brown, A. L., Cocking, R. R., & National Research Council (U.S.). (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C: National Academy Press.

In addition, there is an expectation that these three key findings about learning are not simply generic conclusions but, rather, 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 science¹¹.

- 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. . . . (S)tudents 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) inquire, think critically, and gain knowledge; (2) draw conclusions, make informed decisions, apply knowledge to new situations, and create new knowledge; (3) share knowledge and participate ethically and productively as members of our democratic society; and (4) pursue personal and aesthetic growth¹².

¹¹ *How Students Learn: History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom*; M Suzanne Donovan and John D. Bransford, editors, Committee on How People Learn, A Targeted Report for teachers, National Research Council, Washington, DC, 2005

¹² www.ala.org/aasl/standards

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 teaching¹³ (NICHD and NCATE, 2007, 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 in order 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, 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)¹⁴. Although the particular training needed by each type of professional may vary, it is clear that strong preparation of each is needed, along with an emphasis on the 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)¹⁵.

¹³ *Child and Adolescent Development Research and Teacher Education: Evidence-based pedagogy, policy, and practice*, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, DC, 2007

¹⁴ Adelman, H. S., & Taylor, L. (2010, July). Creating successful school systems requires addressing barriers to learning and teaching. *The F. M. Duffy Reports*, 15(3).

¹⁵ National Association of School Psychologists. (2010a). *Model for comprehensive and integrated school psychological*

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). 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 opportunities to access print and digital resources and to benefit from adult instruction and guidance (Dickinson, G., Gavigan, K. and Pribesh, S. 2008)¹⁶.

CAEP Principle B. Content

SPA standards under this principle 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.

The term “content knowledge” has two meanings. First—and certainly for initial and advanced teacher preparation—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 principle is intended to guide SPAs toward standards that describe the subject content knowledge candidates are expected to acquire in their field and apply it in their teaching. The SPA standards should also encourage candidates to make content

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.

¹⁶ 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 [<http://www.ala.org/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmr/slmrcontents/volume11/Dickinson>].

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 principle 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 Council¹⁷ 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)

CAEP Principle C. Instructional Practice

SPA standards under this principle 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***

¹⁷ *How People Learn*, op. cit.

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 CAEP principle guides SPAs toward standards that describe what candidates should learn and be able to apply, for their field, about 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), 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 instruction; data gathering, interpretation, and evaluation; use of technology and information literacy; and applications of research.

The concepts forming this principle 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 learn¹⁸.

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

¹⁸ NAE 2005 op. cit. p. 48

requirements focused on the proper integration of learning and assessment in teachers' educational experience¹⁹ (NRC 2001, p. 309).

- 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 principle draws from longitudinal data derived from research conducted in New York City schools,²⁰ 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. 2008, p. 26), and (2) teacher preparation in the curriculum used in New York City (Boyd et al. 2008). These findings indicate that candidate knowledge and skills associated with standards-based curricula should be an 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.

CAEP Principle D. Professional Responsibility

SPA standards under this principle 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,***

¹⁹ *Knowing What Students Know*, National Research Council, Washington, DC, 2001

²⁰ *Teacher Preparation and Student Achievement*; Don Boyd, Pam Grossman, Hamp Lankford, Susanna Loeb, and Jim Wyckoff; State University of New York at Albany, Stanford University, and University of Virginia; August 2008

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 principle is intended to guide SPA standards toward descriptions of professional practices for the specialty field that are necessary by program completion. The standards must 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, 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 instance, the state of Ohio expects that teachers will collaborate and communicate student progress with students, parents and colleagues, and that they will collaborate with other teachers, administrators, and school and district staff, with community agencies, when and where appropriate “to promote a positive environment for student learning. The North Carolina state standards speak to a shared leadership among staff and administration in order to bring consensus and common, shared ownership of the vision and purpose of work of the school. Educators are also expected to create a culture that empowers students “to collaborate and become lifelong learners.

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 longing. (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. (8) Librarians must apply best practices for planning library policies and procedures, budgeting, and evaluating human, information, and physical resources. (AASL/ALA, 2010)

The Building Level Standards for Education Leadership (ELCC, 2011) 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 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 of SPA standards

The *Guidelines* reflect EPPs' insistence on consistency across SPA program standards so that similar topics are covered as well as a sharp focus so that expectations are feasible to put into place. The *Guidelines* are advanced as a means to help program faculty share a common vision for programs in an educator preparation unit, so terms have common definitions, so units can have more cross-program coherence, and so units and programs can actually accomplish what is set out in 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 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.

The guidelines on structure and formatting are intended to promote concise and consistent SPA program standards writing:

- a. SPA standards should be written around the four principles 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) SPA standards committees should also see part B.5, below, on adaptations of the principles for some specialty fields.

EXAMPLE of writing around the four principles: (adapted from NAEYC 2010 standards²¹)

THE LEARNER AND LEARNING

Standard 1. Promoting child development and learning—Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs are grounded in a child development knowledge base. They use their understanding of young

²¹ The intent of this example and the two that follow is to illustrate, separately and succinctly, the first three formatting guidelines—writing around the four principles, writing standards and components, and writing standards language that embraces all of the components. While standards from three different specialized professional associations are used as illustrations in the *Guidelines* document, it was concluded that differing writing styles among the three associations' standards might make the point here more difficult to follow; hence only one association is provided as an illustration.

children's characteristics and needs, and of multiple interacting influences on children's development and learning, to create environments that are healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging for each child.

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Standard 5. Using content knowledge to build meaningful curriculum—

Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs use their knowledge of academic disciplines to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that promote positive development and learning for each and every young child.

Candidates understand the importance of developmental domains and academic (or content) disciplines in early childhood curriculum. They know the essential concepts, inquiry tools, and structure of content areas, including academic subjects, and can identify resources to deepen their understanding. Candidates use their own knowledge and other resources to design, implement, and evaluate meaningful, challenging curriculum that promotes comprehensive developmental and learning outcomes for every young child.

- b. “Standards” is the term that describes the primary level and “components” is the term for the next level. There will not be additional layers (such as “indicators” or “sub-components”) below that.

EXAMPLE of standards and components (adapted from NAEYC 2010 standards)

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE

Standard 3. Observing, documenting, and assessing to support young

children and families—Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs understand that child observation, documentation, and other forms of assessment are central to the practice of all early childhood professionals. They know about and understand the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment. They know about and use systematic observations, documentation, and other effective assessment strategies in a responsible way, in partnership with families and other professionals, to positively influence the development of every child.

Components of Standard 3

3a: Understanding the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment – including its use in development of appropriate goals, curriculum, and teaching strategies for young children

3b: Knowing about assessment partnerships with families and with professional colleagues to build effective learning environments

3c: Knowing about and using observation, documentation, and other appropriate assessment tools and approaches, including the use of technology in documentation, assessment and data collection

3d: Understanding and practicing responsible assessment to promote positive outcomes for each child, including the use of assistive *technology* for children with disabilities.

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

EXAMPLE of language in standards that embraces each of the components (adapted from NAEYC 2010 standards)

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Standard 2. Building family and community relationships—Candidates prepared in early childhood degree programs understand that successful early childhood education depends upon partnerships with children’s families and communities. They know about, understand, and value the importance and complex characteristics of children’s families and communities [*NOTE: see 2a, below*]. They use this understanding to create respectful, reciprocal relationships [*NOTE: see 2b, below*] that support and empower families, and to involve all families [*NOTE: see 2c, below*] in their children’s development and learning.

Components of Standard 2

- 2a: Knowing about and understanding diverse family and community characteristics
- 2b: Supporting and engaging families and communities through respectful, reciprocal relationships
- 2c.: Involving families and communities in young children’s development and learning

- d. The number of SPA standards and components must be sufficiently limited that standards can be sampled in six to eight program report assessments. There is a numerical limit of seven 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. Programs will be required to provide evidence for all the components of a standard. A SPA may identify some components as mandatory. The mandatory components must be clearly identified as “Required Components.” Programs must meet the “Required Components,” if specified by a SPA. However, SPAs cannot require programs to meet all the components of all the standards as a criterion for National Recognition.
- f. To further align SPA standards with the CAEP/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 in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence. This will be based on the professional judgments of the SPA reviewer teams.

- g. 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. “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 standards²² 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 must be related to the principles and limited to what candidates who are completing preparation programs must know and be able to do.
- i. Program standards must 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 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. 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. Program standards must include rubrics or criteria 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. Rubrics for SPA standards must demonstrate the characteristic described as the minimal level of sufficient evidence as identified in the SPA Evaluation Tool for Programs. (Appendix D, page 79).

²² *Taking Science to School: Learning and Teaching Science in Grades K-8*, Richard A. Duschl, Heidi A. Schweingruber, and Andrew W. Shouse, editors, Board on Science Education, National Research Council, Washington, DC, 2006, Executive Summary p. 4 and chapter 11, p. 13.

- k. Assessment evidence guidelines—SPA standards must 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. Program standards must 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

All SPAs are permitted to 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. 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. However, there may be state activities, national legislation or 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 educators²³.

²³ 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. That report further recommended 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 (*Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*, Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Kenneth M. Zeichner, editors, Published for the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Mahwah, New Jersey, 2005) 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

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. A statement of the SPA’s rationale constituting such a “case” must be submitted to the SPA Standards Committee one year prior to that in which the SPA is to submit its new or revised standards for approval. Procedures will be the same as those specified in the second item under B.5 on “Adapting principles for different SPA programs.” SPAs may not specify a specific number of hours or credits in a field and clinical experiences standard.

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

- The SPA case would be constructed around the language of CAEP Standard 2, *Clinical Partnerships and Practice*.
- The SPA case would describe the clinical and field experience expectations for the settings or the nature of such experiences.
- The SPA case would 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.

If the SPA Standards Committee approves 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 approved by the Committee may be in addition to the limit of seven standards that these *Guidelines* sets 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.

SPAs 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

education program, individuals may still resist changing their own beliefs or practices because they are personally uncomfortable with the competing beliefs and practices.”

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 that choose to advance the case for an additional programmatic standard under this paragraph, must count that additional programmatic standard within the limit of seven candidate performance standards permitted in formatting guideline B.4.d.

B.6 Adapting principles for initial and advanced teacher preparation programs

The principles should accommodate standards for both initial and advanced teacher preparation programs. The principles have been crafted with a perspective focused on student learning, and, with CAEP's commitment to flexibility of interpretation, can serve as the structure or organizing framework for most SPA standards.

In those instances where, under Part B.4, item a, above, the principles have no explicit provision for an attribute that is important for a specialty field, or where the principles have a provision that a SPA finds incongruent with their specialty field, then:

- The SPA may make a case to the SPA Standards Committee identifying which features of the principles are incongruent and for which they need a waiver from the general policy; the request for a waiver should include a rationale and documentation explaining why those features are incongruent with their specialty field.
- Any SPA that identifies such an incongruent feature of the principles should notify the SPA Standards Committee and seek concurrence during an annual Board meeting scheduled one year prior to that in which the SPA is to submit its new or revised standards for approval. CAEP staff will provide assistance to assure that the SPA's case is completed on a timely basis for review. The SPA Standards Committee will consider each case on its individual merits, will consider possible implications for SPAs in other specialty fields, and will provide a response at the annual Committee meeting held every Fall. (See, also part C.2, Checklist for components of SPA standards submission, p 35).

These provisions for flexible adaptation of the CAEP principles pertain to all SPA standards, regardless of the level or type. For advanced teacher standards, SPAs would determine whether standards for advanced preparation are written or not. If the decision is made to write them, advanced preparation will be guided by the same principles as initial standards. The SPA Standards Committee would expect greater depth or breadth in the advanced standards, and the SPA may determine that there should be different or additional emphases. For example, there may be less emphasis on content knowledge or more on the research base. For program reports, CAEP would expect that both assessments and scoring rubrics differ from those used with initial standards.

B.7 Adapting principles 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. As a policy, CAEP expects that such standards will be guided by two overarching goals that describe standards for all education professionals: all must demonstrate a focus on student learning, and all must demonstrate a foundation in the knowledge base of the specific field.

Second, 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
- Candidates develop positive environments that are supportive of student learning

Third, within the other school professional SPA standards are some that have a strong component of *teaching*—for example, those for school librarians, for reading specialists, and for technology education. By contrast, some of these other standards represent specialty roles with important—but different—responsibilities, such as principals and 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.12) 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:

- **Principle 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) might be a part of most standards for other school professionals.
- **Principle 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.

- **Principle 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.
- **Principle 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 Review of the SPA standards application package

B.8.a Supplemental document

The SPA Standards Committee invites 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 both as the foundation for a briefer set of SPA standards used for the program review process, and also 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

The SPA Standards Committee invites SPAs to provide explicit suggestions and examples that could guide institutions toward stronger assessment to gather evidence to meet SPA standards. CAEP stipulates programs to provide evidence in their program reports using no more than eight assessments. All assessments, taken as whole, must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. As outlined in section A.4, programs using Option A (refer to Part II, Section B) for writing a program report requires five specific assessments: state licensure assessment, content knowledge assessment, unit or planning evidence, classroom skills evidence, and evidence of effects on student learning. A sixth assessment is required, but its nature may be specified by SPAs. For SPAs that do not specify the nature of the sixth assessment, it may serve as a supplemental assessment that is used to provide evidence for any or all SPA standards. Assessments seven and eight are not required but may be used by programs as additional instruments for review.

While CAEP encourages institutions to seek performance evidence about former candidates after they are on the job, in fact, high quality information of this type is frequently not available. “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.

Dispositions will be reviewed during the EPP accreditation process, although dispositions expressed by SPAs in behavioral terms in their standards may be included in the sample of assessments.

As a general guide, SPA standards writing committees should reconsider, and probably eliminate, any proposed standard if they are unable to define what performance-based evidence would demonstrate candidates’ proficiency in that proposed standard.

B.8.c Diversity and Digital Learning

As appropriate for the specialty field, the SPA Standards Committee strongly encourages attention to diversity and digital learning. These are cross-cutting themes woven throughout the CAEP standards. Standards describe knowledge and skills candidates need to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners. Standards specify appropriate and effective integration of technology and digital literacy to support student learning. However, the program standards should not duplicate CAEP standards except where emphasis is necessary for the specialty area.

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

C.1 SPA process for developing or revising standards

Each seven years, specialized professional associations must prepare revisions of the program standards or a rationale for not changing them. To accomplish this, SPAs must identify mechanisms for preparation of new or revised program standards. Note that information on the SPA mechanisms for developing new or revised program standards, as well as the resulting standards, are among the items to be submitted for review (see the CHECKLIST in part C, item 2, and items C.1.a through C.1.d, below). The SPA Standards Committee has written the following guidelines as assistance for SPAs preparing to write new or revised standards.

C.1.a Soliciting and responding to comments

In developing new or revised program standards, SPAs will invite, and respond to, comments about their current-specialty program standards from CAEP, other specialized professional associations, institutions, and states. CAEP staff will take

timely steps to remind both SPAs and the SPA Standards Committee that comments are required at the beginning of standards development, will bring any comments CAEP has received from other individuals or organizations, and will provide observations from their own experience that are pertinent to SPA standards revisions.

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

In preparing program standards, SPAs should draw on 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 must describe and make use of the 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 must create processes to develop consensus for their standards using 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 and their input; and an overview of how the input was used by the SPA in the final standards development.

C.2 Checklist for components of SPA standards submissions

The twelve items described below are components of a specialized professional association 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.

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** — 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). At the direction of the Committee, CAEP staff will prepare guidance and examples for writers of new or revised SPA standards that summarize components contained in exemplary SPA introductions.

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

3. **A copy of the complete standards**—SPAs must submit a complete copy of the text of new or revised standards, components, supporting explanations, rubrics, and assessment evidence guidelines that will be disseminated to programs.

Supporting Explanations - Program standards must include standard statements, standard components, and 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 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.

4. **Statement on development of the standards**—Descriptions showing how the SPA program standards were developed. The description should show the SPA's understanding of related events and developments elsewhere that influence its views about program standards, from guidelines C.1.a and C.1.b (p.34); provide an explanation of the knowledge base(s) upon which the program standards are founded from guideline C.1.c (p.34); and include comments on how critiques and differences of opinion were handled from guideline C.1.d (p.35).
5. **Potential duplication and/or overlaps in standards**—A written analysis of commonalities and differences with existing CAEP program standards or accreditation standards indicating areas of duplication and/or overlap. 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. SPAs will receive information from staff during discussions leading up to their application for admission to CAEP candidacy so they will be notified early on that overlap and/or duplication of standards must be formally reconciled by all affected SPAs before new SPA standards can be accepted.
6. **Analysis of differences from current standards**—Specialty organizations preparing revised program standards for approval must present a written analysis

of the extent to which the revised program standards differ from current program standards.

7. **Assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines**—SPA standards must include 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 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. Assessment rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines will be reviewed by the SPA Standards Advisory Committee to determine the measurability of the standards and their component parts.

Assessment rubrics - Program standards must include rubrics or criteria 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 minimal level of sufficient evidence as identified on the SPA Evaluation Tool for Programs (Appendix D). SPA 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 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

Assessment evidence guidelines - Program standards must include 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 within the policy of six to eight assessments. The SPA Standards Committee has adopted the following policy to provide guidance for SPAs, programs, and reviewers:
 - Under CAEP’s SPA Program Review Option A with National Recognition, six to eight assessments are provided as 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.

- Guidance for reviewers should be provided to assure consistency in program reviews. 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 should provide examples of candidate actions that would 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.

8. Approach to implementation of the SPA Standards Committee Guidelines—

The SPA must describe its approach to implementation of these Guidelines. Included must be the rationale for its decisions and interpretations for applying the Guidelines and principles to its SPA-unique standards. The SPA must also provide evidence of retaining focus on the most essential knowledge and skills that should be attained by well-prepared candidates in the specialty field. The SPA submission should point out any “dispositions,” stated in terms of candidate behavior, that appear in the standards and why these cannot appropriately be examined during the accreditation process. In addition, the submission should explain the SPA’s decisions on creating supplementary materials, as described in Part B.8 (p. 32), Optional features of SPA standards.

Decisions on waivers—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.

- A. Waivers requested of the SPA Standards Committee in accord with provisions under B.6 and B.7, *Adapting principles for different SPA programs*, together with the Committee’s decisions, and any subsequent SPA action following those decisions.

- B. The second is a SPA's case that a field and/or clinical programmatic standard is necessary and is proposed to the SPA Standards Committee in accord with provisions under B.5, *Standard on field and clinical experiences*. Again, the submission would include the Committee's decision, and any subsequent SPA action following that decision.
- C. 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). Here, too, the SPA standards submission would include the SPA Standards Committee decision, and any subsequent SPA action following that decision.

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

- a. **Training and resources**— SPAs are to describe the frequency and content of training and assistance for institutions and the media resources they make available.
 - 1. **Training for program faculty**— A description of SPA training and assistance available to institutions. The SPA should indicate how such assistance may be accessed, together with required charges, if any.
 - 2. **Resources provided by SPAs**— A 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. Include citations for sources where appropriate.
- b. **Information on SPA procedures for selection, training, and evaluation of program reviewers and representation of diversity within the profession**— SPA standards submissions are to include information on SPA procedures for quality assurance in the selection, training, and evaluation of individuals who will conduct program reviews. It is important that specialty program reviewers represent the diversity within their professions and those they serve. SPAs must have 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. SPAs must provide a profile of its reviewers over the past three years as evidence for addressing diversity in selection of reviewers. SPAs must document their procedures and evidence of calibration (such as, fairness, accuracy, and reliability) for addressing this policy when submitting their standards for approval.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS — The SPA Standards Committee invites 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 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 on pages 41-52.

Committee worksheet for review of proposed, new and revised standards

Conduct of the standards review	Please complete the following
<p>Section C.5.c of the <i>Guidelines for Writing and Approval of SPA Standards</i> states that the SPA Standards Committee will review specialty organization submissions to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The overall conformance of the specialty organization standards with SPA Standards Committee guidelines.• The SPA Standards Committee decision to approve, or approve 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.• 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. <p>Under the SPA Standards Committee procedures, the Committee Chair reports findings to the CAEP Board of Directors with a motion that embodies the action recommended by the Committee.</p>	<p>Association _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Standards are for initial teaching license <input type="checkbox"/> Standards are for advanced teaching <input type="checkbox"/> Standards are for other school professionals</p> <p>The Audit Team has reviewed these standards for conformance with SPA Standards Committee Guidelines and recommends that the SPA standards be:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Approved with these modifications _____ _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-submitted with instructions for addressing the following matter _____ _____</p>
Motion: That the SPA Standards Committee _____ _____	

Item with GUIDELINES reference and Review Criteria	Page Number	CAEP staff comments prepared for the standards review committee	SPA Standards Committee audit team review and decisions
1. Title page			
2. Brief introduction to the program standards for SPA Standards Committee use			

<p>3. Statement on development of the standards</p> <p>Evidence that the standards draw on developments in the SPA's field (<i>Guidelines C.1.b and C.2.3</i>) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. An explicit description of the context for the SPA's field. ii. A description of how that context influenced the standards. iii. Evidence the standards are based on empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice (<i>Guidelines C.1.c, and C.2.3</i>). iv. An explicit description of the findings from the knowledge base that have influenced the SPA's standards (that is, not just citations, but findings and how they were used in the SPA's standards). v. Evidence of consensus development process (<i>Guidelines C.1.a and C.1.d, and C.2.3</i>). vi. The efforts at consensus development appear to be genuine, extensive, and evidenced in the final SPA standards. vii. The SPA responded to CAEP comments or concerns, as well as to those from other SPAs, professional associations, institutions and states. 		
<p>4. Potential duplication and/or overlaps in standards</p> <p>SPA submissions are to include a written analysis of commonalities and differences with existing CAEP SPA program standards or accreditation standards indicating areas of duplication and/ or overlap (<i>Guidelines C.2.4</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential duplication or overlap with standards of other SPAs have been identified and adequately addressed. <p>A. As appropriate for the specialty field, SPA Standards Committee strongly encourages attention</p>		

<p>to CAEP's cross-cutting theme on diversity (<i>Guidelines B.8.c.</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The SPA Standards avoid duplicating CAEP standards except where emphasis is necessary for the specialty area. ii. Standards describe the knowledge and skills candidates need to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners. <p>B. As appropriate for the specialty field, SPA Standards Committee strongly encourages attention to CAEP's cross-cutting theme on technology and digital learning (<i>Guidelines B.8.c.</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The SPA Standards avoid duplicating CAEP standards except where emphasis is necessary for the specialty area. ii. The SPA standards specify appropriate and effective integration of technology and digital literacy in instruction to support student learning. 	
<p>5. Analysis of differences from current standards (<i>Guidelines C.2.5</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The analysis of differences is sufficiently clear for program faculty. ii. The analysis will be understandable by others in an institution. 	
<p>6. Approach to implementation of the Guidelines (the rationale for decisions and interpretations made to apply the Guidelines to SPA-unique standards, Checklist, <i>Guidelines C.2.6</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The SPA developed standards that are consistent with the <i>Guidelines</i>. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. The SPA standards focus on the most essential knowledge and skills that should be attained by well-prepared candidates in the specialty field. iii. Any dispositions are stated in terms of candidate behavior). If so, there is a justification explaining why these cannot appropriately be examined at the unit level instead (<i>Guidelines C.2.6</i>). 		
<p>7. Decisions on waivers</p> <p>There are three cases for which the <i>Guidelines</i> permits waivers when a SPA makes a case to SPA Standards Committee one year in advance. In all cases, the Committee makes a decision based on its conclusions about the merits of the SPA's case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. If a one-year-in-advance case for a waiver is pending, then SPA Standards Committee (<i>Guidelines B.5</i>) "will consider each case on its merits, will consider possible implications for SPAs in other specialty fields, and will provide a response at the annual meeting." ii. If the final SPA submission is pending and such a waiver was granted the previous year, there should be convincing evidence that the SPA has addressed the outcome of the SPASC review in the final SPA standards. <p>A. For any SPA, there may be a determination that a field and clinical programmatic standard is necessary for its specialty. If that determination is made, then the SPA should construct a case around the language of CAEP Standard 2, <i>Clinical Partnerships and Practice</i>. The SPA case is to describe the</p>		

<p>clinical²⁴ and field experience²⁵ expectations for the settings or the nature of such experiences. It is to detail how the expectations for clinical and field experiences of candidates in the SPA's field are sufficiently different from the "norm" for education preparation to justify their status as a programmatic standard. If approved by SPA Standards Committee, this would be an eighth standard (<i>Guidelines B.5</i>). In addition, the SPA Standards Committee will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The SPA makes a compelling case that needs in its field "are sufficiently different from the 'norm' by their variety of placements, qualifications of supervisors, or the sequence of experiences" (<i>Guidelines B.5</i>). ii. The outcome of the SPA's one-year out request for the waiver is clearly addressed and is reflected in the final SPA standards. <p>B. For any SPA that finds that the principles "have no explicit provision for an attribute that is important for their specialty field, or where the principles have a provision that a SPA finds incongruent with their specialty field," they may make a case for a waiver to SPA Standards Committee a year in advance of submitting their standards (Initial and Advance teacher preparation, <i>Guidelines, B.6</i>). The usual instance of this finding is likely to be for a SPA that writes standards for "other school professionals." SPA Standards Committee policy prescribes that the Committee "will interpret the</p>	
---	--

²⁴ *Clinical experiences:* Guided, hands-on, practical applications and demonstrations of professional knowledge of theory to practice, skills, and dispositions through collaborative and facilitated learning in field-based assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments across a variety of settings. These include, but are not limited to, culminating clinical practices such as student teaching or internship. (CAEP Handbook, Glossary, p. 177)

²⁵ *Field experiences:* Early and ongoing practice opportunities to apply content and pedagogical knowledge in P-12 settings to progressively develop and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. (CAEP Handbook, Glossary, p. 181)

<p>principles . . . as a general guide... that requires flexible interpretation” (Other school professionals, B.7). The SPASC will consider the evidence provided in relation to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The SPA standards for other school professionals demonstrate a focus on student learning and/or creating supportive environments for student learning. ii. The SPA standards demonstrate a foundation in the knowledge base of the specific field. <p>C. SPAs preparing “other school professional” standards that believe there are unique circumstances for their field that can only be adequately addressed through a programmatic standard (other than field and clinical experiences that all SPAs may seek), may make a case explaining to the SPA Standards Committee why such a programmatic standard is believed necessary (<i>Guidelines B.5</i>) on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPA Standards Committee finds a compelling SPA case presented that state activities, national legislation, research findings, or other circumstances are unique to the specialized professional association’s field so that a separate programmatic standard is required (<i>Guidelines B.5</i>). 			
<p>8. The SPA Standards</p> <p>A. SPA standards are written around the four principles and the principles form “a structure or organizing framework” (<i>Guidelines B.4.a</i>) as identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. For teachers, the content of the SPA standards introductory material and the principles and supporting explanations <i>focus on student learning</i> (<i>Guidelines B.1</i>). ii. For other school professionals, the content of the SPA standards introductory material and the principles and 			

<p>supporting explanations focus on <i>creating supportive environments for student learning</i>, as appropriate to the specialty field (<i>Guidelines B.7</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. The principles explicitly appear in the structure of the proposed SPA standards. iv. The content of the standards clearly reflect the principles. 			
<p>B. SPA has included standards and components, but no additional layers of specificity (<i>Guidelines B.4.b</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If any additional layers of description are included, they are provided as explanations, not as requirements for evidence. 			
<p>C. SPA standards are written so that each concept that is to be a component appears in the language of the standard (<i>Guidelines B.4.c</i>).</p>			
<p>D. The number and complexity of standards and components are limited to no more than seven standards and 28 components total and are sufficiently limited to be comprehensively evaluated in six to eight assessments (<i>Guidelines B.4.d</i>).</p>			
<p>E. The SPA standards require programs to provide evidence for all of the components of a standard (<i>Guidelines B.4.e</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 			

<p>F. Reviewer decisions on whether standards are met based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level; decisions on national recognition are based on preponderance of evidence that standards are met (<i>Guidelines B.4.f</i>). See explanation below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The use of “Preponderance of Evidence” means an overall confirmation of candidate performance on the standards in the strength, weight, 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 weight 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 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. 			
<p>G. The standards are limited to the special knowledge and skills that candidates should acquire and demonstrate in the SPA’s field (<i>Guidelines B.4.g</i>). For example, education</p>			

<p>foundations and generic pedagogy would not be unique to a SPA's field.</p>			
<p>H. Standards are related to the principles and limited to what education professionals who are completing preparation programs must know and be able to do (<i>Guidelines B.4.h</i>).</p>			
<p>I. SPA Standards make clear distinctions on types of education professionals for whom they are written: initial teaching credential, advanced teaching, or other school professionals (<i>Guidelines B.4.g</i> and <i>B.4.h</i>).</p>			
<p>J. SPA standards include rubrics or criteria that guide program reviewer judgments and that can assist program reviewers and program faculty (See Appendix D and <i>Guidelines B.4.g</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The rubrics or guidelines define how program reviewers will review and make decisions on standards. ii. The rubrics or guidelines clearly articulate which <i>components are essential</i> for program reviewers to determine that a preponderance of evidence exists that program candidates meet a standard. iii. The rubrics or guidelines are clear to a non-SPA reader. iv. The rubrics or guidelines demonstrate the following characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 providing candidates with explicit feedback. 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 			
<p>K. SPA standards include assessment evidence guidelines that guide program reviewer judgments and that can assist program reviewers and program faculty (<i>Guidelines B.4.k and Appendix D</i>) as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 			
<p>L. SPA standards include supporting explanations that can assist program reviewers and program faculty (<i>Guidelines B.4.i</i>) as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The supporting explanations adequately 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 (<i>Guidelines B.4.i</i>). ii. The supporting explanations, together with the rubrics, provide useful suggestions about ways the standard can be assessed. iii. The supporting explanations and rubrics support assessments that are aligned with standards. 			

iv. The characteristics of assessments that are implied or explicit in the rubrics and explanations adhere to good assessment practices for the particular standard.			
9A. Training and resources (<i>Guidelines</i> , Part I, Section B.8.a, Supplemental Document; Part III, Section E, item 1, Policies on Training): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The descriptive information has been provided. ii. The SPA training and assistance practices are in accord with CAEP requirements. iii. If a SPA creates any additional guidance (e.g., criteria, interpretations, and significant topics to be covered) such guidance has been made widely available to CAEP, to the providers, and to states. 			
9B. Information on SPA procedures for selection, training, and evaluation of program reviewers and representation of diversity within the profession is provided and explicitly addresses diversity (see text paragraph in item k of the <i>Guidelines</i> , section C.2 in the Checklist for components of SPA standards submissions to the SPA Standards Committee).			
10. Optional supplemental document (<i>Guidelines</i> B.8.a). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPA Standards Committee does not attempt to standardize such documents. Committee reviewers may, voluntarily, look at them sufficiently to reach their own conclusions about the value of these documents for program faculty and provide commentary as appropriate. 			
11. SPA Standards Committee invites SPAs to provide explicit suggestions and examples that could guide			

institutions toward stronger assessment evidence
(Guidelines B.8.b) and which reflect the following:

- i. The examples are models of effective assessment practices.
- ii. The examples contain exemplary features that adhere to rigorous and research-based assessment practices and that should be brought to the attention of other SPAs.

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 review

CAEP staff will prepare an initial analysis of features of the specialty organization submission to assure that the submission is ready for the SPA Standards Committee review. This analysis will draw the SPASC's attention to possible deviations from the guidelines and features of particular interest, and will describe how the specialty organization proposes to use candidate proficiency and other evidence in making national recognition decisions.

C.4.b SPA presentations and Committee questions

During the SPA Standards Committee meeting at which the SPA standards submission is considered, representatives from the association will be assigned approximately thirty minutes for oral presentation and discussion of the new or revised program standards. During this time, Committee members may ask questions about the SPA program standards and the association's response to the *Guidelines*.

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

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

- The overall conformance of the SPA standards with guidelines.
- The SPA Standards Committee decision to approve, or approve with modifications, or to ask for re-submission of the SPA standards.
- Any modifications needed to bring the SPA submission into conformance with guidelines, especially those under section B, on standards.
- 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.
- 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 fashion for the Committee meeting one year prior to the scheduled review.

SECTION D. THE SPA STANDARDS COMMITTEE

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 program review process is based on the *Guidelines* developed by the SPA Standards Committee in relation to the development and implementation of the SPA standards. SPA standards are scheduled for revision every seven years.

Responsibilities

- Review information and materials relevant to specialized program areas (SPAs) standards and determine whether the standards meet criteria for acceptance outlined in the *Guidelines*.
- Annually, the SPA Standards Committee will review and revise as necessary the Guidelines to align with updated policy and practice as regards standards development and implementation.
- Ensure that any changes introduced by SPAs in their review policies and procedures are aligned to the Guidelines.
- Hold accountable all specialized professional associations that have partnership with CAEP for the quality and consistency of the program review process.

Membership and Appointments

- SPA Standards Committee members are expected to have the following expertise:
 - Current or very recent experience related to preparation of teachers or other school personnel in an EPP;
 - Experience with the SPA program review and audit processes;
 - Recent experience with SPA standards development process; and
 - Deep understanding of CAEP accreditation and SPA review process
- SPAs will be given the opportunity, annually, to nominate two individuals for consideration for service on the SPA Standards Committee.
- Appointments to the Committee will be made by the CAEP President and the Senior Director of Program Review, in consultation with the Nominating Committee. As with all CAEP Committee appointments care must be taken relative to the consideration of the expected background, particularly current experiences in the field of teacher education, and all considerations regarding equitable appointments.
- Members of the SPA Standards Committee are appointed to a term of three years and are limited to two (2) consecutive terms. The terms are staggered so no more than one-third (1/3) of terms expire in any fiscal year.
- The Chair is selected from among the members of the committee and serves a 3-year appointment, with the third year of this appointment being used to “apprentice” the incoming chair.
- Given the nature of the ongoing work of this committee and the need for the Board to be closely involved in decisions on SPA work one Board member

representing the Postsecondary Expertise sector (Specialized Professional Association), will serve on the Committee. The Board member's term on the committee will run concurrently with his/her appointment to the Board of Directors.

- A Committee member who is involved with a SPA whose standards are subject to review will not participate in reviewing and commenting on the said standards, thus averting any potential or implication of conflict of interest.
- CAEP should provide online and/or face-to-face training for the SPA Standards review process for all members of the *SPA Standards Committee*. Such training will be directed by the Committee Chair and appropriate CAEP staff.
- SPA programs being reviewed should provide CAEP with a contact person to be available online or by phone, to discuss any critical questions that may arise during the review of their revised SPA Standards. Such contact by the Committee with a SPA will be initiated, if necessary, by CAEP Staff or the Committee chair.
- All deliberations and report elements of the SPA review process will be confidential. *SPA Standards Committee members* will sign a statement attesting to their confidentiality within the review process.

PART II: EVIDENCE USED IN PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION

SECTION A. POLICY ON SPA SPECIFICATION OF ASSESSMENTS FOR PROGRAM REPORTS

Educator preparation programs have widely adopted the use of assessments to monitor progress of candidates and evaluate programs, and CAEP relies on them as evidence for the review of programs that select the Program Review Option with National Recognition using standards set by specialized professional associations (SPAs). However, creating assessments to provide valid evidence that standards are met is often a challenge. In response to institutional concerns that SPA requirements are sometimes overly prescriptive, and sharing a belief that institutions should be invited to make their own case for meeting SPA standards as they think best, the SPA Standards Committee adopts the following policy:

1. Under CAEP's SPA Program Review Option A with National Recognition, six to eight assessments are provided as 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.
2. For Option B reports to meet SPA standards, programs can use a maximum of 8 assessments and must include the following (not in any specific order): (1) state licensure exam data (content knowledge); (2) evidence demonstrating candidates' content knowledge (additional assessment on content knowledge); (3) evidence demonstrating candidates' pedagogical content knowledge and skills; and (4) evidence demonstrating candidates' impact on student learning.
3. Option C for writing SPA reports has been discontinued by CAEP Board of Directors in June 2015.
4. Option D (Validity and Reliability Studies): This option permits programs to conduct validity and reliability studies of its assessments in lieu of other program report evidence requirements. The validity and reliability of assessments (content in relation to standards, consistency with other evidence, success in subsequent employment, etc.) is so integral to a 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.

SECTION B. POLICY ON SPA PROGRAM REVIEW DECISIONS BASED ON PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE AT THE STANDARDS LEVEL

SPA program report reviewers and audit team members make a decision on whether a program provides sufficient evidence to meet SPA standards and criteria for National Recognition. In order to ensure consistent practices among SPA reviewers in the analysis of assessment evidence and in reaching National Recognition decisions based on that evidence, the SPA Standards Committee adopts the following policy:

1. 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 and as outlined by respective SPAs.
2. Program reviewers weigh the evidence presented in SPA 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. The components are used by programs and reviewers 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 make judgments that “overall” there is/is not sufficient evidence that the standard is met. In case a SPA requires specific components to be met as a precondition to meeting a particular standard, the components must be clearly identified.
3. *Programs will be required to provide evidence for all the components of a standard.* However, 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.
4. Rubrics and assessment evidence guidelines developed by the SPAs for use by program reviewers must reflect this policy. Reviewers must be trained to review evidence and make judgments based on the preponderance of evidence that standards are met.

SECTION C. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR USE OF BENCHMARKED LICENSURE DATA

C.1 Policies on benchmarked licensure test data as evidence

- CAEP does not require programs to meet a specific pass rate for its completers at the cohort level on state licensure examinations as a pre-condition for SPA National Recognition. However, a SPA may have set specific benchmarks related to state licensure examinations for programs as a pre-condition for program review and successful National Recognition (Refer to Appendix F). Programs submitting SPA reports must follow individual SPA guidelines regarding state licensure requirements.
[SPAs opting to specify their own benchmarks related to state licensure examinations as a pre-condition for National Recognition, must seek a waiver from the SPA Standards Committee]
- As part of the program review reporting process, all programs are required to document candidates' performance on state licensure examinations as partial evidence for candidates' content knowledge. If a SPA requires a specific pass rate in licensure examinations as a precondition for National Recognition, programs must provide evidence to fulfill the requirement (Refer to Appendix F).
- Only SPAs will make decisions that licensure assessments are sufficiently aligned with their content standards to provide valid evidence for program review.
- To provide useful guidance to programs, reviewers should write comments not only about their decisions as a whole, but also about what ways the assessment is congruent with SPA standards. Areas of relative strength and weakness should both be addressed.
- The SPA program review process for National Recognition should provide information to assist in the interpretation and use of benchmarked data as one form of content evidence contained in program reports.
- In managing the program review process, CAEP should work with SPAs and institutions to see that the data from state licensure examinations are routinely included in program report evidence.
- CAEP should discuss elementary education teacher tests with ETS to determine which ones are most likely to be the dominant tests over the next several years and include those among the tests to be benchmarked.
- CAEP should consider possible extension of the benchmarking idea to principles of learning and teaching tests.

C.2 Guidelines for reviewers on 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
- The range of scores for candidates completing the program
- Category data or sub-area scores for any SPA that makes use of those 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 just 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:
 - 1) the proportion of candidates that fall below the benchmark level;
 - 2) what the institution is doing to lift the performance of low-scoring candidates;
 - 3) information about candidate knowledge contained in the second program report assessment;
 - 4) information from category data or sub-area scores indicating areas of stronger or weaker performance.

SECTION D. GUIDELINES FOR USING AND DOCUMENTING COURSE GRADES AS AN ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

The SPA Standards Committee recommends that all SPAs accept course grades when provided by the program as one of the content assessments. 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.

D.1 Guidelines on documenting course grades

The CAEP 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:

- b. 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.
- c. 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 acquisition of admitted candidates.
- d. The grade evidence must be accompanied by the institution's grade policy or definitions of grades.
- e. 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.
- f. Syllabi cannot be submitted.

D.2.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.

[Refer to Appendix G for an example on formatting grades]

D.2.b. 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:

1. Description of the transcript analysis process including when it occurs, who does the analysis, etc.
2. 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.
3. Description of the process used to ensure that candidates who do not meet the requirements are required to remediate deficiencies.
 4. 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.
 5. 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.

SECTION E. MINIMUM DATA COLLECTIONS FOR PROGRAM REPORTS

For full recognition, programs submitting reports for initial review will be required to submit data that represent *two consecutive applications of the assessment*. That is, the assessment must be given and data collected at least two times. If an assessment is part of a course that is offered every semester, then the two applications could be satisfied in one academic year. If the assessment is part of a course that is offered once per year, then the two applications would take two academic years. For revised and response to conditions reports, data from a minimum of one application of the revised assessment(s) would be required for full national recognition. *The only exception is data provided for state licensure examinations, for which programs need to provide three years of most recent data.*

Programs are encouraged to submit program reports when they have at least the minimum data necessary for review. Programs failing to provide any data in the initial report, or providing data from only one application of the assessments will be required to provide a minimum of two cycles of new data in their revised or response to conditions report. For response to conditions and revised reports, programs will be required to provide new data as evidence that has been received after receipt of the SPA feedback from initial report.

Programs receiving a decision of *Further Development* or *Recognized with Probation* will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*.

A program receiving a decision of *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition*. If the program does not submit acceptable information within the designated timeframe, the decision reverts to *Not Nationally Recognized*.

Overall, programs will have a maximum of two chances (following initial review) to resubmit a report in order to meet SPA National Recognition.

SECTION F. REVIEW OF PROGRAMS IDENTIFIED AS ADVANCED LEVEL FOR CAEP ACCREDITATION PURPOSES

Advanced Level programs to be submitted for review as part of CAEP accreditation process will be limited to programs whose SPAs have Advanced Level Standards and who meet any of the following conditions:

- The program is designed to develop P-12 teachers or other school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts or to further the pedagogical knowledge and skills of P-12 teachers and/or other school professionals;
- More than 50% of the candidates enrolled in the program serve as teachers and/or other school professionals in P-12 schools/districts;
- The program is part of M.Ed.; M.S.; M.A.; Ed.D., or Ph.D., program specific to the preparation of specialists for to P-12 schools/districts (e.g., reading specialists, school librarians; school psychology, school administrators); and
- Advanced level programs that are designed to further the knowledge and skills of P-12 teachers and/or other school professionals such as curriculum and instruction, educational technology, etc.

SECTION G. REVIEW OF ENDORSEMENT AND ADD-ON PROGRAMS

The following policy is intended to help providers who are in states who require the SPA review process to determine which of their programs could be considered endorsements and/or add-ons and whether they should undergo the SPA review process. Providers should contact their states for clarification on this provision. The first set of bullets in the following criteria describe what programs should NOT be submitted. The second set of criteria describe what programs should be submitted. If a unit is still unsure how to apply these criteria they should contact CAEP staff to make a determination.

Programs that do not need to be submitted:

- Endorsements and add-on programs that require only a few courses, insufficient content, and/or limited requirements are not included as part of CAEP's self-study report and will not be listed among the offering of an educator preparation provider.
- Minors in subject areas are usually not submitted for SPA program review with National Recognition, unless the state agency requires them to be reviewed against national or state program standards.
- Short-term programs offered as professional development for teachers and other educators are not included as part of CAEP's self-study report and will not be listed among the programs of an accredited professional education unit.

Programs that must be submitted for SPA review (if required to do so by the state) and that are included as part of CAEP's self-study report include the following:

- Endorsement and add-on programs that are similar in content and requirements to other programs within that content area
- Programs that are of sufficient breadth and depth to meet the SPA standards.
- Graduate level (licensing or non-licensure) programs where more than half of the candidates enrolled will work in a pre-school through 12 educational setting after completion.

PART III: CONDUCTING PROGRAM REVIEW WITH NATIONAL RECOGNITION

SECTION A. PROGRAM REVIEW: GOALS AND PROCESS

A.1 Goals for program review

Program review is an integral part of the accreditation process adopted by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) that provides evidence of candidates' specialty/license area competency. Program Review with National Recognition using standards of specialized professional associations (SPAs) is a process by which CAEP, in collaboration with the SPAs, assesses the quality of programs offered by educator preparation providers. Program review helps to address the following questions:

- Have candidates mastered the content knowledge?
- Can candidates conceptualize and plan their teaching or other professional education responsibilities?
- Can candidates implement their conceptual plan with students and colleagues?
- Are candidates effective in promoting student learning?
- Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?

This is accomplished through standards developed by SPAs in their respective specialty areas, which represent the perspectives of the profession, and through reviewers who are trained to evaluate evidence that candidates are proficient in specialty standards.

A.2 The program report document

The program report will be a document prepared by an institution summarizing information from six to eight critical assessments that demonstrate candidate proficiencies in specialty standards, including:

- Candidates' knowledge of subject content or specialty field
- Candidates' ability to apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, and specialty skills and dispositions
- Candidates' effects on P-12 student learning or on creation of environments that support P-12 student learning

Programs may submit reports for review by SPAs either during the spring or fall review cycle conducted every year. The report will provide contextual information about a program and about faculty use of assessment evidence to improve candidate proficiencies and program effectiveness. In addition, the report will:

- Be organized in a web-based format through CAEP's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS)
- Be limited to 25-35 pages of text plus a limited number of attachments (see next two points)
- Attach all key or decision point assessments with their scoring guides

- Attach the program of study (or equivalent for graduate level or advanced admissions requirements)
- Not include samples of candidate work on assessments

A.3 SPA program report review and response

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. One of these reviewers, preferably with extensive review experience, will be the “lead” reviewer. Each reviewer submits an independent report in AIMS. 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 is edited by CAEP staff to prepare 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 next accreditation cycle, programs are required to submit an initial review report three years prior to the next CAEP site visit. The National Recognition status will expire if the status is not renewed by the decision through date noted on the Recognition Decision report.

SPA reports are used as evidence to meet CAEP Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, and specifically to address CAEP Component 1.3²⁶. CAEP sufficient level for Component 1.3 is that a majority (51% or above) of SPA program reports have achieved National Recognition.

Criteria for National Recognition:

- The program substantially meets standards.
- If no further submission is required, the program will receive full *National Recognition* when the unit receives accreditation.
- The program is recognized through the semester and year of the provider's next CAEP accreditation decision in 5-7 years. To retain recognition, another program report must be submitted for initial review mid-cycle (2

²⁶ CAEP Component 1.3: Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).

years in advance for a 5-year accreditation cycle and 3 years in advance for a 7-year accreditation cycle) before the next scheduled CAEP accreditation visit.

- The program will be listed on the CAEP website as *Nationally Recognized* if the provider is already accredited.
- b) **Nationally Recognized with Conditions:** The decision made when a program has substantially met the standards of a specialized professional association but there remain sufficient weaknesses or issues to prevent 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*.

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
 - SPA officially sets a benchmark on state licensure test(s) that 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* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. The program will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. 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*.

- 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* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. The program will have two opportunities within *24 months* after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. 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 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* or *National Recognition with Conditions* 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.

SECTION B. 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 by CAEP ([CAEP Accreditation Handbook](#), p. 77) as a licensure area 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.
- A low enrollment program may choose to seek a waiver from the state to submit a SPA report. If the state grants the waiver, the program may choose not to submit a SPA report when it is due and update the program’s status on the Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS) accordingly. Not submitting a SPA report on time may lead to loss of any National Recognition earned by the program upon the expiration date of the recognition status.
- 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.

Upon completion of the review process, CAEP will notify the institutions that the response to their program report can be accessed through AIMS. State departments are also notified about the publication of the SPA Recognition Reports.

SECTION C. SPA RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO PROGRAM REVIEW

Program review with National Recognition requires collaboration between CAEP and SPA staff. Specialized professional associations are responsible for the following aspects of the review process:

1. Developing the standards
 - i. Forming a standards development committee to frame the standards, the assessment rubrics and evidence guideline for program review a minimum of four years prior to time for submission.
 - ii. Preparing a standards application package for review and approval by the SPA Standards Committee.
2. Implementing the standards
 - i. Training programs seeking National Recognition on the SPA standards and procedures for writing a SPA report for review.
 - ii. Recruiting and training of reviewers on SPA standards and expectations.
 - iii. Identifying a contact person (SPA Coordinator) to assist CAEP in the interpretation of the specialty standards and in the coordination of the steps involved in the SPA review process. The role of the Coordinators may vary across SPAs. Generally, they would be responsible for recruiting reviewers; coordinating and conducting trainings for reviewers and program report writers; assigning program reports to reviewers each cycle based on earlier experiences and information of reviewers' performance; reviewing program reports (if applicable); appointing the audit committee; serving as a liaison between the SPA and CAEP; addressing SPA-specific queries from programs related to the review process and the SPA National Recognition decision; and attending meetings conducted by CAEP for SPAs.

SECTION D. SHARED CAEP RESPONSIBILITIES IN PROGRAM REVIEW

CAEP collaborates with the SPAs to ensure consistency of process, quality assurance, and alignment of SPA program review with CAEP's accepted *Guidelines*. Program Review staff at CAEP collaborate with SPAs by:

1. Monitoring the use of the Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS) as the primary platform to conduct program review.
2. Conducting technical edits of all SPA Recognition Reports before they are sent out to programs at the end of the fall and spring review cycles every year.
3. Participating in program report writer and reviewer training sessions organized by SPAs to provide training on CAEP policies related to program review.
4. Conducting periodic webinars/ online meetings with SPA Coordinators to provide updates on program review trends and program review related policies; facilitating information dissemination among SPAs; and seeking feedback on improving the review process
5. Planning incorporation of SPA sessions at CAEP fall conferences.
6. Conducting the face-to-face annual meeting with SPA Coordinators.
7. Collaborating with SPA Coordinators in responding to questions from programs on SPA review timelines, policies, and procedures.
8. Providing guidance and resources for the development of SPA specific reviewer training materials.
9. Providing guidance on CAEP policies related to the development and approval of SPA standards.
10. Serving as a liaison between the SPAs and the SPA Standards Committee reviewing the standards.

SECTION E. POLICIES ON TRAINING AND DIVERSITY OF SPA PROGRAM REVIEWERS

The SPA Standards Committee provides the following guidelines about the SPA's training of reviewers and diversity in the membership of SPA program reviewer pools.

1. SPAs develop procedures for quality assurance in the selection, training, and evaluation of individuals who will conduct program reviews.
2. Program reviewers for each specialty professional association must represent the diversity within their profession and those they serve. SPAs must have 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, and school administrators) as reflected in their profession. SPAs must document their procedures for addressing this policy when submitting their standards to the SPA Standards Committee for approval.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A- SPA STANDARDS SUBMISSION DATES AND TIMELINES

ASSOCIATION	LAST approval	SCHEDULED approval
ACTFL	2013	2020
ALA/AASL	2010	2019*
AMLE	2012	2019
CEC Initial Advanced	2012	2019
ELCC Building Level District Level	2011 (Spring)	2018
Elementary Teacher Education (K-6)	2007	2017*
IRA/ ILA	2010	2017
ISTE Computer Science Education Coach Technology Director Technology	2012	2019
NAEYC Initial Advanced	2010	2018*
NAGC/CEC	2013	2020
NASP	2012	2019
NCSS	2003	2016*
NCTE	2012	2019
NCTM Elementary Middle Level Secondary	2012	2019
NSTA	2011	2018

SHAPE America- Health Education	2008	2016*
SHAPE America- Physical Education Initial Advanced	2016	2023
TESOL	2009	2017*

*Requested an extension

Tentative Timeline for SPA new/revised standards presentation to the SPA Standards Committee

Year		SPA Task	CAEP/ SPASAC Task
3-7 years prior to seeking approval		<p>SPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)	<p>2-year out review – SPA may</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • send draft (new/revised) standards to CAEP and request feedback. • request delay in presenting revised standards to the SPA Standards Committee. <p>Documents must be submitted to CAEP by July 1.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAEP Staff reviews current standards <p>At SPA Standards Committee Annual Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee offers feedback to the SPA on current/new standards for SPA consideration. • CAEP Staff presents its feedback to the SPA and the Committee.
One year prior	Summer (July-August)	<p>1-year out review – SPA may</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • send draft (new/revised) standards to CAEP and request feedback. • request delay in presenting revised standards to the SPA Standards Committee. <p>Documents must be submitted to CAEP by July 1.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAEP Staff reviews draft standards
	Fall (October)		SPA Standards Committee offers feedback to the SPA on draft new/revised standards for SPA consideration.
Year of submission	Spring (April 15)	SPA sends draft version of the new/revised standards to CAEP.	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.
	Summer (July-August)	<p>SPA sends final version of the new/revised standards to CAEP and notifies CAEP who will present the standards to the SPA Standards Committee at the annual meeting.</p> <p>Documents must be submitted to CAEP by July 1.</p>	CAEP Staff disseminates the final version of the standards among the SPA Standards Committee members.

	Fall (Annual meeting in August-October)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPA presents new / revised standards to the SPA Standards Committee • SPA includes all received feedback as an appendix to the presented standards. 	SPA Standards Committee reviews the final version of the standards, offers feedback, and recommends approval/revision of the standards. Standards may be approved with modifications.
--	--	--	---

For New SPAs

- Once SPA has become a member of CAEP, it submits to CAEP staff the date it intends to present its standards for final review and approval (no less than 2 years from the time the SPA joins CAEP).
- In the interim period, the SPA submits progress reports to the SPA Standards Committee including the draft standards using the timeline above. The Committee will provide feedback on the draft standards as noted above.

APPENDIX B—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](#).

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 SPASC/ InTASC principles/ standards/ components
with CAEP Standard 1**

SPASC principles/components and InTASC categories/ standards	CAEP Standard 1
<p>Principle A: The Learner and Learning</p> <p>Component/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.</p> <p>Component/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.</p> <p>Component/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.</p>	<p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>
<p>Principle B: Content</p> <p>Component/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.</p> <p>Component/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.</p>	<p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>

<p>Principle C: Instructional Practice</p> <p>Component/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.</p> <p>Component/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.</p> <p>Component/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 connections, and to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>	<p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>
<p>Principle D: Professional Responsibility</p> <p>Component/Standard #9: 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, and other professionals in the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p> <p>Component/Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.</p>	<p>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</p>

APPENDIX C- PROGRAM REVIEW UNDER STATE PARTNERSHIPS

CAEP policies related to State and International Partnerships (CAEP Policy XXXV) states: *CAEP may enter into an agreement with one or more state agency or relevant government agency for international EPPs responsible for approving educator preparation programs. The purpose of State/Country Partnerships is to share information about the quality of EPPs between CAEP and the state (or country) and to reduce the duplication and cost of reviewing EPPs by both the state (or country) and CAEP using common CAEP standards.*

CAEP POLICY XXXVI Program Review Options

As part of the self study process, all providers are required to submit evidence of specialty/license area competency. Review of specialty license area data or reports is integral to the accreditation review process; the Accreditation Council uses this data to determine if CAEP Standard 1 on Content and Pedagogical Knowledge has been met.

The review options available to Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) are based on the CAEP-State Partnership [Agreement](#). States can allow three options for specialty licensure area review, which include Specialized Professional Association (SPA) review with National Recognition, Program Review with Feedback, and State review. All providers should check with their state's department of education or another governing body to determine the program review option(s) available in their state. The state partnership agreement may identify more than one program review option available to providers and providers can select any of the options available for inclusion in the self-study.

In the absence of a state partnership agreement or equivalent for EPPs located outside the United States, all three of the following options are available to EPPs:

- **Program Review with National Recognition:** An EPP's specialty areas submit program reports responding to standards defined by the specialized professional association (SPA). These program reports are reviewed by the appropriate SPA, which provides a report on its findings. Program Review by SPAs is the only review option leading to National Recognition of programs.
- **Program Review with Feedback:** For the Program Review with Feedback option, EPPs will provide specialty licensure area data as evidence to meet CAEP Standard 1. It is built into the self-study process and requires no additional report. Evidence for the Program Review with Feedback process is developed through the analysis of specialty licensure data that are disaggregated by licensure area as required for Standard 1. The Program Review with Feedback option has two parts: (a) a review of specialty/license area data alignment with state standards and requirements, and (b) a review of the disaggregated data for specialty/license areas presented in the provider's self-study report for Standard 1. Licensure area evidence provided on the self-study report is reviewed by CAEP reviewers who will prepare a feedback report for the EPP, CAEP, and the state or relevant government agency for international EPPs. Review with Feedback option does not lead to the National Recognition of programs.

- **State Program Review:** EPP's specialty areas are reviewed by the state or relevant government agency for international EPPs. State or country reviews of programs are available to the EPP and CAEP site visitors.

APPENDIX D-- 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	
■	<p>1. ADMINISTRATION AND PURPOSE (informs relevancy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of assessment and use in candidate monitoring or decisions are consequential
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use or purpose are ambiguous or vague 	<p>2. INFORMING CANDIDATES (informs fairness and reliability)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>3. CONTENT OF ASSESSMENT (informs relevancy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost all evaluation categories or tasks (at least those comprising 95% of the total score) require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate 	

EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES BELOW SUFFICIENT LEVEL	SPA SUFFICIENT LEVEL	EXAMPLES OF ATTRIBUTES ABOVE SUFFICIENT LEVEL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>proficiencies in the standards</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>4. SCORING RUBRIC (informs reliability and actionability)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	N/A
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?				
<i>Provide a rationale for your overall rating:</i>				

APPENDIX E-- EXAMPLE: INTERPRETING BENCHMARKED DATA AS AN INDICATOR OF SUBJECT CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

	Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014)	Social Studies: Content Knowledge (0081)	Biology: Content Knowledge (0235)	Mathematics: Content Knowledge (0061)	SHAP E Americ a		CEC		
Alignment statement from SPA→	The test embeds ACEI standards for reading/language arts, social studies and science and can provide valid evidence. There was a generally good alignment in math, except for explicit documentation of reasoning processes of math. The panel has made recommendations for future assessments	The test is sufficiently aligned with NCSS standards to provide valid evidence. The panel found some gaps they would like addressed in future assessments, especially in U. S. and world history and government; the geography section was particularly strong.	The test is sufficiently aligned with NSTA standards to provide valid evidence. The panel found some gaps in alignment they would like addressed in future assessments. For instance...	The test is aligned with a subset of indicators for NCTM standards and can provide a portion of the assessment evidence needed to demonstrate candidate proficiencies in those standards					
SPA benchmark score (where applicable)→		80% pass rate in state licensure			80% pass rate in state licensure		80% pass rate in state licensure		
Range of state qualifying or pass scores									
Median state qualifying or pass scores									
State	Pass score	Pass score	Pass score	Pass score	Pass score	Pass score	Pass score	Pass score	Pass score

APPENDIX F—EXAMPLES FOR FORMATTING GRADES

Example for Part b. Alignment Matrix and Course Description

Course Name & No.	SPA Standard/s Addressed by Course	Brief Description of How Course Meets Cited Standards (if course title is unclear)
MATH 150: Discrete Mathematics	9.5, 9.7, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	

Example for Part d. 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