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Purpose of the Guidelines for Writers and Reviewers

This guidebook was written to support both IRA Program Report writers and reviewers. We know firsthand how much time, expertise, and effort you offer to your institution and our professional association. In the first section, the Introduction, you will find information that is pertinent to both writers and reviewers. Next, the writers’ section follows. This section is most useful to writers primarily. Then, you will find the reviewers’ section. Of course, this section was designed with reviewers in mind, but we encourage Program Report writers to carefully read this section. Writers may find it helpful to re-examine their Program Report through the lens of the reviewers. Last, you will find many resources to support both writers and reviewers, such as policy actions taken by CAEP’s Specialty Areas Studies Board, CAEP’s new options, Program Recognition Decisions, 2010 Working Review (for reviewers), recognized with conditions notetaking form (for reviewers), reviewers’ rubric, application and qualifications for applying to become a program reviewer and frequently asked questions.

The authors would like to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of Dr. William and Dr. Michael L. Shaw, two of the co-authors of the April, 2008 version of the Guidelines for Reviewers, which provided a model for this version. In addition, we acknowledge CAEP, which provided many useful policy documents and professional resources, which were also used to shape this guidelines document. We also want to express our gratitude to the IRA auditors, who provided additional ideas and revisions to this resource.
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Introduction
History of IRA, NCATE and CAEP Partnership

NCATE was founded in 1954 to help establish high quality teacher preparation. Five groups were instrumental in the creation of NCATE: the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Education Association (NEA), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National School Boards Association (NSBA). When NCATE was founded as an independent accrediting body, it replaced AACTE as the agency responsible for accreditation in teacher education. These groups represented the field at large at that time. They recognized the need for a strong, independent, quality assurance mechanism composed of all key stakeholders in education.

July 1, 2013, marked the de facto consolidation of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), making the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) the new, sole specialized accreditor for educator preparation. (CAEP accreditation is specific to educator preparation and is different from regional accreditation. It is the educator preparation provider, specifically, that receives CAEP accreditation — not the larger organization or institution of higher education that may house the provider.)

Under de facto consolidation, NCATE and TEAC are subsidiaries of CAEP, maintaining their recognition by the U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) for the purpose of maintaining the accreditation of educator preparation providers until such time as said providers come up for accreditation under CAEP.

CAEP represents more than a coming together of two organizations. The design team that recommended to the respective boards the creation of CAEP as a unified accrediting body made clear its ambitions for CAEP as a change agent:

*We wish to emphasize that we have not approached our task as merely unifying NCATE and TEAC with the least possible change to two accrediting systems that are already quite similar and effective. Rather, we have set a much more ambitious goal: to create a model unified accreditation system....*

*CAEP’s goals should be not only to raise the performance of candidates as practitioners in the nation’s P-12 schools, but also to raise the stature of the entire profession by raising the standards for the evidence the field relies on to support its claims of quality. (Design Team Report)*

CAEP has member organizations of teachers, teacher educators, content specialists, and local and state policy makers, all committed to advancing excellence in educator preparation with the ultimate goal of strengthening P-12 student learning. Together, these organizations represent more than 3 million individuals. The professional associations that comprise CAEP also provide financial support and participate in the development of standards, policies, and procedures.
A council of educators created to ensure and raise the quality of preparation for their profession, NCATE was founded in 1954 to accredit teacher certification programs at U.S. colleges and universities. Five national education groups were instrumental in the creation of NCATE:

1. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE, which formerly accredited teachers colleges),
2. National Education Association (NEA),
3. National School Boards Association (NSBA),
4. National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)
5. Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

TEAC was founded in 1997 as a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving academic degree programs for professional educators, those who will teach and lead in schools, pre-K through grade 12. The TEAC accreditation process — which forms the basis for CAEP’s Inquiry Brief Accreditation Pathway — is built around the provider’s case that it prepares competent, caring, and qualified professional educators. The provider is required to have evidence to support its case, and the accreditation process examines and verifies the evidence.

IRA has been a constituent member of NCATE, now CAEP, since 1980. As one of 33 Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs), we have developed a strong and positive role within the CAEP coalition. Other members include the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National School Boards Association. Members of IRA’s Professional Standards and Ethics project serve as advisors on the IRA-CAEP partnership and, with others, act as program reviewers.

Specialty Professional Associations (SPAs) like IRA have representatives that serve on one of CAEP’s four constituent boards. The current IRA representative serves on the Specialty Areas Studies Board. This appointment is a three year term.

IRA also has members serving on CAEP’s Board of Examiner (BOE) team. BOE members serve on teams that review institutions on-site on behalf of CAEP. This board is composed of representatives from four groups: teacher educators, teachers, state and local policymakers, and specialized professional associations.

In 1987, the Council of Chief State School Officers organized the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) to promote cooperation among states as they developed individual standards for teacher preparation. This resulted in the articulation of a national, common core of skills and dispositions that should be acquired by all new teachers.

CAEP incorporated INTASC principles in its work in 1995, bringing the SPAs into the movement toward unified standards and beginning the alignment of accreditation and licensing across states. All of the SPAs have endorsed a performance-based system in which candidates graduating from teacher preparation programs must be able to demonstrate not only their knowledge, but also their ability to teach the skills and dispositions children require.
Guidance for Preparing a Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach Program Report for Submission to IRA/CAEP

(Writer’s Section)
Guidelines for Program Writers

The Roles of the Contemporary Reading Professional

Reading Specialists/Literacy Coaches are professionals whose goal is to improve reading achievement in their assigned school or district positions. Their responsibilities and titles often differ based on the context in which they work, and their teaching and educational experiences. Their responsibilities may include teaching, coaching, and leading school reading programs. Reading Specialists/Literacy Coaches may also serve as a resource in reading and writing for educational support personnel, administrators, teachers, and the community, provide professional development based on historical and current literature and research, work collaboratively with other professionals to build and implement reading programs for individuals and groups of students, and serve as advocates for students who struggle with reading. Many of these professionals have a specific focus that further defines their duties, such as serving as a teacher for students experiencing reading difficulties, as a reading or literacy coach, as a coordinator of reading and writing programs at the school or district level, or in several combinations of these roles. Explanations for these roles follow:

- The Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach may have primary responsibility for working with students who struggle with reading.
- The specialist may have primary responsibility for supporting teacher learning.
- The specialist may have primary responsibility for developing, leading, or evaluating the school or district pre-K–12 reading and writing program.

See Standards for Reading Professionals-Revised 2010 for a complete description on the reading specialist/literacy coach role and certification requirements. Also, see Appendix O.

Overview of Program Report

The Program Report consists of a Cover Sheet and five sections. The Cover Sheet provides basic information about the program being. Section I presents background and contextual information about the program; Section II includes a chart that lists each of the 6-8 assessments; Section III includes a chart that links the 6-8 assessments with the IRA/CAEP standards; Section IV provides a two page narrative plus the assessment tool or description, the rubric and/or scoring guide and the data tables for each of the 6-8 assessments; and Section V provides information on how the program faculty have used the data to improve their program and strengthen candidate performance. The following information supplies more detail about each section of the Program Report for Option A, Option B, Option C, and Option D. See Program Standards and Report forms on CAEP’s website at this link. [link updated 6/21/11]

OPTION A: The current process continues as a viable option. This option requires that the program select 6 to 8 key assessments required of all candidates. CAEP has prescribed the type of assessments for #1 – 5. The following changes have been made to the Program Report form:
1. In Section I, questions 4 and 5 for all SPAs have been deleted.
2. In Section I, question 3 has been deleted for IRA.
3. In Section IV, instructions have been clarified and shortened.
OPTION A: GENERAL DIRECTIONS
To complete a Program Report, institutions must provide evidence of meeting IRA/CAEP standards based on data from 6-8 assessments. In their entirety, the assessments and data required for submission should demonstrate the candidates have mastered the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level. The Program Report form has the following sections:

Section I. Context
Provide general information on the program as specified by the directions for this section. Each question that requires a narrative has a specific character limit. There is one attachment required, a program of study for the program. Note that the table for Candidate Completer information is filled out online. The faculty information is entered one time for all faculty in the AIMS Manage Faculty Information view, then pertinent faculty information is imported into each program report - see the CAEP Coordinator at your institution.

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

Section III. Relationship of Assessments to Standards
Using the chart included in the Option A report form, indicate which of the assessments listed in Section II provide evidence of meeting specific IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level.

Section IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards
For each assessment, attach one document that includes the assessment, scoring guide/criteria, data tables and a 2-page maximum narrative.

Section V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance
Describe how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and student learning.

Section VI. For Revised and Response to Conditions Reports Only
Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the concerns raised in the original recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and describe the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report and for preparing a response to conditions report are available on the CAEP web site at http://www.CAEP.org/ProgramReviewers/Resources/SubmittingRecognitionReportsinPRS/tabid/208/Default.aspx [link updated 6/21/11]

Attachments: Sections I and IV include attachments. In Section IV, each attachment should be no longer than the equivalent of seventeen text pages. A program report can include no more than a total of 20 attachments. A single attachment cannot be larger than 2mb. Attachments must be created as documents with “.doc” extension. The AIMS system
will not accept documents created with a “.docx” extension.

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

**Formatting Instructions:** You may opt to prepare a draft of your report as a Word document and cut and paste the text into the online AIMS/PRS system (although you can create drafts in the online AIMS/PRS system). But it is important to note that text boxes in Sections I, II, V, and VI are html-based and will not accept any formatting such as bullets, tables, charts, etc. Be sure that your responses are text-only. If you do need to include a table or a graph in a response to a question, then you must separate that into a unique file and attach in Section I. This restriction does not apply to the documentation for Section IV, since these documents are all uploaded as attachments.

**NOTE:** CAEP staff may require institutions to revise reports that do not follow directions on format, page limits, and number of attachments. In addition, hyperlinks imbedded in report documentation will not be read by reviewers and cannot be used as a means of providing additional information.

**Resources:** CAEP has multiple resources on their web site to help you prepare your reports. These resources are available at http://www.CAEP.org/ProgramReviewers/Resources/SubmittingRecognitionReportsinPRS/tabid/208/Default.aspx. [link updated 6/21/11] Writers are reminded to carefully review the SPA Specific Guidelines for IRA [Appendix A] and the IRA position statements on The Reading Specialist and The Reading Coach at http://www.reading.org/General/AboutIRA/PositionStatements.aspx.

**OPTION B:** This option provides institutions greater flexibility to choose their own assessments (up to a maximum of 8) and take responsibility to demonstrate how the collection documents candidate mastery of the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level. Faculty can select the key assessments (required of all candidates) with the following constraints:

1. Faculty can select up to 8 assessments (there is no lower limit on the number of assessments).
2. One assessment must be the state licensure test if there is a state licensure test in the discipline area (reading specialist/literacy coach).
3. One assessment must focus on candidate impact on student learning.
4. Assessments, taken as a whole, must demonstrate mastery of IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level.
5. Assessments must address the following key elements of CAEP Unit Standard 1: content, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and impact on student learning.

**OPTION B: GENERAL DIRECTIONS**
To complete a Program Report, institutions must provide evidence of meeting IRA/CAEP standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level as based on data from key assessments. A program is free to select the types of assessments within the following constraints:

1. A program cannot use more than 8 key assessments. There is no minimum requirement.
2. Assessments must be required of all candidates.
3. The program must include the state licensure test in the program area for assessment #1. This requirement is waived if there is no state licensure test in the program area.
4. One assessment must demonstrate candidate effect on student learning.
5. In their entirety, the assessments and data should demonstrate that candidates have mastered the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level.

The Program Report form includes the following sections:

Section I. Context
Provide general information on the program as specified by the directions for this section. Each question that requires a narrative has a specific character limit. There is one attachment required, a program of study for the program. Note that the table for Candidate Completer information is filled out online. The faculty information is entered one time for all faculty in the AIMS Manage Faculty Information view, then pertinent faculty information is imported into each program report - see the CAEP Coordinator at your institution.

Section II. List of Assessments
Using the chart included in this report form, indicate the name, type, and administration point for each of the assessments documented in this report. (Note that Section IV of the report form lists examples of assessments that may be appropriate for each type of assessment that must be documented in the Program Report.)

Section III. Relationship of Assessments to Standards
Using the chart included in this report form, indicate which of the assessments listed in Section II provide evidence of meeting specific IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level.

Section IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards
Attach a single document that provides a rationale for how the key assessments, taken as a whole, demonstrate candidate mastery of the IRA/CAEP standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level. For each assessment, attach one document that includes the assessment, scoring guide/criteria, and data table.

Section V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance
Describe how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and student learning.

Section VI. For Revised and Response to Conditions Reports Only
Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the issues raised in the original recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report and for preparing a response to conditions report are available on the CAEP web site at [http://www.CAEP.org/ProgramReviewers/Resources/SubmittingRecognitionReportsinPRS/tabid/208/Default.aspx](http://www.CAEP.org/ProgramReviewers/Resources/SubmittingRecognitionReportsinPRS/tabid/208/Default.aspx) . [link updated 6/21/11]

Attachments: Sections I and IV include attachments. In Section IV, each attachment
should be no longer than the equivalent of seventeen text pages. A program report can include no more than a total of 20 attachments. A single attachment cannot be larger than 2mb. Attachments must be created as documents with “.doc” extension. The AIMS system will not accept documents created with a “.docx” extension.

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

**Formatting Instructions:** You may opt to prepare a draft of your report as a Word document and cut and paste the text into the online AIMS/PRS system (although you can create drafts in the online AIMS/PRS system). But it is important to note that text boxes in Sections I, II, V, and VI are html-based and will not accept any formatting such as bullets, tables, charts, etc. Be sure that your responses are text-only. If you do need to include a table or a graph in a response to a question, then you must separate that into a unique file and attach in Section I. This restriction does not apply to the documentation for Section IV, since these documents are all uploaded as attachments.

**NOTE:** CAEP staff may require institutions to revise reports that do not follow directions on format, page limits, and number of attachments. In addition, hyperlinks imbedded in report documentation will not be read by reviewers and cannot be used as a means of providing additional information.

**Resources:** CAEP has multiple resources on their web site to help you prepare your reports. These resources are available at [http://www.CAEP.org/ProgramReviewers/Resources/SubmittingRecognitionReportsinPRS/tabid/208/Default.aspx](http://www.CAEP.org/ProgramReviewers/Resources/SubmittingRecognitionReportsinPRS/tabid/208/Default.aspx). [link updated 6/21/11] Writers are reminded to carefully review the SPA Specific Guidelines for IRA [Appendix A] and the IRA position statements on The Reading Specialist and The Reading Coach at [http://www.reading.org/General/AboutIRA/PositionStatements.aspx](http://www.reading.org/General/AboutIRA/PositionStatements.aspx).

**OPTION C: Continuing Recognition:** This option is only available to programs using the IRA 2003 standards. These programs, during their previous review cycle, were recognized using the 6 to 8 key assessment model. If programs meet these criteria, the documentation required for the current review could be significantly reduced as follows:

1. Programs must submit data on all assessments.
2. Programs submit documentation only for those assessments that are new or substantially changed since the previous submission.
3. Programs respond only to those items in Section I for which there has been substantial change since the previous submission.
4. There is a greater focus on Section V focusing on how programs have used data to improve their program.

**OPTION C: GENERAL DIRECTIONS**

To complete a program report, institutions must provide evidence of meeting IRA/CAEP standards based on data from 6-8 assessments. In their entirety, the assessments and data required for submission should demonstrate the candidates have mastered the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level. For continuing recognition programs are required to submit full documentation on all assessments that are new or substantially changed since the
submission during the previous review cycle. Programs must also submit data on all assessments.

The Program Report form includes the following sections:

Section I. Context [for continuing recognition respond to questions 1 – 2 only if there have been substantial changes in this information since the previous submission]
Provide general information on the program as specified by the directions for this section. Each question that requires a narrative has a specific character limit. There is one attachment required, a program of study for the program. Note that the table for Candidate Completer information is filled out online. The faculty information is entered one time for all faculty in the AIMS Manage Faculty Information view, then pertinent faculty information is imported into each program report – see the CAEP Coordinator at your institution.

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

Section III. Relationship of Assessments to Standards
Using the chart included in this report form, indicate which of the assessments listed in Section II provide evidence of meeting specific program standards.

Section IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards
For each assessment that is new or substantially changed, attach one document that includes the assessment, scoring guide/criteria, data tables and a 2-page maximum narrative. Submit data tables for all assessments. Data tables should document an alignment to IRA standards and elements at the reading specialist/literacy coach level.

Section V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance
Describe how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and student learning. For each assessment listed in Section II, discuss why changes have or have not been made to the assessment and/or scoring guide since the previous submission.

Section VI. For Revised and Response to Conditions Reports Only
Describe what changes or additions have been made in the report to address the issues raised in the original recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report and for preparing a response to conditions report are available on the CAEP web site at http://www.CAEP.org/ProgramReviewers/Resources/SubmittingRecognitionReportsinPRS/tabid/208/Default.aspx. [link updated 6/21/11]
Attachments: Sections I and IV include attachments. In Section IV, each attachment should be no longer than the equivalent of seventeen text pages. A program report can include no more than a total of 20 attachments. A single attachment cannot be larger than 2mb. Attachments must be created as documents with “.doc” extension. The AIMS system will not accept documents created with a “.docx” extension.

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

Formatting Instructions: You may opt to prepare a draft of your report as a Word document and cut and paste the text into the online AIMS/PRS system (although you can create drafts in the online AIMS/PRS system). But it is important to note that text boxes in Sections I, II, V, and VI are html-based and will not accept any formatting such as bullets, tables, charts, etc. Be sure that your responses are text-only. If you do need to include a table or a graph in a response to a question, then you must separate that into a unique file and attach in Section I. This restriction does not apply to the documentation for Section IV, since these documents are all uploaded as attachments.

NOTE: CAEP staff may require institutions to revise reports that do not follow directions on format, page limits, and number of attachments. In addition, hyperlinks imbedded in report documentation will not be read by reviewers and cannot be used as a means of providing additional information.

Resources: CAEP has multiple resources on their web site to help you prepare your reports. These resources are available at [link updated 6/21/11]. Writers are reminded to carefully review the SPA Specific Guidelines for IRA [Appendix A] and the IRA position statements on The Reading Specialist and The Reading Coach at [link updated 6/21/11].

OPTION D: Validity and Reliability Studies Option - This option permits an institution 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 IRA standards. It would permit institutions 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 several institutions, or at least 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, the program must receive approval from CAEP. For more information contact Margie Crutchfield (margie@CAEP.org).
Guidance for “Recognized with Conditions” or “Recognized with Probation” Reports

National Recognition with Conditions and National Recognition with Probation reports require writers to take extra care when completing the review. IRA reviewers write clear and specific conditions in the Program Recognition Report, Part G. Each statement of condition should clearly state, and only consist of, what the program must do in order to satisfy that condition. Statements of condition are framed directives. Although the program may have some latitude in how it addressed the condition, the condition must be addressed and should not be considered a ‘suggestion’ or ‘recommendation.’ Conditions statements also spell out IRA and CAEP expectations for the data to be provided in the resubmission. Below is the CAEP Specialty Association Studies Board (SASB) October 2009 change in data policy:

For full recognition, programs will be required to submit data that represent two applications of the assessment. That is, the assessment must be given and data collected at least two times. If an assessment is in a class that is offered every semester, then the two applications could be satisfied in one academic year. If the assessment is in a class that is offered once per year, then the two applications would take two academic years. For revised and response to conditions reports, data from one application of the assessment would be required for full recognition [Appendix B].

Additional Considerations Based on CAEP Policy Changes

Below is a list of policy changes writers should be mindful of as they write the Program Report. For further information, please see Appendix B.

- Low-enrollment programs
- Change in date for review cycles
- Endorsements
- Decisions at the standard level, based on preponderance of evidence

Designing Program Level Assessments

Assessments must be aligned with the standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level — there must be a match between the content of the standard at the reading specialist/literacy coach level and what the assessment is measuring. It is quite likely that a single assessment could address components of multiple standards (as indicated in the chart in Section III of the program report). The following specific questions may be helpful to program writers and faculty members as they evaluate the alignment of the assessments:

- CONTENT: Do the same or consistent content topics appear in the assessments that are in the standards? Do the topics align with the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level?

- RANGE: Do the assessments address the range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are delineated in the standard? In general, is the preponderance of the content of the standard addressed by the assessments assigned to it? If the IRA standard is very dense and covers a
number of concepts, it is not necessary to check off every single element. It is better to look holistically at the standard as you compare it to the assessments. IRA resources should be helpful to you when addressing this question.

- **COMPLEXITY:** Are the assessments congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in the standards?

- **DIFFICULTY:** Is the level of effort required, or the difficulty or degree of challenge of the assessments consistent with standards? Is this level reasonable for candidates who are ready to take on other professional responsibilities of a reading specialist/literacy coach at the novice level?

- **SPECIFICITY:** Are the assessments clear, specific, and well defined, or are they vague or poorly defined? The assessments might include an entry like “portfolio entries, test results, observations.” What entries? What test results? What observations? These need to be identified as specific experiences.

- **SCORING GUIDES:** Are scoring guides clear and explicit about faculty expectations for candidate proficiencies in relation to standards? A scoring guide is the tool faculty use to determine candidates’ ratings on specific assessments. Scoring guides should address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate knowledge and performance related to the standards on an assessment task and should be used to reach meaningful decisions. Scoring guides can take many forms (such as Likert scales and rubrics) depending on the assessment activity. Regardless of the form the scoring guides take, they should have written and shared criteria for judging performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated. They should be explicit enough to anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment. It is recommended that programs develop assessments and rubrics at the element level within each standard to give reviewers confidence that the broader standard is being addressed fully.

- **BIAS:** Are the assessments and their scoring guide free from racial, ethnic, gender, cultural, or other bias? From information provided in the Program Report, reviewers should be able to infer some important qualities about the avoidance of bias. Assessments should be constructed in ways that avoid biases in both language and in testing situations.

*For an assessment model and scoring rubric using IRA 2010 Standards, see Appendix L.*
Guidance for Reviewing Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach Program Reports for Submission to IRA/CAEP

(Reviewer’s Section)
IRA's Philosophy on Program Review

Institutions that submit their reading programs to IRA/CAEP for review, expect a fair and consistent process; qualified and knowledgeable program reviewers who have the ability to make reasoned, unbiased professional judgments about education programs based on their alignment with the IRA standards and reviewers who adhere to confidentiality about all aspects of the process. Reviewers are asked to accept the integrity of the program and review it for the purpose of determining if the information submitted meets the IRA standards. The reviewer’s role is not to redesign an institution’s program. It is to objectively evaluate the quality of the institution’s performance assessments and rubrics with respect to alignment with the IRA Standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level. Reviewing should be completed with a positive perspective and must include clear, substantive, focused comments to support the reviewers’ decision and to provide the information institutions need to bring their programs to full National Recognition.

The 7 C’s That Should Guide Reviewers (Diane Kern, 2004)

1. **Conscientious**—Reviewers thoughtfully, thoroughly, and carefully complete this important task.
2. **Caring**—Reviewers care about the success of your Reading Program and are careful to offer helpful suggestions and feedback. Reviewers are professional colleagues who want your program to be Nationally Recognized.
3. **Collegial**—Reviewers appreciate the time and effort it takes to develop a program that meets IRA Standards. They are reading faculty just like you.
4. **Communication**—Reviewers communicate well with one another by email or phone and communicate their availability to complete the review in a timely way. They also communicate with the IRA Audit Team and IRA/SPA Coordinator to address any questions or concerns.
5. **Consensus**—Review teams reach consensus on each standard. Reviewers also agree to disagree and use the knowledge and experience of the Audit Team to resolve any conflicts in reaching a decision.
6. **Constructive**—Reviewers offer suggestions, advice, and solutions to change unmet standards into standards that are met.
7. **Celebrate**—Reviewers highlight the strengths of your program and celebrate the efforts to improve your program.

The IRA/CAEP Process is Viewed as a Self-Improving Process to Continually Build Programs that Meet IRA’s Standards
Guidelines for Program Reviewers

Roles of Reviewers

- Judge alignment of assessment and candidate data with IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level
- Communicate clearly the strengths and areas in need of improvement in relation to the standards
- Make a judgment with a clear and open mind
- Make a judgment based on accepted criteria rather than personal bias
- Make an objective assessment about the degree to which a given program meets the standards, based on candidate performance evidence
- Accept the integrity of the program and review it for the purpose of determining if the information submitted meets the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level

Information for New Program Reviewers

Information about becoming a program reviewer, responsibilities of the review and audit teams, timelines, and team assignments can be found in Appendix K. An application form for program reviewers is found in Appendix C; IRA Code of Ethics and Conflict of Interest, Appendix M and N.

Description of Primary Documents

The Program Report is the documentation submitted by the program to demonstrate that it meets the SPA standards. All of the information that you will use to make a decision will be found in the Program Report, which is the report that the institution has written. This document, submitted online, is available to you online on the AIMS Program Review System (PRS).

As you review the Program Report you will have several documents with which you will work. The IRA/CAEP Working Review [Appendix D] and the IRA Reviewer Rubric [Appendix E] are designed to help you work your way through the standards and to prepare the information needed to reach a program recognition decision based on a preponderance of evidence presented in the Program Report. The Recognized with Conditions Note-taking Form [Appendix F] is naturally only for those Program Reports, which have been resubmitted because of conditions. You may want to print these out so you can use them to take notes as you read through the report. These are personal documents and will not be shared with your teammates, IRA or CAEP. We do ask that you destroy the documents once your review has gone through the complete process, which is your review—the lead reviewer’s report—the team report—the auditor report—and the final report.

The CAEP Program Recognition Report is the official document submitted to the AIMS Program Review System online for review by other team members. Your team leader will prepare a team Program Recognition Report and the final Program Recognition Report will be reviewed by the SPA Audit Committee, and then sent to the institution after review by CAEP. All of the SPAs use the same format for the CAEP Program Recognition Report.
Overview of the Program Report

The Program Report consists of a Cover Sheet and five sections. The Cover Sheet provides basic information about the program. Section I presents background and contextual information about the program; Section II includes a chart that lists each of the 6-8 assessments; Section III includes a chart that links the 6-8 assessments with the SPA standards; Section IV provides a two page narrative plus the assessment tool or description, the rubric and/or scoring guide and the data tables for each of the 6-8 assessments; and Section V provides information on how the program faculty have used the data to improve their program and strengthen candidate performance. The following information supplies more detail about each section of the Program Report including information on how to use each section as you complete your evaluation.

Section I—Context
Section I, the Context Section of the Program Report, should provide background information for the reviewer.

Section II—Assessments and Related Data
Section II is a chart that program writers will use to list the key assessments.

Section III—Standards Assessment Chart
The chart in Section III links the assessments to the standards. Each standard is listed in the first column. In the final column compilers have checked the numbers of the assessments (from the chart in Section II) that they feel address each standard.

Section IV—Evidence for Meeting Standards
In Section IV compilers present required assessment descriptions, rubrics and data tables. In addition, a narrative is required.

Section V—Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance
The purpose of the final portion of the Program Report, Section V, is to demonstrate how results from the key assessments have been used to improve candidate performance and program development.

Completing the CAEP Program Recognition Report

Ready, Set, Review!

Each reviewer has his or her own way of reviewing but here are some tips to get you started in the program review process. First and foremost, reviewers cannot impose their vision of the ideal graduate reading specialist/literacy coach program on submitted reports. Reviewers must focus on whether the program addresses IRA Standards through assessments and rubrics. Below, we provide a step-by-step view of the program review process from beginning to end.
Your Review Team

Approximately one month prior to receiving their assignments, all program reviewers will receive a “Conflict of Interest” form from CAEP. Reviewers will note institutions for which they have a potential conflict of interest as well as indicate if they are not available for an assignment during the given time period. CAEP staff will use this information to assign reviewers to teams. Each team will be made up of two to three reviewers, one of whom is designated as the “lead” reviewer. As soon as you receive notification of your assigned reports, please log in to the CAEP AIMS website on-line at http://aims.caepnet.org/AIMS_Login.asp, select Program Review System (PRS). Once in PRS you will see this screen:

As you can see, the second column is called ‘Team.’ Select the team icon and you will find the name, email and telephone number of each team member as well as contact information for IRA’s SPA Coordinator and the CAEP representative assigned to your team. Please send an email to your teammates a week or so after you receive notification from CAEP just to introduce yourself and to share your planned timeline for your review. This is especially important if you are planning a vacation or time away from the office. Each reviewer will complete an individual evaluation of the Program Report and will confer with his or her team members on the preparation of the final report. The lead reviewer takes responsibility for compiling and submitting the final report. Each SPA has named six to eight individuals to serve on a SPA audit team. The audit team has two primary responsibilities: 1) audits all reports completed by IRA reviewers and, 2) makes decisions on any program reports for which the original review team cannot reach consensus. You can access the support and expertise of your team leader or an audit team member by contacting the IRA SPA Coordinator.
Reviewing the Program Report Documentation

When you first log into the AIMS PRS on-line system, you will find it helpful to determine if your assigned Program Report is an initial, continuing, recognized with conditions, recognized with probation, or further development required report. See Appendix H for a broader explanation of these report decisions. In addition, you will want to know if the Program Report is using CAEP’s Option A, B, C or D. See Appendix G for an overview of each option. **Important Note— Recognized with Conditions and Recognized with Probation reports have typically met some standards in their previous review cycle. The only time a reviewer can go back and code a standard or standards as “not met” that were previously determined to be “met” is if the Program Report writers replaced an assessment with a new assessment that does not meet standards. In addition, this would require that there are no other assessments in the report that address the standard. Section III, the chart entitled Relationship of Assessments to Standards, is especially helpful when making this determination. You may want to use the Recognized with Conditions Note-taking Form [Appendix F].

Guidance for “Recognized with Conditions” or “Recognized with Probation” Reports

National Recognition with Conditions and National Recognition with Probation reports require reviewers to take extra care when completing the review. As noted in the last section, one cannot code a standard that has been ‘met’ as ‘not met’ except in exceptional circumstances. In addition, reviewers write clear and specific conditions in the Program Recognition Report, Part G. Each statement of condition should clearly state, and only consist of, what the program must do in order to satisfy that condition. The statement can refer the institution to comments in other parts of the report for guidance on how to address the condition. Statements of condition should be framed directives. Although the program may have some latitude in how it addressed the condition, the condition must be addressed and should not be referred to as a ‘suggestion’ or ‘recommendation.’ IRA asks reviewers to also direct programs what sections of the Program Report, besides assessments, should be submitted with the Response to Conditions report (most often Sections II, II and V). If IRA does not specify these resubmissions, the program is not under obligation to resubmit them. Conditions statements should also spell out IRA and CAEP expectations for the data to be provided in the resubmission. Below is the CAEP Specialty Association Studies Board (SASB) October 2009 change in data policy:

For full recognition, programs will be required to submit data that represent two applications of the assessment. That is, the assessment must be given and data collected at least two times. If an assessment is in a class that is offered every semester, then the two applications could be satisfied in one academic year. If the assessment is in a class that is offered once per year, then the two applications would take two academic years. For revised and response to conditions reports, data from one application of the assessment would be required for full recognition [Appendix B].

Additional Considerations based on CAEP Policy Changes

Below is a list of policy changes reviewers should be mindful of as they read the Program Report. For further information, please see Appendix B.

- Low-enrollment programs
• Change in date for review cycles
• Endorsements
• Decisions at the standard level, based on preponderance of evidence

Using the IRA/CAEP Working Review [Appendix D]

Next, begin by reading Section I first, scanning Sections II and III, and then opening the attachments in Section IV. This should help give you an understanding of the assessments and how they relate to the standards. You can then go to the IRA/CAEP Working Review and work through each of the standards and elements, making notes or highlighting any evidence the program includes. You will want to note which standards and elements are addressed in each of the assessments presented (from Section III of the Program Report). Next, you will evaluate the reported candidate data, and then use your notes to help make a decision about whether or not each standard is met. Consider the following questions as you take a careful look at each component of the Program Report. As you consider the questions, you might make note of any issues or strengths in the notes section of the IRA/CAEP Working Review.

Developing Program Level Assessments

Assessments must be aligned with the standards at the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach level — there must be a match between the content of the standard at the reading specialist/literacy coach level and what the assessment is measuring. It is quite likely that a single assessment could address components of multiple standards (as indicated in the chart in Section III of the program report). The following specific questions may be helpful to program reviewers as they evaluate the alignment of the assessments:

• CONTENT: Do the same or consistent content topics appear in the assessments that are in the standards? Do they align with the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level?

• RANGE: Do the assessments address the range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are delineated in the standard? In general, is the preponderance of the content of the standard addressed by the assessments assigned to it? If the IRA standard is very dense and covers a number of concepts, it is not necessary to check off every single element. Look holistically at the standard as you compare it to the assessments. IRA resources should be helpful to you when addressing this question. See Appendix A for links to additional resources.

• COMPLEXITY: Are the assessments congruent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill requirements described in the standards?

• DIFFICULTY: Is the level of effort required, or the difficulty or degree of challenge of the assessments consistent with standards? Is this level reasonable for candidates who are ready to take on other professional responsibilities of a reading specialist/literacy coach at the novice level?

• SPECIFICITY: Are the assessments clear, specific, and well defined, or are they vague or poorly defined? The assessments might include an entry like “portfolio entries, test results, observations.” What entries? What test results? What observations? These need to be identified as specific experiences.
• SCORING GUIDES: Are scoring guides clear and explicit about faculty expectations for candidate proficiencies in relation to standards? A scoring guide is the tool faculty use to determine candidates’ ratings on specific assessments. Scoring guides should address relevant and meaningful attributes of candidate knowledge and performance related to the standards on an assessment task and should be used to reach meaningful decisions. Scoring guides can take many forms (such as Likert scales and rubrics) depending on the assessment activity. Regardless of the form the scoring guides take, they should have written and shared criteria for judging performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated. They should be explicit enough to anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment. It is recommended that programs develop assessments and rubrics at the element level within each standard to give reviewers confidence that the broader standard is being addressed fully.

• BIAS: Are the assessments and scoring guides free from racial, ethnic, gender, cultural, or other bias? From information provided in the Program Report, reviewers should be able to infer some important qualities about the avoidance of bias. Assessments should be constructed in ways that avoid biases in both language and in testing situations.

The Reviewer Rubric

In October, 2009 the Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB) of CAEP decided that all program recognition decisions will be made at the standard level based on a preponderance of the evidence. [Appendix B]

CAEP has provided the following guidance on determining preponderance of the evidence:

In order to gain national recognition, programs must meet all IRA standards based on a “preponderance of the evidence.” Not all elements and components within an element need to be addressed to meet the standard. While CAEP is now focusing on meeting IRA’s requirements at the standard level for the reading specialist/literacy coach, it is recommended that programs develop assessments and rubrics at the element level within each standard to give reviewers confidence that the broader standard is being addressed fully.

The IRA Reviewer Rubric was designed to guide you in determining if each of the IRA standards for the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach has been met based on the preponderance of evidence presented in the Program Report. The rubric has three levels: target, acceptable, and unacceptable. Each of these is defined below:

- Target: Fully meets and exceeds standard
- Acceptable: Meets standard; weaknesses may be found, but overall the standard is met
- Unacceptable: Weaknesses are serious and must be addressed
Reviewing Linked Program Reports [6/20/11]

CAEP has made a major improvement in the PRS system to deal with those programs in the same discipline (English, Elementary, etc.) that are at different levels (for example, undergraduate and post-baccalaureate) or different in other ways—but that have identical assessments. If the assessments are not identical then individual program reports must be submitted for each program.

In order to ensure that each program receives an individual decision, it is necessary for a shell (or template) to be created for each program in PRS. We now require that in PRS there is a single shell for each of these kinds of programs. But we are able to “link” them so programs only have to submit the program report one time (with information and data for all the programs) and PRS automatically copies all of the information into the second report shell. The compiler can then go in and make changes to the second (and/or third) linked report shell and submit each report.

The linked reports are marked in PRS by a very obvious color banding. Programs that are linked together are the same color.

As reviewers, you handle linked reports in much the same way as compilers. You can be confident that the only changes made by compilers are changes on the cover sheet (e.g. degree level). Compilers have been instructed to include all information for all programs in the first report, including data charts that show data disaggregated for each of the linked programs.

You only have to write the review one time. When you submit the first recognition report, PRS will automatically copy all your text into all the recognition reports linked to the first one.

This is how it works:

1. Open the first recognition report form and complete your review. Include information and comments about all linked programs in the first recognition report. Once you are ready to submit your final report (this could be before or after you discuss the program with your team), go to the end of the report and click on submit. You will know your report is submitted when you see the red and white pdf icon in your column in PRS.
2. When you open the second report, PRS can automatically copy all text, information and attachments into each recognition report linked to the first one.
3. You should open the second report and change any necessary information (for example, in the example give above, the compiler would change the “Degree Level” from Undergraduate to Masters). You may have a different decision for the second report and, if so, change the decision in this report.
4. You then submit the second report.
5. The above process can be repeated if there are three reports that have been linked. When you submit the first report, all the information and attachments in the submitted program will be filled into all the program reports shells that are linked to it.

CAEP staff have created a new mini-video that will walk you through this process. This video (and others) is available at the following URL:
http://www.CAEP.org/ProgramReviewers/Resources/SubmittingRecognitionReportsinPRS/tabid/208/Default.aspx
**Final Program Recognition Decision**

After you have made individual decisions for each of the standards, you are asked to look at all of these decisions and then make one recognition decision for the program as a whole. As you do this, there are several things to consider.

**Consideration in Determining a Program Recognition Decision**
- Standards met at the reading specialist/literacy coach level
- Degree of divergence of ratings across standards

Remember…….
- There may be many ways programs can meet a standard
- Judgments must be based on standards, not personal opinion
- Be respectful of the efforts and time programs have invested

**Final Decision Recommendation**

There are three possible decisions you can recommend to your review team and team members must reach consensus on prior to submitting your team report.

### RECOMMENDED FINAL DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Choices for a Program Not Previously Recognized:</th>
<th>Decision Choices for a Program Currently Recognized:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ National Recognition</td>
<td>_____ Continued National Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ National Recognition with Conditions</td>
<td>_____ Continued National Recognition with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Further Development Required</td>
<td>_____ Continued National Recognition with Probation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Appendix G for a detailed explanation on each decision.*

**Completing the CAEP Program Recognition Report**

The CAEP Program Recognition Report is the formal document that you complete and submit to CAEP. Your team leader, using individual reviewer reports and other input, will complete the team report that will be submitted to CAEP. The SPA Audit team will have access to all the individual reviewer reports as well as the final report. A Program Recognition Report should be completed for each program report you review.
The CAEP Program Recognition Report has 7 sections. The following information provides information about each section and describes how to use information from the Reviewer Worksheet to complete the report.

**Introductory Information:**

Complete this information for each program. This information can be copied from the Cover Sheet of the Program Report.

**Part A—Recognition Decision**

A.1.—SPA Decision on CAEP recognition of the program.
In this section put your final decision, taken from the Reviewer Worksheet, Section G. There are three possible decisions taken from the IRA/CAEP Working Review.

A.2—Test Results
The information on the 80% pass rate can be taken from the Cover Sheet in the Program Report. There is a place to add comments if appropriate.

A.3—Summary of Strengths
It is important that you cite strengths of the program that you have noticed. See Appendix I, Part A-Summary of Strengths, for specific samples.

**Part B—Status of Meeting IRA Standards**

In this section cite each individual standard as Met, Met with Conditions or Not Met. If a standard is found Met with Conditions or Not Met, you must include a comment to explain why it is met with conditions or not met. The comment should provide enough information for the program to be able to understand the issue. See Appendix I, Part B-Status of Meeting SPA Standards, for guidelines on writing the comments. For the 2003 standards, use the following to guide your decision: [12/7/10]

- Mark an element as met if at least one component of the element is strongly met at the reading specialist/literacy coach level.
- Mark an element as met with conditions if most aspects of the element have been demonstrated, except coaching.
- Mark an element as not met if all aspects of the element have not been demonstrated.

**Part C—Evaluation of Program Report Evidence**

In Part C you are asked to evaluate how well the program’s assessments and candidate data address content knowledge, pedagogical and professional content knowledge skills and dispositions, and candidate impact on student learning. The information in Part C summarizes the Program Report evaluation in a way that will be extremely useful to the Board of Examiners when they evaluate the unit against CAEP Unit Standard 1. See Appendix I, Part C- Evaluation of Program Report Evidence.
Part D—Evaluation of the Use of Assessment Results

In Part D, you should provide your evaluation of the information submitted in Section V of the Program Report. Questions for consideration might include:

- Is it clear that assessment evidence is used by the institution in evaluating the program, counseling candidates, and revising courses or other elements of the program?
- Has the institution made program changes based on assessment evidence?
- Do you find the faculty interpretations consistent with the evidence provided in the program report?
- Are the implications for programs that appear in this section of the program report derived from the interpretations?

Part E—Areas for Consideration

In this section of the Program Recognition Report, reviewers would address broad, programmatic issues that the review team feels may be affecting the program, but may not be standards based. This is also a section where the review team can write about any issues that may be affecting the program, even if the program is nationally recognized. See Appendix H.

Part F—Additional Comments

Part F provides you with the opportunity to make any additional comments that you think are appropriate. In F.1 your comments should focus on the Context Statement and other issues that were not addressed elsewhere in this report. In F.2, you can cite concerns for follow-up by the Board of Examiners. These could be issues that are related to the CAEP Unit Standards but not directly related to the IRA standards. For example, you may be concerned about the number of faculty assigned to the program in relation to the number of candidates or you could be concerned that the clinical practice experiences are not adequately supervised or not sufficient for the program. See Appendix H.

Part G—Conditions Statement

Part G acts as a contract between IRA, CAEP, and the program. Each statement of condition should clearly state, and only consist of, what the program must do in order to satisfy that condition. This statement can refer the program to comments in other parts of the report for guidance on how to address the condition. Conditions should state the amount of data required for resubmission. Statements or conditions should be framed as directives. See Appendix H.

Examining the Program Report By Sections – Frequently Asked Questions

Appendix J provides an overview of the sections of the institution’s report with questions frequently asked by reviewers.
Appendices
SPA Specific Guidelines for IRA Program Reports

The Roles of the Contemporary Reading Professional

Reading Specialists/Literacy Coaches are professionals whose goal is to improve reading achievement in their assigned school or district positions. Their responsibilities and titles often differ based on the context in which they work, and their teaching and educational experiences. Their responsibilities may include teaching, coaching, and leading school reading programs. Reading Specialists/Literacy Coaches may also serve as a resource in reading and writing for educational support personnel, administrators, teachers, and the community, provide professional development based on historical and current literature and research, work collaboratively with other professionals to build and implement reading programs for individuals and groups of students, and serve as advocates for students who struggle with reading. Many of these professionals have a specific focus that further defines their duties, such as serving as a teacher for students experiencing reading difficulties, as a reading or literacy coach, as a coordinator of reading and writing programs at the school or district level, or in several combinations of these roles. Explanations for these roles follow:

- The Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach may have primary responsibility for working with students who struggle with reading (interventionist).
- The specialist may have primary responsibility for supporting teacher learning (coach).
- The specialist may have primary responsibility for developing, leading, or evaluating the school or district pre-K–12 reading and writing program (leader).

See Standards for Reading Professionals-Revised 2010 for a complete description on the reading specialist/literacy coach role.

Who Should Submit A Program Report?

Graduate reading and/or literacy programs that lead to a Master’s degree with a concentration in reading and writing education. Typically, programs should have the equivalent of 21–27 graduate semester hours in reading, language arts, and related courses. The program must include a supervised practicum experience, typically the equivalent of 6 semester hours.

Which Program Report Format?

- Option A, The current process will continue to be an option. This option requires that the program select 6 to 8 key assessments required of all candidates.
- Option B, This option provides institutions greater flexibility to choose their own assessments (up to a maximum of 8) and take responsibility to demonstrate the collection demonstrates candidate mastery of the SPA standards.
- Option C, This option is available to programs that, during their previous review cycle, were recognized using the 6 to 8 key assessment model with the 2003 standards and are submitting through spring 2012. Option C is not available at this time for those using the 2010 standards.
- Option D, Validity and Reliability Studies Option.
Will IRA accept grades as one of the assessments?
CAEP policy is that all SPAs will accept course grades as one of the 6 to 8 key assessments and provides guidelines if grades are being submitted. IRA strongly recommends that course grades not be submitted because grades make it difficult to determine that Standards are being addressed at the reading specialist/literacy coach level. IRA strongly recommends submitting rubrics aligned to IRA Standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level for all performance-based assessments. Grades and test scores can be submitted for State licensure exams and comprehensive examinations.

Additional Guidelines:
- IRA strongly recommends institutions submit assessments that take place in a variety of courses throughout the program rather than focusing multiple assessments on a single course.
- Literacy coaching experiences provided in graduate courses are appropriate as candidates develop competencies as literacy coaches at the novice level. In addition IRA requires literacy coaching experiences in authentic public and/or private school settings. Multiple coaching experiences should occur in a variety of assessments.
- In addition to the required assessment types, IRA strongly recommends institutions submit the 1-2 optional assessments permitted by CAEP to demonstrate the breadth and depth of the program.

Resources:
- IRA Website of Assessment Resources
  http://www.reading.org/Resources/ProfessionalDevelopment/Accreditation/Support.aspx
- CAEP’s SPA Assessment Library (Assessment Models for IRA),
  http://www.CAEP.org/Accreditation/ProgramReview/ProgramReviewResources/SPAAssessmentLibrary/tabid/460/Default.aspx [12/7/10]
- CAEP’s Link to Program Standards and Report Forms,
- IRA Position Statements on the Role of the Reading Specialist and The Reading Coach
  http://www.reading.org/General/AboutIRA/PositionStatements.aspx

APPENDIX B

Actions Taken by CAEP’s Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB), October 2009

The SASB approved the following motions:

1. **Change in Data Policy:**
   For full recognition, programs will be required to submit data that represent two applications of the assessment. That is, the assessment must be given and data collected at least two times. If an assessment is in a class that is offered every semester, then the two applications could be satisfied in one academic year. If the assessment is in a class that is offered once per year, then the two applications would take two academic years. For revised and response to conditions reports, data from one application of the assessment would be required for full recognition.

2. **Advanced Teaching Programs:**
   CAEP will revoke the requirement for programs to submit for review programs for the advanced preparation of teachers in the same discipline in which they were previously trained. This guideline does not apply to programs that prepare other school personnel. Advanced teaching programs will
continue to have the option to seek national recognition if they so choose. The SASB will re-visit this issue if a preponderance of the SPAs develop and seek approval for advanced teaching standards.

3. New Review Process for Secondary Initial Licensure/Post-Baccalaureate (IL/PB) Programs: SASB approved the process for reviewing secondary IL/PB programs (formerly called MAT-like programs) as delineated in the staff proposal provided to the SASB in October 2009. CAEP staff is directed to report on the progress of the implementation at the October 2010 meeting.

4. Low-Enrollment Programs: [6/21/11]
Low-enrollment programs are defined as programs with ≤5 completers in the last three years (in total). CAEP’s low enrollment policy is an option that programs can choose but they are not required to do so. Programs that have even one completer still have the option to submit a program report and be reviewed by the SPA. Decisions are based on whether assessments and scoring guides are appropriately aligned with SPA standards and adequately measure candidate mastery of standards. If so, the program should be nationally recognized. A SPA cannot withhold national recognition as long as a program has at least one completer. If you decide a lesser decision, a SPA could suggest they consider taking the low enrollment deferral.

5. Change in Dates for Spring Review Cycle:
The SASB approves the change to the date for spring program report submission from 2/1 to 3/15 and the termination of the 4/15 submission cycle. This change will go into effect beginning with the spring 2010 review cycle.

6. Endorsements:
The SASB approves the following addition to the SASB Policies and Guidelines:

The following policy is intended to help institutions determine which of their programs that could be considered endorsements and/or add-ons (or a similar term used in their state) should be included in the unit review and be submitted for national program review if required to do so by their states. 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 in the CAEP review and will not be listed among the offering of an accredited professional education unit.

- Minors in subject areas are not normally submitted for national program review 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 in the CAEP review 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 in the CAEP unit review 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.

All programs will continue to have the option to submit if they so choose.

7. Changes Based on the Redesign Initiatives:
The SASB would like to convey to the Executive Board support for the options for Program Review based on the Redesign Initiative. The SASB also wants to reinforce the importance of adequate training of reviewers to be able to effectively review these programs. CAEP staff is directed to report back in early 2010 to the P & E committee with specific guidelines for each of the four options for program review.

8. Timelines for Transitioning to Mid-Cycle Review:
The SASB will direct CAEP staff to prepare a proposal for the revision of decision rules based on the revised timelines and to report back to the P & E committee at the October 2010 meeting.

9. Motion for delays requested:
The pending requests for delays will be granted to SPAs for reviews to be conducted no later than 2013. Furthermore the CAEP staff will develop a schedule for all SPAs through 2015.

10. SASB approves the Task Force recommendations for new policy on guidelines for SPA standards as follows:
Following advice of a joint UAB/SASB Task Force in 2007, SASB charged a new Task Force as follows:

   The existing SASB guidelines for SPA standards need to be rethought in light of current research, national experience, and constructive feedback. As a result, the SASB Chair will appoint an inclusive Task Force to create a conceptual framework with comprehensive guidelines for the development of SPA program standards.

The Task Force, after two years of work, presented a set of recommendations to the SASB for new criteria for SPA standards. These recommendations were approved unanimously by the SASB. In the future SPA standards will be organized around 4 principles (content knowledge, content pedagogy, learning environments, and professional knowledge and skills). Each set can have no more than 7 standards addressing the principles and no more than 28 elements as a whole. Decisions will be made at the standard level and will be based on the preponderance of evidence. The following motions were approved by the SASB:

   Motion 1–Guidelines for Assessments
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 its program reviews. However, creating assessments to provide valid evidence that standards are met is often a challenge. As one effort to assist institutions in meeting their responsibilities, to train SPA reviewers and help them conduct reviews, and to contribute toward greater consistency and common understandings of good assessment practices, SASB adopts the following policy and implementation procedures:

   A. GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSMENTS THAT ARE USED AS EVIDENCE IN PROGRAM REPORTS AND ACCREDITATION
1. It is the policy of the Specialty Areas Studies Board that CAEP assemble and widely
distribute guidelines for assessments that are used as evidence in program reports and
accreditation. These guidelines should express appropriate practices in creating and
administering assessments and in judging their results so that valid evidence, consistent
with SPA program standards, will be achieved.

2. To implement this policy, CAEP staff will draft guidelines on assessments used in
program review and accreditation that will be readily accessible to all faculty who
prepare program reports and all institutions that seek CAEP accreditation. These
Guidelines will draw on existing CAEP documents, writings of assessment experts,
experiences of SPA reviewers and CAEP in evaluating program report evidence, and
other appropriate sources.

3. SASB will establish procedures for adopting these guidelines, maintaining their currency,
and publicizing them.

SASB makes conforming changes in the current Section 2, “Policies for Evidence Used in
Program Reports,” by renumbering it Section II, and by deleting in its entirety the first policy of
that section headed “Assessment Principles for Performance-Based Systems in Professional
Education Programs—A statement from CAEP’s Specialty Areas Studies Board, February
2000.”

Motion 2—Policy on Specification of Assessments for program reports
Under CAEP program review procedures adopted in 2004, 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. The effect is to
leave the institution little or no room to make its case, as it chooses, to demonstrate that
candidates meet the knowledge and skills described in SPA standards. 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, SASB adopts the following policy:

B. POLICY ON SPECIFICATION OF ASSESSMENTS FOR PROGRAM REPORTS

Under CAEP policies adopted in 2004, five assessments were defined for program report
templates: (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. It is the policy of the
Specialty Areas Studies Board that SPAs may specify, but are not required to specify, a sixth
assessment to complete the evidence that standards are met. Institutions may, at their
discretion, submit a seventh and/or eighth assessment that they believe will further strengthen
their demonstration that standards are met.

Motion 3—Policy on SPA program review of evidence at the level of standards
SPA program report reviewers and audit team members are asked to judge whether or not there is sufficient evidence to conclude that a program meets standards and should be nationally recognized. Under CAEP program review procedures adopted in 2004, there have been differing practices among SPA reviewers in analysis of assessment evidence and in reaching national recognition decisions based on that evidence. While SPA reviewers may or may not be aware of these differences, program faculty and institutional leadership in CAEP units find these differing practices confusing and incoherent, and perceive the differing results as inequitable. SASB adopts the following policy with the intent and expectation that reviewers and institutions share a common understanding about use of evidence in reaching program decisions:

C. POLICY ON THE BASIS FOR PROGRAM REVIEWER DECISIONS ON STANDARDS AND NATIONAL RECOGNITION

1. SPA program reviewer decisions that standards are met will be based upon the preponderance of evidence at the level of SPA standards; not every element that comprises each standard must be met.

2. SPA program review decisions on national recognition are based upon the preponderance of evidence that standards are met; not every aspect of every standard must be met.

3. In this context, SASB interprets “preponderance of evidence” to mean an overall confirmation of candidate performance on the standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence. Programs are required to submit data at the standard level, but not at the element level, and they may disaggregate data by elements to better make their case, but that is not required. 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 elements 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 elements presented in the eight possible assessments is weak. Reviewers make judgments that “overall” there is/is not sufficient evidence that the standard is met.

4. Rubrics 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.

Motion 4—Guidelines for SPA standards
SASB has oversight responsibility for the CAEP program review process in accreditation and for the standards that serve as the foundation for that process. Following advice of a joint UAB/SASB Task Force in 2007, SASB charged a new Task Force as follows:

The existing SASB guidelines for SPA standards need to be rethought in light of current research, national experience, and constructive feedback. As a result, the SASB Chair will appoint an inclusive Task Force to create a conceptual framework with comprehensive guidelines for the development of SPA program standards.

The Task Force on Program Standards has completed its work and made proposals for new guidelines for SPA standards. In response to those proposals, SASB takes the following actions:
• Section 1 of the SASB Policies and Procedures, titled “SASB Guidelines on Writing and Approval of SPA Program Standards” is rescinded in full.

• To replace the rescinded material, there will be a new section heading, Section I, bearing the title, “Policy on Guidelines for Writing and Approval of SPA Standards,” consisting of the proposed Policy on Guidelines for SPA standards prepared by the Task Force on Program Standards and presented at the October 2009 meeting of the SASB.

• The 2007 SASB charge for the Task Force on Program Standards has been completed and the authorization is rescinded as of this date.

Motion 5—Implementation of the SASB policy on guidelines
These Guidelines were adopted by the Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB) on October 22, 2009 and are for use by specialized professional associations (SPAs) in preparing new or revised standards for submission to the SASB beginning fall 2010. These guidelines replace “SASB Guidelines for Specialized Professional Association Program Standards” adopted October 23, 2004.
Application for IRA/CAEP Program Reviewer
Qualifications and Performance Expectations

Thank you for your interest in becoming an IRA/CAEP Program Reviewer. Applications are reviewed by IRA’s Professional Standards and Ethics Committee. The following is a list of qualifications and performance expectations for program review:

1. Current membership in IRA
2. Expertise in the field of teaching, administration, teacher education, research, and/or program evaluation
3. Three or more years of teaching or other experience related to P–12 reading or literacy education
4. Basic knowledge about interpretation of data, performance-based assessment, use of rating scales and rubrics, and analysis of written information
5. Familiarity with current and former editions of *Standards for Reading Professionals*
6. Ability to make reasoned, unbiased professional judgments about education programs based on their alignment with IRA standards
7. Commitment to meet deadlines
8. Excellent writing skills that convey clear, substantive judgments about the program that support the review decision and that offer focused comments to provide institutions the information needed to bring their program into alignment with IRA standards
9. Good interpersonal skills, the ability to interact with team members in a courteous and collegial manner, and the ability to work toward consensus in team deliberations
10. Computer literacy and access to the Internet and e-mail and familiarity with submission and review databases [the CAEP review is conducted online]
11. Commitment and availability to perform duties for a 3-year term
12. Ability to attend annual training sessions at either the IRA annual convention or the College Reading Association annual conference
13. Commitment to follow IRA’s Code of Conduct

Because professional development workshops are held only a couple times a year, you may attend the training even if you have not yet submitted your professional references. *However, approval of your application will be contingent on receipt of your references and other conditions outlined above.*

Please click on this link [http://fs6.formsite.com/intntlreading/form63/index.html](http://fs6.formsite.com/intntlreading/form63/index.html) to complete an application form online and attach your vita and two letters of reference [9/12/11]. If you are selected as a Program Reviewer, you must agree to review up to five program documents twice yearly. Generally this is done each spring and fall.

International Reading Association
Diane Kern, IRA/CAEP Program Review Coordinator
dkern@reading.org
Please click on this link http://fs6.formsite.com/intnltreading/form63/index.html to complete the application online and attach your vita and two letters of reference. [11/7/11]

International Reading Association
IRA/CAEP PROGRAM REVIEWER APPLICATION

Name _______________________________ IRA Membership# ___________ (required)

Address (please check box to indicate preferred mailing address):

0 (Home):________________________________________________________________________

0 (Work):________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

Phone (Work):________________________ (Home):____________________________

E-Mail: _____________________________ (Fax): ______________________________

Present Position:________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

Education Background:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Major Field</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading or Other Related Education Experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAEP or other Reviewer Experience:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Reason(s) for Volunteering to Serve as a Reviewer:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Other Professional Affiliations:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Provide Professional References: (Please provide two (2) letters of professional reference from persons who can attest to your writing skills, ability to meet deadlines, and knowledge and experience in literacy education).

I understand the time (three year term) and financial commitments involved in serving as a program reviewer, including the obligation to attend annual training conducted at the time of the IRA Annual Convention and/or additional training sessions at other national conferences. I understand that I must be able to send and receive e-mail attachments and have access to the Internet. I further agree to abide by the IRA Code of Conduct.

__________________________________________  ______________________________
Signature                                      Date
### CONTENT: Standard 1. Foundational Knowledge
Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

As a result, candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Evidence that demonstrates competence may include, but is not limited to, the following</th>
<th>Column for notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.1** Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading-writing connections. | - Interpret major theories of reading and writing processes and development to understand the needs of all readers in diverse contexts.  
- Analyze classroom environmental quality for fostering individual motivation to read and write (e.g., access to print, choice, challenge, interests).  
- Demonstrate a critical stance toward the scholarship of the profession.  
- Read and understand the literature and research about factors that contribute to reading success (e.g., social, cognitive, physical).  
- Inform other educators about major theories of reading and writing processes, components, and development with supporting research evidence, including information about the relationship between culture and native language of English learners as a support system in their learning to read and write in English.  
- Other | |
| **1.2** Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components. | - Interpret and summarize historically shared knowledge (e.g., instructional strategies and theories) that addresses the needs of all readers.  
- Inform educators and others about the historically shared knowledge base in reading and writing and its role in reading education.  
- Other | |
| **1.3** Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students’ reading development and achievement. | - Model fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior when teaching students and in working with other professionals.  
- Communicate the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in literacy instruction and professional behavior.  
- Other | |

**MET?**
### PEDAGOGY: Standard 2. Curriculum and Instruction

Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing. As a result, candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Evidence that demonstrates competence may include, but is not limited to, the following</th>
<th>Column for notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2.1 Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.** | • Demonstrate an understanding of the research and literature that undergirds reading and writing curriculum instruction for all pre-K–12 students.  
• Develop and implement the curriculum to meet the specific needs of readers who struggle with reading.  
• Support teachers and other personnel in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the reading and writing curriculum for all students.  
• Work with teachers and other personnel in developing a literacy curriculum that has vertical and horizontal alignment pre-K–12.  
• Other | |
| **2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading/writing connections.** | • Use instructional approaches supported by literature and research for the following areas: concept of print, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, critical thinking, motivation, and writing.  
• Provide appropriate in-depth instruction for all readers and writers, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.  
• Support classroom teachers and/or education support personnel to implement instructional approaches for all students.  
• As needed, adapt instructional materials and approaches to meet the language-proficiency needs of English learners and students who struggle to learn to read and write.  
• Other | |
| **2.3 Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.** | • Demonstrate knowledge of and a critical stance toward a wide variety of quality traditional print, digital, and online resources.  
• Support classroom teachers in building and using a quality, accessible classroom library and materials collection that meets the specific needs and abilities of all learners.  
• Lead collaborative school efforts to evaluate, select and use a variety of instructional materials to meet the specific needs and abilities of all learners.  
• Other | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Evidence that demonstrates competence may include, but is not limited to, the following</th>
<th>Column for notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | • Demonstrate an understanding of the literature and research related to assessments and their uses and misuses.  
• Demonstrate an understanding of established purposes for assessing the performance of all readers, including tools for screening, diagnosis, progress monitoring, and measuring outcomes.  
• Recognize the basic technical adequacy of assessments (e.g., reliability, content, and construct validity).  
• Explain district and state assessment frameworks, proficiency standards, and benchmarks.  
• Other | |
| 3.2 Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes. | • Administer, and interpret appropriate assessments for students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.  
• Collaborate with and provide support to all teachers in the analysis of data, using assessment results of all students.  
• Lead school-wide or larger scale analyses to select assessment tools that provide a systemic framework for assessing reading, writing, and language growth of all students.  
• Other | |
| 3.3 Use assessment information to plan and to evaluate instruction. | • Use multiple data sources to analyze individual readers’ performance and to plan instruction and intervention.  
• Analyze and use assessment data to examine the effectiveness of specific intervention practices and students’ responses to instruction.  
• Lead teachers in analyzing and using individual, grade-level or schoolwide assessment data to make instructional decisions.  
• Plan and evaluate professional development initiatives using assessment data.  
• Other | |
| 3.4 Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences. | • Analyze and report assessment results to a variety of appropriate audiences for relevant implications, instructional purposes, and/or accountability.  
• Demonstrate the ability to communicate results of assessments to various audiences.  
• Other | |
### ENVIRONMENT: Standard 4. Diversity

Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect and a valuing of differences in our society. As a result, candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Evidence that demonstrates competence may include, but is not limited to, the following</th>
<th>Column for notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4.1** Recognize, understand and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. | • Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which diversity influence the reading and writing development of students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.  
• Assist teachers in developing reading and writing instruction that is responsive to diversity.  
• Assist teachers in understanding the relationship between first- and second-language acquisition and literacy development.  
• Engage the school community in conversations about research on diversity and how diversity impacts reading and writing development.  
• Other | |
| **4.2** Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students’ knowledge, beliefs and engagement with the features of diversity. | • Provide differentiated instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources, that capitalize on diversity.  
• Support classroom teachers in providing differentiated instruction and developing students as agents of their own literacy learning.  
• Support and lead other educators to recognize their own cultures in order to teach in ways that are responsive to students’ diverse backgrounds.  
• Collaborate with others to build strong home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections.  
• Other | |
| **4.3** Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity. | • Provide students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link their community with the school.  
• Advocate for change in societal practices and institutional structures that are inherently prejudiced against certain groups.  
• Demonstrate how issues of inequity and opportunities for social justice and resiliency can be incorporated into the literacy curriculum.  
• Collaborate with teachers, parents, and administrators to implement policies and instructional practices that promote equity and that draw connections between home and community literacy and school literacy.  
• Other | |

*MET?*
**ENVIRONMENT: Standard 5. Literate Environment**
Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments. As a result, candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Evidence that demonstrates competence may include, but is not limited to, the following</th>
<th>Column for notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5.1 Design the physical environment to optimize students’ use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction.** | • Arrange instructional areas to provide easy access to books and other instructional materials for a variety of individual, small-group, and whole-class activities and support teachers in doing the same.  
• Modify the arrangement to accommodate students’ changing needs.  
• Other | |
| **5.2 Design a social environment that is low-risk, includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students’ opportunities for learning to read and write.** | • Create supportive social environments for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.  
• Model for and support teachers and/or other professionals in doing the same for all readers.  
• Create a supportive environment where English learners are encouraged and provided many opportunities to use English.  
• Other | |
| **5.3 Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., time allocation, transitions from one activity to another; discussions, and peer feedback).** | • Understand the role of routines in creating and maintaining positive learning environments for reading and writing instruction using traditional print, digital, and online resources.  
• Create effective routines for all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.  
• Support teachers in doing the same for all readers.  
• Other | |
| **5.4 Use a variety of classroom configurations (i.e., whole class, small group, and individual) to differentiate instruction.** | • Use evidenced-based grouping practices to meet the needs of all students, especially those who struggle with reading and writing.  
• Support teachers in doing the same for all students.  
• Other | |
# Professionalism: Standard 6. Professional Learning and Leadership

Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as a career-long effort and responsibility. As a result, candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Evidence that demonstrates competence may include, but is not limited to, the following</th>
<th>Column for notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6.1 Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning theories and related research about organizational change, professional development, and school culture.** | • Use literature and research findings about adult learning, organizational change, professional development and school culture in working with teachers and other professionals.  
• Use knowledge of students and teachers to build effective professional development programs.  
• Use the research base to assist in building an effective schoolwide professional development program.  
• Other | |
| **6.2 Display positive dispositions related to one’s own reading and writing and the teaching of reading and writing and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.** | • Articulate the research base related to the connections among teacher dispositions, student learning, and parent/community involvement.  
• Promote the value of reading and writing in school and out of school by modeling a positive attitude towards reading and writing with students, colleagues, administrators, and parents.  
• Join and participate in professional literacy organizations, symposia, conferences, and workshops.  
• Demonstrate effective interpersonal, communication, and leadership skills.  
• Demonstrate effective use of technology for improving student learning.  
• Other | |
| **6.3 Participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs.** | • Collaborate in planning, leading, and evaluating professional development activities for individuals and/or groups of teachers. Activities may include working individually with teachers (e.g., modeling, coplanning, coteaching, and observing) or with groups (e.g., teacher workshops, group meetings, and online learning).  
• Demonstrate ability to hold effective conversations (e.g., for planning, reflective problem solving) with individuals and groups of teachers, work collaboratively with teachers and administrators, and facilitate group meetings.  
• Other | |
### 6.4 Understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.

- Demonstrate an understanding of local, state, and national policies that affect reading and writing instruction.
- Write or assist in writing proposals that enable schools to obtain additional funding to support literacy efforts.
- Promote effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders, including parent and guardians, teachers, administrators, policymakers, and community members.
- Advocate with various groups (e.g., administrators, school boards, and local, state, and federal policymaking bodies) for needed organizational and instructional changes to promote effective literacy instruction.
- Other

### Notes:

### Strengths:

### Areas for Improvement:

### Comment for Board of Examiners:

#### Recommended Final Decision for a Programs Not Previously Recognized

- _____ National Recognition
- _____ National Recognition with Conditions
- _____ Further Development Required

#### Recommended Decision for a Program Currently Recognized

- _____ Continued National Recognition
- _____ Continued National Recognition with Conditions
- _____ Continued National Recognition with Probation
## CONTENT: Standard 1. Foundational Knowledge

**Unacceptable**
Candidates have an inadequate understanding of theoretical foundations, historically shared perspective, and the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge.

**Acceptable**
Candidates understand theoretical foundations, historically shared perspective, and the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge. They inform and communicate with others about theoretical perspectives, historically shared knowledge and the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy and ethical behavior.

**Target**
Candidates have an in-depth understanding and analyze theoretical foundations, historically shared perspectives, and the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge. They inform and communicate with others about theoretical perspectives, historically shared knowledge and the importance of fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior. They reflect on their own knowledge and recognize when additional information is needed and are able to develop professional development plans.

## PEDAGOGY: Standard 2. Curriculum and Instruction

**Unacceptable**
Candidates are unable to design and or implement an integrated, comprehensive and balanced curriculum. They are unable to use appropriate and varied instructional approaches and a wide range of instructional texts. They are unable to support teachers in using curriculum, instructional approaches and a range of texts.

**Acceptable**
Candidates design and and/or implement an integrated, comprehensive and balanced curriculum. They use appropriate and varied instructional approaches and a wide range of instructional texts, from traditional print, digital and online resources. They support teachers in using curriculum, instructional approaches, and a range of materials to meet the needs and specific abilities of all learners. Candidates differentiate instructional materials and approaches.

**Target**
Candidates are adept at designing and/or implementing an integrated, comprehensive and balanced curriculum. They are highly skilled at using appropriate and varied instructional approaches and a wide range of instructional texts, from traditional print, digital and online resources. They are highly skilled at supporting teachers in using curriculum, instructional approaches, and a range of materials to meet the needs and specific abilities of all learners. Candidates are highly skilled at differentiating instructional materials and approaches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Met/ Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDAGOGY:</strong> Standard 3. Assessment and Evaluation Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.</td>
<td>Candidates are unable to understand, administer, and interpret assessments and use assessment information to inform and evaluate instruction. They are unable to communicate assessment results and implications. They are unable to collaborate with and provide support to teachers in the analysis of data using assessment results of all students.</td>
<td>Candidates understand, administer, and interpret assessments and use assessment information to inform and evaluate instruction. They communicate assessment results and implications. They collaborate with and provide support to teachers in the analysis of data using assessment results of all students.</td>
<td>Candidates are adept at understanding, administering, and interpreting assessments and use assessment information to inform and evaluate instruction. They are highly skilled at communicating assessment results and implications. They are highly skilled at collaborating with and providing support to teachers in the analysis of data using assessment results of all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT Standard 4. Diversity</strong> Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect and a valuing of differences in our society.</td>
<td>Candidates display a limited recognition, understanding, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. They develop and implement a literacy curriculum and strategies to advocate for equity. They collaborate with others to build strong to home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections.</td>
<td>Candidates recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. They develop and implement a literacy curriculum and strategies to advocate for equity. They collaborate with others to build strong to home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections.</td>
<td>Candidates are adept at recognizing, understanding, and valuing the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write. They are highly skilled at developing and implementing a literacy curriculum and strategies to advocate for equity. They are highly skilled at collaborating with others to build strong to home-to-school and school-to-home literacy connections. They engage the school community in conversations about research on diversity and how diversity impacts reading and writing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Met/Not Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 5. Literate Environment</strong></td>
<td>Candidates are unable to design a physical and social environment to optimize student learning. They are unable to use instructional routines in a variety of configurations to support reading and writing instruction. They are unable to support teachers in creating a literate environment.</td>
<td>Candidates design a physical and social environment to optimize student learning. They use instructional routines in a variety of configurations to support reading and writing instruction. They support teachers in creating a literate environment.</td>
<td>Candidates are adept at designing a physical and social environment to optimize student learning. They are highly skilled at using instructional routines in a variety of configurations to support reading and writing instruction. They are highly skilled at supporting teachers in creating a literate environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONALISM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 6. Professional Learning and Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Candidates are unable to demonstrate foundational knowledge of the theoretical perspectives and evaluation on adult learning, organizations change, professional development, and school culture. They are unable to display positive dispositions related to personal and professional learning. They are unable to design and facilitate effective professional development programs. They are unable to work individually with teachers and with groups. They unable to understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.</td>
<td>Candidates demonstrate foundational knowledge of the theoretical perspectives and evaluation on adult learning, organizations change, professional development, and school culture. They display positive dispositions related to personal and professional learning. They design and facilitate effective professional development programs. They work individually with teachers and with groups. They understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.</td>
<td>Candidates are highly skilled at demonstrating foundational knowledge of the theoretical perspectives and evaluation on adult learning, organizations change, professional development, and school culture. They are highly skilled at displaying positive dispositions related to personal and professional learning. They are highly skilled at designing and facilitating effective professional development programs. They are highly skilled at working individually with teachers and with groups. They understand and influence local, state, or national policy decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Important Note**—Recognized with Conditions and Recognized with Probation reports have typically met some standards in their previous review cycle. *The only time a reviewer can go back and code a standard or standards as not met that were previously determined to be ‘met’ is if the Program Report writers replaced an assessment with a new assessment that does not meet standards.* In addition, this would require that there are no other assessments in the report that address the standard. Section III, the chart entitled Relationship of Assessments to Standards, is especially helpful when making this determination.
## Review of Program with Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions to be Met</th>
<th>Institution’s Response to Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Options for Program Review (CAEP, February 2010)

In 2004, in response to widespread dissatisfaction with the then-current program review process, a major change was made in the national program review process. CAEP headquarters assumed the management of the program review process; and uniform forms, policies, and guidelines were applied to all program areas. All programs were required to have six to eight performance assessments that, taken together, demonstrated candidate mastery of the standards of the appropriate Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs). Programs were required to have five specific types of assessment and then were given some flexibility to select other assessments. SPAs were also allowed to require specific types of assessments beyond the first five.

This current process has been in place for over five years. In general, the response to the greater uniformity in the process has been welcomed. However, faculty have had a greater than expected struggle to develop appropriate assessments that meet the SPA criteria and have continued to be frustrated with the complexity of the process. In response to these and other concerns, and as part of the ongoing CAEP Redesign Initiative, the following options for program review have been approved by the CAEP Specialty Areas Studies Board. The current process (now called Option A) will continue with some changes to the required documentation. All options are available beginning for programs submitting program reports in Spring 2010.

**For programs submitting program reports for the first time:**

**Option A**: The current process will continue to be an option. This option requires that the program select 6 to 8 key assessments required of all candidates. CAEP has proscribed the type of assessments for #1 – 5. The following changes have been made to the program report form:

1. In Section I, questions 4 and 5 for all SPAs have been deleted.
2. In Section I, question 3 has been deleted for all SPAs except CEC, NCTE, and NASP.
3. In Section IV, instructions have been clarified and shortened.

**Option B**: This option provides institutions greater flexibility to choose their own assessments (up to a maximum of 8) and take responsibility to demonstrate the collection demonstrates candidate mastery of the SPA standards. Faculty can select the key assessments (required of all candidates) with the following constraints:

1. Faculty can select up to 8 assessments (there is no lower limit on the number of assessments)
2. One assessment must be the state licensure test if there is a state licensure test in the discipline area
3. One assessment must focus on candidate impact on student learning, or, for non-teaching programs, an assessment of candidate impact on providing a supportive learning environment.
4. Assessments, taken as a whole, must demonstrate mastery of SPA standards.
5. Assessments must address the following key elements of CAEP Unit Standard 1: content, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and impact on student learning.
For programs submitting program reports for continuing recognition:

**Option C:** Continuing Recognition: This option is available to programs that, during their previous review cycle, were recognized using the 6 to 8 key assessment model ad the IRA 2010 standards. If you believe your program meets these criteria, contact CAEP to receive permission to use Option C. If approved, the documentation required for Option C could be significantly reduced as follows:

1. Programs must submit data on all assessments.
2. Programs submit documentation only for those assessments that are new or substantially changed since the previous submission.
3. Programs respond only to those items in Section I for which there has been substantial change since the previous submission.
4. There is a greater focus on Section V focusing on how programs have used data to improve their program.

**Option D:** Validity and Reliability Studies Option

This option permits an institution 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 institutions 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 several institutions, or at least 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.

For more information contact Stevie Chepko (Stevie.chepko@CAEP.org)
Guidelines on Program Recognition Decisions (CAEP, March 2010)

A. Decision Choices for a Program not Previously Recognized:

Those programs that are going through review for the first time will have several 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 being penalized with a “not recognized” decision. It will also allow the program review process to be more collaborative between the SPAs and the program faculty. The following decision choices would also apply to programs at continuing institutions that may have been recognized in the past but are not currently recognized one year prior to the visit. A program that is being evaluated for the first time will receive one of the following three results:

1. **National Recognition**
   - The program substantially meets standards
   - No further submission required; program will receive full national recognition when the unit received accreditation
   - Program will be listed on the CAEP website as Nationally Recognized if the unit is already accredited. If the unit is not accredited the program will be listed as Nationally Recognized pending unit accreditation.

2. **National Recognition with Conditions**
   - The program generally meets standards; however a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
     - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met
     - Insufficient alignment among standards and scoring assessments or scoring guides
     - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides
     - An insufficient number of SPA standards was met
     - The CAEP requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met
   - The program has two opportunities within 18-months after the decision to remove the conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*.
   - The program is listed on the CAEP website as *Nationally Recognized* until it achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*, in which case the program will be removed from the list on the website.

3. **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 the 12 to 14 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 could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in achieving *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*.

**B. Proposal for Review of a Program that is Currently Recognized:**

Program reports that were approved by a SPA during the previous review cycle will not be in jeopardy of losing their recognition status immediately after their first review in a cycle. These programs will receive one of the following three decisions:

1. **Continued National Recognition**
   - The program substantially meets standards
   - No further submission required
   - Program is listed on the CAEP website as Nationally Recognized

2. **Continued National Recognition with Conditions**
   - The program generally meets standards; however, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
     - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met
     - Insufficient alignment among standards and scoring assessments or scoring guides
     - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides
     - An insufficient number of SPA standards was met
     - The CAEP requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met
   - The program has two opportunities within 18-months after the decision to attain National Recognition. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*.
   - The program is listed on the CAEP website as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the UAB makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program is still *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* the designation on the website will be changed to *National Recognition with Conditions*. This designation will stand until the program achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *Not Nationally Recognized*, in which case the program will be removed from the list on the website.

3. **Continued National Recognition with Probation**
   - 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 unit may submit a revised program report addressing unmet standards within 12 to 14 months, or the unit may submit a new program report for national recognition within 12 to 14 months.
   - The program will have two opportunities with the 12 to 14 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*.
The program is listed on the CAEP website as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the end of the semester in which the UAB makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, the decision will be changed to *Not Nationally Recognized* and the program will be removed from the website.

A program could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in reaching either *National Recognition* or *Continued National Recognition with Conditions*. 
APPENDIX I

Suggested Reviewer Statements

Part A - Test Results
The comment section for A.2 should be limited to whether or not Assessment 1 documents the required 80% candidate pass rate on the state licensure test in the content area. It should not include comments on the evidence provided by Assessment 1 toward meeting standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Menu of Phrases</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 80% pass rate on state content test is met</td>
<td>Although the pass rate is not clearly documented in Assessment 1, the report states that candidates must pass the Praxis II as a requirement for [program completion / admission to student teaching].</td>
<td>If the report includes a definitive statement in the Context section or in Assessment 1 that passing the state test is a requirement for program completion, that is sufficient to check that the pass rate is met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pass rate cannot be determined</td>
<td>Assessment 1 does not provide test data in such a way that the pass rate can be determined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part A - Summary of Strengths

► Although reviewers have been encouraged by CAEP and the SPAs to list program strengths, it sometimes may be more appropriate to leave the section blank, rather than include gratuitous references to areas where the program simply meets basic expectations (e.g., "The program has sequenced field experiences.").

Positive comments on the quality of the report itself - as opposed to the quality of the program and/or some of its assessments or other practices - may be best placed in Part F of the report.

► When strengths are listed, they should not be followed by "caveats." (For example, "Most of the assessments submitted by the program have the potential to provide evidence for standards; however . . . "). On the other hand, comments that are encouraging to the program (e.g., "Although work is needed on some assessments to make them more closely aligned with the standards, the assessment system overall consists of comprehensive and challenging requirements that are well integrated to form a meaningful framework for candidate evaluation.")

► The "Summary of Strengths" should not be used for overall commentary on the program report.

Part B - Status of Meeting SPA Standards
Although SPAs use a variety of approaches to writing comments for each standard in Part B, the most common and, it seems, helpful format is to first list the assessments that are attributed to the standard in Section III, and then write a brief comment on how well each assessment addresses the standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Menu of Phrases</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Framing comments for standards in Part B (introductory statement)</td>
<td>The program indicated that Assessments [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8] provide evidence for this standard.</td>
<td>No comment is necessary if the standard is met. Name the assessment the first time it is mentioned in Part B. Avoid excessive repetition of comments. If the same comment about an assessment applies to other standards, it is best to say &quot;See comment under Standard 1 on Assessment 1.&quot; It is not necessary to include the decision in the comment (e.g., &quot;Standard 6 is met.&quot;) although it is fine to do that. However, the comment should clearly support or justify the decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inappropriate Assessments

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E when assessments in and of themselves are not appropriate and should be replaced or dropped from the program's set of 6-8 assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 <strong>Assessment allows options</strong></td>
<td>The assessment allows candidates to choose among tasks, activities, or the subject matter for their written response; there is no assurance that all candidates will address the option that aligns to this standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The assessment is designed in such a way that there is no assurance that all candidates will be evaluated on this particular standard or element.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 <strong>Assessment is too narrowly focused</strong></td>
<td>Although the assessment is an effective measure of Standard [##], it only evaluates candidates on a single standard or element, and thus may be too narrowly focused to be included as one of the 6-8 comprehensive assessments used by the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment 1 issues

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E related to common problems with Assessment 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 <strong>State licensure exam</strong></td>
<td>The state licensure exam has limited application to the performance based aspect of the IRA standards and thus minimal evidence towards meeting standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment 2 issues (Course Grades and Comprehensive Exams)

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E related to common problems with course grade assessments and comp exams, which are most often used for Assessment 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 <strong>Course-grade based assessment</strong></td>
<td>If grades in courses are used as an assessment, the program must follow CAEP guidelines for the construction of the assessment: <a href="http://www.CAEP.org/institutions/GuidelinesGrades.asp?ch=90">http://www.CAEP.org/institutions/GuidelinesGrades.asp?ch=90</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 <strong>Comprehensive exam related to program content</strong></td>
<td>Based on the sample provided, the exam does not appear to be an adequate instrument for evaluating candidates on the depth and breadth of standards that the exam is purported to cover.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The objectives of the exam and its alignment to SPA standards are not clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The choices given to candidates for essay questions does not ensure all candidates will be evaluated on their knowledge of this particular standard or element.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment narrative issues

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E related to common problems with the narrative section of assessment documentation (description, alignment, and analysis). No references are made to item 4 in the narrative (Data as Evidence for Meeting Standards) because very few reports include comments specific to that item of the narrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Inconsistent w/ assessment instrument</td>
<td>The description of the assessment appears inconsistent with the assessment instrument or instructions to candidates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Vague or incomplete</td>
<td>The description of the assessment does not provide enough information to give reviewers a sense of context for the assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALIGNMENT TO STANDARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Inconsistent with Section III</td>
<td>Although Section III indicates that this standard is addressed by Assessment [#], the assessment itself does not include reference to the standard, nor does the assessment appear to be an appropriate source of evidence for the standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Not included in alignment, but could be</td>
<td>Although the program makes no mention of this standard in its documentation of Assessment [#], it appears that with some modification the assessment could document candidate proficiency in relation to this standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANALYSIS OF DATA FINDINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Insufficient</td>
<td>The analysis of data findings does not examine what the data reveal about candidate strengths and weaknesses in terms of assessment performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Not enough data for analysis</td>
<td>Because the amount of performance data collected to date is small, only general references are made about data results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment issues (instrument, scoring guide, data tables)

The following comments might be used in Parts B, C or E related to common problems with the assessment itself (instrument, scoring guide or rubric, data tables). In most cases, the complete comment would consist of multiple statements related to different components of the assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT DOESN'T ADDRESS STANDARD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 General statement</td>
<td>The assessment does not address this standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Missing</td>
<td>The assessment instrument (instructions to candidates or evaluative tool) was not included. Without the assessment instrument it is not possible for reviewers to know what specific tasks, knowledge and activities candidates are evaluated on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Description and not instructions</td>
<td>The assessment instrument submitted reads more as a description of the assessment, rather than the actual directions that are given to the candidate for completing the assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Incomplete</td>
<td>The instructions to candidates appear to be incomplete or not provided in enough detail for reviewers, or candidates, to understand what candidates are specifically required to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Assessment is generic</td>
<td>The generic nature of the assessment does not allow for specific alignment to the SPA standards, although the assessment could be revised to that end.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORING GUIDE OR RUBRIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Missing</td>
<td>The assessment is not supported by a rubric or scoring guide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Generic; not aligned to standards</td>
<td>Although the alignment to standards is evident in the assessment instrument, the rubric does not describe performance levels in ways that reflect the standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Not correlated to performance</td>
<td>The rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.), and not on the performance of skills or possession of knowledge as described by standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Not anchored by descriptions of performance</td>
<td>Rubrics do not describe the qualities or characteristics of performance that would indicate differentiated levels of performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Rubrics are mainly checklists</td>
<td>Rubrics are essentially a checklist of items to be turned in order to complete the assessment, and do not provide means for a qualitative, standards-based evaluation of candidate performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Distinctions between performance levels not clear</td>
<td>Rubrics do not always make a distinction between performance levels; in particular, the expectations of what is a high level of performance is not clearly enough differentiated from a somewhat high level of performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Minimal level of performance unclear</td>
<td>It is not clear, based on rubric categories, what the program considers to be minimally acceptable performance in each evaluated performance.</td>
<td>Usually this would be that the program uses a 4-column rubric that has some intermediate category (e.g. &quot;basic&quot;) between unacceptable and acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA TABLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Insufficient data</td>
<td>Data were only provided for one [year/semester]. CAEP expects data to be provided for two applications of the assessment instrument. The number of candidates for which data were reported seems disproportionately small to the number of candidates/completers reported in Section I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Holistic reporting of data</td>
<td>Data provided represent the overall score or grades received by candidates, and not performance on each standards-based item included in the assessment. Data provided can not be used by the program for analysis of candidate strengths and weaknesses related to the assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Problems w/ how data are presented</td>
<td>The &quot;n&quot; for the data was not included. The semester or year represented by the data is not included. Data should be disaggregated by the semester or year represented by the data, as opposed to grouping multiple semesters or years of data in a single tabulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Data not aligned to instrument</td>
<td>Data reported are not aligned to the assessment instrument or rubric; it is not clear what data represent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Data not aligned to standards</td>
<td>Data reported are not referenced to the standards, making it difficult for reviewers to interpret the meaning of data in relation to standards or performance reflected by the data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Data aligned to multiple standards</td>
<td>Because the assessment and/or rubric are designed to evaluate performance across multiple standards in some cases, the resultant data cannot be used as evidence of successful candidate performance on individual standards or elements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Problems w/ how data are presented</td>
<td>Data are not presented in such a way that the meaning of data can be readily interpreted. Data should be aggregated to display the number of candidates who scored at the unacceptable, acceptable, and target levels in each scored category. Data should not be provided on a per candidate basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Data reflect poor candidate performance</td>
<td>Data show that not all candidates scored at acceptable levels; the program should indicate what remediation is offered or required of candidates who do not achieve acceptable levels of performance on assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Data not disaggregated by site of delivery</td>
<td>Data must be disaggregated to reflect candidate performance in programs delivered in each site or delivery mode.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C - Evaluation of Program Report Evidence

Comments in the "phrase menu" below are provided as examples - there are too many variants to construct a set of common statements.

► Comments in Part C should be written with the understanding that the BOE team will make use of the information in its response to Standard 1 in the BOE report. Thus, summarized statements on the sufficiency of evidence in each of the three areas of Part C comprise the best approach to writing this section. That said, a few SPAs tend to use Part C to summarize all comments related to individual assessments.

► Technical feedback on assessments that are primarily addressed to the report writer perhaps work best in Part B of the report (see comments under the "Part B intros" tab). Alternately, detailed analysis of revisions needed to individual assessments could be placed in Part E of the report.

► Note that C.1, C.2 and C.3 are not "standards" and therefore should not be referred to as "met" or "not met." Instead, best to refer to them as areas of competency, or some other general phrase - as needed.

► A comment is required for C.1, C.2 and C.3 for first reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>36 C.1 Content Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Data from Assessments 1 (state licensure test) and 2 (course grades) provide sufficient evidence of candidate content knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates' successful performance on the state licensure test provides evidence of candidate content knowledge. Candidate course grades also indicate that they master the content of coursework which is aligned to the SPA's content-based standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates' successful performance on the state licensure test provides evidence of candidate content knowledge. Candidate course grades provide some supporting evidence of candidate content knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data from Assessment [4] support that candidates' understand the subject matter that they teach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The program did not provide sufficient evidence that candidates know the subject matter they will teach. See comments on Assessments 1 and 2 in Part B of the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, the report did not provide conclusive evidence of candidate content knowledge. Subscores for licensure test data were not provided, and the course grade assessment was insufficiently documented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37 C.2 Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills</strong></td>
<td>Data from Assessments 3 (Unit Plan) and 4 (Student Teaching Evaluation) provide primary evidence of candidate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of the generic nature of assessments in this area, evidence is weak or insufficient that candidate's have the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills specific to [the SPA discipline] as reflected by the SPA standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments in this area are overly reliant on the evaluation of candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part D - Evaluation of the Use of Assessment Results

Comments below in the "phrase menu" are provided as examples - there are too many variants to construct a set of common statements.

► A comment in Part D is required for all first reviews. If the SPA wishes Section V to be revisited in the Revised or Response to Conditions report, it should make that clear - either in comments in this part of the report, or in Parts E or G. **Unless the reviewers specifically request or suggest that Section V be resubmitted, programs should not be considered under an obligation to resubmit Section V in future reports.**

► Reviewers should be careful to distinguish between the impact of lack of data due to new assessments or failure of the program to submit data, vs. lack of data due to small program size. Comments - in Part D and elsewhere in the report - should not suggest that small programs themselves are a problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>39 Response complies with requirements for Section V</strong></td>
<td>The program has provided examples of the use of data to inform program change and improvement, and demonstrates assessment data are reviewed systematically and comprehensively by faculty and other stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 Not enough data to provide substantive response</strong></td>
<td>Due to the small size of the program and the lack of data for three new or revised assessments, the program has little data to apply toward program analysis. No program changes were reported. It is also not evident that the program has a process in place for systematic analysis of data. This section of the report, informed by additional data, should be addressed in the program's Revised Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41 Response does not address Section V</strong></td>
<td>The program's response focused on changes it has made to the program and program assessments over the past three years, but does not refer to any assessment data as being an impetus for program change. The narrative in Section V of the report addressed changes made by the unit, and not at the program level. Section V was not organized according to the categories of content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge, and student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I-7

Part E - Areas for Consideration

Even among CAEP staff there may not be complete agreement as to the role of Part E in the national recognition report. Also the purpose of this part of the report has evolved over time. Most SPAs however do use Part E to convey general comments about the program's assessments and the overall ability of assessments to meet standards and achieve or maintain national recognition. In other words, comments in this part of report are most likely to relate to the program's assessment system itself, and not to other aspects of the program or the report. Based on that view of the role of Part E, here are some general comments:

► If the program has not achieved National Recognition, comments should provide overall guidance or summarization of what needs to be done to improve assessments, or provide evidence of candidate success on assessments, in order for standards to be met. Programs will use comments in this section, and in Part B, to guide their preparation of the Revised Report.

► If the program has achieved National Recognition, comments should give direction to the program for further improvements and refinements to be made to the assessment system (as needed).

► If the program is Recognized with Conditions, comments should distinguish between what must be done to address Conditions vs. other areas for consideration that should be attended to by the program, but are not serious enough to be Conditions to National Recognition. In fact, it might work best to only list the areas for consideration that are not actual Conditions to Recognition in Part E, and then end with a statement of "also see Conditions to Recognition listed in Part G."

► Part E does not require a comment. There is no need to repeat comments that are made in sufficient detail elsewhere in the report.

► Comments in Part E should be written in the form of declarative statements, as opposed to directives. Example:

"The rubric for Assessment 7 is not aligned to the assessment instrument or to the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level."

VS

"Align the rubric for Assessment 7 to the assessment and IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level."

Examples of Areas for Consideration that are most often include in Part E:

► An analysis of the flaws of the overall assessment system, including:
  - The need for assessments to address the elements of standards, and not just the overall standard
  - Overreliance on assessments that are not based on performance in a classroom setting
  - Duplicate or overlapping assessments, which weaken the overall assessment system

► Concerns related to lack of two applications of data for some/all assessments, or inconsistency of the “n” in data sets across the reports

► Suggestions that the program continue to revise assessments to create more specific alignment to the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level
### Part F - Additional Comments

#### Part F.1 - Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:
Comments in Part F.1 should relate to the Context section of the report, or may include comments related to overall problems with the report submitted (excess typos, confusing presentation, didn't follow guidelines, etc.) Some SPAs also use this part of the report to commend the program on the quality of the report, or changes made to address original review concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 Faculty qualifications</td>
<td>The degrees of many/most faculty are not in the field of [the SPA discipline].</td>
<td>Concerns about faculty qualifications cannot be a reason for denying national recognition if the program meets the IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Faculty reported incorrectly</td>
<td>Only faculty who are directly affiliated with the program should be reported (i.e. professors and instructors, directors or administrators, supervisors of clinical experiences).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Field experiences</td>
<td>It was not clear from Section I of the report that candidates participate in field experiences across the grade range of the license for which they are preparing. The number of hours candidates must spend in required field experiences was not included in the report. Not enough information was provided on what candidates are required to do in their field and/or clinical experiences and to how candidates engage in coaching experiences across multiple settings. It was not clear from the report what courses included required field experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Fewer than five completers in three years</td>
<td>Please note that in the fall of 2009, CAEP's SASB approved a policy that will allow programs with very low enrollment numbers to be exempted from the national program review requirement, pending approval from the respective state agency. If the program wishes to consider that option in place of submitting a second report, it should contact Dr. Margaret Crutchfield at CAEP (<a href="mailto:margie@CAEP.org">margie@CAEP.org</a>).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Report did not follow guidelines; advised to seek assistance</td>
<td>The report did not follow CAEP guidelines for report submission. Please review CAEP guidelines at <a href="http://www.CAEP.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=10">http://www.CAEP.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=10</a>. The program may also benefit from participating in a CAEP Webinar on preparation of program reports, or visit archives of previous webinars; see <a href="http://www.CAEP.org/public/upcomingWebSeminars.asp">http://www.CAEP.org/public/upcomingWebSeminars.asp</a>. SPA assessment examples are also available at <a href="http://www.CAEP.org/institutions/assessmentLibrary.asp?ch=90">http://www.CAEP.org/institutions/assessmentLibrary.asp?ch=90</a>. The program may benefit from attending a report preparation workshop. Workshops are held at IRA or ALER conferences.</td>
<td>Include a URL for information on your upcoming conferences, or other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Files uploaded in the report should be named for easy identification of the file contents (e.g. "Program of Study," "Assessment 1.")

### Part F.2 - Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners

Reviewers should only include comments in this part of the report if they wish to bring the BOE's attention to something in the report that may have implications in that team's review of the CAEP unit standards. Comments may reflect a concern with a certain program practice, or may alert the BOE to a unique or creative practice that may extend to other programs as well. However, reviewers should not include comments that ask the BOE to "investigate" whether the program is making or has made changes, collected data, analyzed data, etc., as outlined by reviewers' concerns within the body of the report. Reviewers should also bear in mind that the BOE reads the entire National Recognition Report, so that all reviewers' comments are taken into consideration as part of the evidence that the BOE considers.

Some examples of appropriate comments in F.2 are:
► a concern that the quality or quantity of field experiences appears to be out of line with common practices for CAEP-quality programs
► concerns with faculty qualifications

### Part G - National Recognition with Conditions

The phrases below might be used as part of the general information provided to a program on what to include in their Response to Conditions report. Reviewers should keep in mind that programs are only required to submit sections of the report that they are instructed to submit in a follow-up report.
General comments on writing conditions statements:

► Many SPAs number the conditions that are specified in this section, which is probably a good idea if there are three or more individual conditions to address.

► Each statement of condition should clearly state, and only consist of, what the program must do in order to satisfy that condition. The statement can refer the program to comments in other parts of the report for guidance on how to address the condition.

► Statements of condition should be framed as directives. Although the program may have some latitude in how it addresses the condition, the condition must be addressed and should not be referred to as a "suggestion" or "recommendation" or something the program "may do."

► Many SPAs specify what sections of the report, besides assessments, should be resubmitted with the Response to Conditions report (most often Sections II, III and V). If the SPA does not specify these should be resubmitted, the program is not under obligation to resubmit them.

► On occasion, a SPA may direct the program to include other material in their Response to Conditions report (for example, a clearer description of field experiences or a better delineated Program of Study). In this case, it may be a better idea to include such a request in Part F of the report (e.g., "Please include more information on the content and clock hours of field experiences as part of the Response to Conditions report") rather than including it as a Condition to Recognition.

► Conditions statements should also spell out SPA expectations for the data to be provided in the Response to Conditions report. Programs are not under an obligation to submit current data for assessments other than those that the SPA indicates must be resubmitted.

► Data requirements – A program report is only required to contain updated or new data if it is so directed by the SPA in the previous national recognition report. In most cases, the SPA should not require additional data from assessments that do not require revision and were submitted with sufficient data in the previous report.

Conditions given for a second time

► If the program has failed to meet conditions for a second time, it has an opportunity to resubmit if within the designated time period. In this case, the conditions statements in the first report should be the basis of the conditions cited in the second report. The program should be informed what conditions have been met, what conditions are partially met, and what remain unmet. Reviewers should not cite additional conditions, although every now and again, the program's first Response to Conditions may cause an original condition to be revised or augmented. If this occurs, the report should include a comment as to why the original conditions language has been altered. [The strict application of the data rule would require that the program have at least one application of data for the revised assessments. However, if appropriate, reviewers could waive that requirement; e.g., a program has sufficient data on all but one or two assessments but provides convincing evidence that the program does collect and use data on a regular basis.]

► It is probably "cleanest" to use other parts of the report (Parts B and/or E) to explain why the program’s first attempt to address conditions were unsuccessful, and use Part G only to spell out the remaining conditions in ways that parallel the conditions statements in the first report.
Revised Reports

The phrases below may be useful in writing the National Recognition report in response to a Revised Report (or a Response to Conditions Report).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Phrase Menu</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 Part A - Pass Rate Requirement</td>
<td>An 80 percent pass rate was established in previous report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Parts C or D</td>
<td>Sufficiently addressed in previous report</td>
<td>Not applicable to this report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments on Revised Reports

Part A - If the pass rate was found to be met, or deemed not applicable, in the first review, the program is not required to re-address this section UNLESS so directed by the SPA in its prior review.

Part B - All standards found met in the first report must retain that status. If the standard was found met in the previous review, it is sufficient to check the "met" decision and leave the comment field blank. …. (Some reviewers do not select a decision, but put a comment that the standard was previously met. As long as it is clear, either method is okay.

Part C - In most cases, some or all of the items in Part C will require a new response based on changes the program has made to its assessments. However, if no changes were made or required for the program's content-based assessments, for example, reviewers may simply indicate "Sufficiently addressed in previous report" or something to that effect.

Part D - A response is not required UNLESS the program has rewritten this section - OR was directed to resubmit this section and failed to do so.

Data requirements - As with Response to Conditions reports, the Revised Report is only required to contain updated or new data if it is so directed by the SPA in the previous national recognition report. In most cases, the SPA should not require additional data from assessments that do not require revision and were submitted with sufficient data in the previous report.
Examining the Institution’s Report Section by Section
Institutions submit a web-based program report. The following information provides an overview of the sections of the institution’s report and information about concerns or questions reviewers may have when reviewing each section.

Section I. Context Information. This section provides the reviewer with general information about the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section I - Frequently Asked Questions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 What is meant by supervised practicum?</td>
<td>Supervised practicum means that there is a supervisor who is licensed in the area he/she is observing and has the appropriate credentials. Supervised practica can include reading/literacy clinics, school-based programs, and/or course assignments that require classroom-based interventions that will be supervised through lesson plans, write-ups, conferences, site visits, and/or videotapes/audiotapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Are 6 credit hours of supervised practicum required and can these be divided among multiple clinic classes?</td>
<td>In the 2010 IRA standards, we use the phrase “typically requires 6 credit hours” to encourage programs to require in-depth supervised practicum experience for reading professional candidates. CAEP no longer allows for credit-hours to determine depth and breadth of an experience, although IRA colleagues will be definitely look for supervised practicum experiences in both program-based clinics and actual school-based settings. This requirement can be met by any configuration of clinical and school-based experiences across courses as long as they are quality experiences to develop interventionists, coaches and leaders and are supervised by reading program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Can general field assignments be used to meet the clinical requirement?</td>
<td>No, the general field assignments cannot be used to meet the clinical requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Can a program that leads to a reading endorsement be nationally recognized?</td>
<td>Yes, as long as it meets all IRA standards and requirements at the reading specialist/literacy coach level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 How do we respond to weaknesses in faculty expertise or the number of faculty?</td>
<td>These weaknesses are noted as Areas of Consideration (ACs), but cannot be used to determine national recognition status. Weaknesses might include an insufficient number of full time professors with terminal degrees in reading/literacy and the absence of extensive experience in reading/literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 How do we review new programs that</td>
<td>We review the quality of the assessments and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>do not yet have candidates enrolled, have a very small number of candidates, or have not collected performance data?</strong></td>
<td>scoring guides. Programs that substantially meet the IRA standards will be given <em>National Recognition with Conditions</em>. Those programs will need to resubmit the program report within 18 months and include the required data and analysis to gain full national recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>How can state requirements affect national recognition?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II. Assessments and Related Data. This section provides the opportunity for institutions to list the required 6-8 key assessments and where they occur in their program. *This section is for informational purposes and is not used to determine national recognition.*

### Section II - Frequently Asked Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How do I respond if many or all of the assessments are clustered in one part of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This information cannot be used for a national recognition decision but should be cited as an Area for Consideration in Part E of the Recognition Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III. Standards Assessment Chart. This section provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate which of the assessments are being used to determine alignment between the assessments and the standards. *This section is for informational purposes and is not used to determine national recognition.*

### Section III - Frequently Asked Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How do I use Section III?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewers should use this section to identify the particular assessments that will be reviewed to determine if each standard is met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>How do I respond if one or more of the standards are not indicated as having been assessed because no boxes are checked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This section is not used to make a determination of national recognition. The reviewer must examine whether the standards were addressed in the assessments submitted in Section IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>How do I respond if each standard is addressed by only one assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This section is not used to make a determination of national recognition. However, the reviewer uses information in section IV to determine if standards are met or not. This can also be noted as an Area for Consideration (AC) in Part E of the Recognition Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards. This section provides information you need to determine if the IRA standards are met.

### Section IV - Frequently Asked Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What do I do if the program report does not follow the CAEP/IRA template?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You should immediately contact your chair. Chairpersons should immediately contact CAEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>What do I do if it becomes clear early on in the review that the program will not be recognized because standards are not being addressed in the assessments and rubrics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue reviewing until you have all the information the institution needs to be able to write a revised report. Provide specific feedback that will enable the institution to take steps to meet the standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>What do I do if it becomes clear early on in the review that rubrics are not making an attempt to address the IRA standards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Even though standards will not be met, continue reviewing until you have all the information the institution needs to be able to write a revised report. Provide specific feedback that will enable the institution to take steps to meet the standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>What do I do if the assessments do not specifically indicate how they are aligned with the standards? [Section IV, Item 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>What do I do if the rubrics are not specifically aligned with the standards? [Section IV, Attachment B]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Do I consider candidate performance in evaluating whether standards have been met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>What do I do when there are strong assessments and scoring guides that align with IRA standards but lack the required coaching components?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>What do I do if there is a generally strong program that meets IRA standards but does not meet the CAEP 80% pass rate for state licensure tests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>What do I do if state licensure tests do not align with IRA standards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>What do I do if an institution submits a test for Assessment #2 but the directions do not include information that the test addresses standards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I know how many components within an element need to be met to meet the standard?</td>
<td>The intent of the components within the elements is designed to identify knowledge and skills required for the reading specialist/literacy coach, including coaching. You must decide if this intent is substantially addressed in the assessments. Not all elements or indicators need to be addressed. This cannot be quantified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the coaching requirement be met by having candidates coaching other teachers in the program or coaching pre-service teachers?</td>
<td>Coaching components can include coaching other teachers in the program or coaching pre-service teachers, but there also needs to be some coaching initiatives that support classroom teachers in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does coaching need to be incorporated in all assessments?</td>
<td>Coaching does not need to be incorporated in all assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can a portfolio or other comprehensive assessment that is not course-specific be used to address more than one required CAEP assessment?</td>
<td>Yes. The key is that the component(s) of these comprehensive assessments address identified IRA standards in the directions and rubric. Reviewers should ask for employer response rates when a survey is used as an assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can employer surveys be used as an CAEP/IRA assessment?</td>
<td>Yes. But the surveys must be aligned with IRA standards at the reading specialist/literacy coach level and there must be a clear scoring guide to identify performance levels in order to analyze data and generate plans for program improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance**

This section provides an opportunity for institutions to indicate how faculty is using the synthesis of the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and effects on student learning.

**Section V - Frequently Asked Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do I do when there is a synthesis of the data and steps for program improvement, but it is not organized around content knowledge and professional and pedagogical knowledge?</td>
<td>Section V is not used for determining national recognition. This can be cited as an area for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do I do when an institution analyzes each separate assessment rather than synthesize the data?</td>
<td>Section V is not used for determining national recognition. This can be cited as an area for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do I do when an institution analyzes its data but does not include steps for program improvement?</td>
<td>Section V is not used for determining national recognition. This can be cited as an area for consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section VI. Revised Programs.** This section provides the opportunity for program faculty to delineate changes or additions that have been made in the report to address the standards that were not met in the original submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section VI - Frequently Asked Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information for New Program Reviewers

IRA invites qualified individuals through its website, conferences, and newspaper to review program reports submitted to CAEP. Program reviewers are expected to be knowledgeable about the IRA standards as well as the program review process administered by CAEP.

Individuals wanting to become reviewers for IRA must complete an application, submit their curriculum vitae and three letters of reference. Applications are reviewed by the IRA/CAEP SPA coordinator and the Professional Standards and Ethics committee chairs. Once approved by IRA, the names are sent to CAEP to be included as reviewers for IRA.

All IRA program reviewers must be members of IRA, be familiar with and understand the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals, have expertise in the field of teaching, and undergo training by IRA. They must also have access to the Internet and basic technology skills, and an understanding how to use PRS, CAEP’s program review system. Reviewers must also adhere to both the IRA and CAEP Codes of Conduct. Confidentiality is an integral part of the accreditation process. Reviewers are also asked to read and sign a confidentiality statement.

IRA conducts program reviewer training sessions each year. These sessions also support program writers. The sessions are conducted twice a year – in spring at the IRA Annual Convention and in the fall at the Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers (ALER) Conference. It is expected that reviewers attend a session at least once every 18 months to ensure they are updated on changes in IRA and CAEP policy and to enhance their review skills in general. In addition, IRA plans to conduct webinars aimed at both program reviewers and writers throughout the year.

Tenure as an IRA program reviewer is contingent on the reviewer’s knowledge of the IRA standards, the quality and objectivity of the review, interaction with team members, and consistency in meeting deadlines.

Review Timeline and Team Assignments

The timelines for program review are set by CAEP and are subject to change. However, there are two submission and review timelines each year – one in the spring and one in the fall. Typically, reviewers will be asked to review during the following approximate times – mid April to June 1 and October to mid-November. Approximately one month before the review cycle, CAEP will notify reviewers and ask them to complete a Conflict of Interest form and to confirm that they will take part in the review process that particular cycle. **Reviewers should respond to this immediately so that CAEP can begin making the program and team assignments.** CAEP makes the team assignments once they receive the conflict of interest forms. Teams are made up of 2 or 3 members, with one member serving as the lead. Once assignments and teams are formed, they are sent to the IRA SPA coordinator (Diane Kern) for review. SPA coordinators can make changes in team assignments and lead reviewers based on their knowledge of the experience of individual reviewers to balance out the team. For instance, typically new reviewers are paired with veteran reviewers. Once assignments have been reviewed and accepted by the SPA coordinator, reviewers are notified of their team members and assigned programs. Whenever possible, revised reports will be assigned to the team that reviewed the initial submission. However, teams change frequently due reviewer’s availability.
Responsibilities of the Review Team

Teams are generally assigned 1-4 programs for review, dependent on the number of programs that are submitted during a particular cycle and the number of reviewers available to review during the cycle. They have approximately 4-5 weeks to complete the reviews. As soon as reviewers receive assignments, they should contact their team members. Lead reviewers, in particular, are encouraged to make contact with all team members. The lead reviewer and team members should discuss their personal timeframes for completing the reviews at the beginning of the cycle. For instance, a team member may be unavailable at some point in time during the review cycle. All team members should be made aware of this at the beginning of the review cycle so that plans can be made to ensure that the reports are submitted to the lead reviewer within the review deadline. Team members must submit their reports at least one to two weeks in advance of the deadline to allow the lead reviewer time to construct the team’s composite report and submit it by the cycle deadline.

CAEP staff assigns the Login ID and password necessary to enter the PRS system with the URL: http://prs.CAEP.org/. Each person on the team completes a review and submits it to the PRS database where all team members can view it. When you receive your login, password, and assignments from CAEP, all team members should go on the PRS system as soon as possible to be certain that 1) they can log in and their password (assigned by CAEP) works and, 2) they are able to open the program reports and the linked attachments. If they have an issue with anything associated with the PRS system, they should contact Sabata Morris at Sabata@CAEP.org. Sabata is the CAEP staff person assigned to handle IRA submissions. They can also contact Diane Kern, the IRA SPA coordinator, at dkern@reading.org.

It is critical to adhere to the deadlines set by CAEP. This is a typical cycle:

1) Institutions submit Program Reports to CAEP on the PRS database  
2) Program Reports are assigned to IRA reviewers by CAEP  
3) IRA Reviewers post their Program Recognition Report (their review) on the PRS  
4) Lead Reviewers post the team’s composite Program Recognition Report on the PRS  
5) IRA’s Audit Team members review the team’s composite report and post the final Program Recognition Reports  
6) Audited reports are reviewed by CAEP staff for tech editing to ensure that reports have consistent grammar, sentence structure, and add dates and condition statements  
7) After CAEP’s completes the edit, Program Recognition Reports are sent to the institutions

Adhering to the deadline of each stage of the process ensures that the Program Recognition Report reaches the institution at the promised time.

Team Members and Lead Reviewers are encouraged to contact the IRA SPA Coordinator, Diane Kern at dkern@reading.org at any time during the process if they have a question or concern. If she cannot answer their questions, she will put them in touch with an Audit Team member. IRA encourages reviewers to seek advice, when they are unsure about an issue, before they post their review. As you can imagine, this helps to eliminate issues at the audit level. Auditors review not only your team’s programs but ALL the programs submitted to IRA in that cycle. Attending to concerns early in the process helps them to complete the audits in a consistent and timely fashion.
Using CAEP’s PRS System to Review and Post a Report

There are clear step-by-step instructions on how to use CAEP’s PRS system on the CAEP website. It is also introduced at the training sessions held twice a year by IRA.

A very brief description for using AIMS - CAEP’s PRS system - follows:

- Go to [http://aims.CAEP.org/AIMS_login.asp](http://aims.CAEP.org/AIMS_login.asp) (CAEP gives you this link in an email)
- At the Login page, type in the user ID and password (CAEP gives you a password)
- Once on the AIMS site, click on Program Review System (PRS)
- You should be able to see your assigned reports and your review team members but you may need to check for the following:
  - Be sure you are on the current semester. There is a drop down list near the upper left corner where you can change the semester. The system usually opens to the current semester, however.
  - Check to be certain you have the correct assigned reports.
  - Be sure you can open your assigned reports
  - Look for attachments for each report. They are usually represented by the paperclip icon. If you are having trouble opening an attachment, you may need to update your Adobe at [adobe.com](http://adobe.com)

When reviewing reports, keep in mind the type of report it is – initial, response to conditions, or revised. If the report is a revised or response to conditions, you will need to look at the previous reviewer’s comments for the NM (Not Met) standards to determine what the issues were in the previous submission and whether they have been addressed in this report.

**One tip to pass on to new reviewers** is about posting your report. Many times new reviewers think they have done this and then leave for vacation, for example, only to learn later that their report was never posted and the lead reviewer was unable to use their review, thereby delaying the entire process. **To ensure that the report has been properly posted, reviewers must do the following:** Go all the way to the last page and click the “next” button. Then go to the page that will ask you “how many hours did you work on this report” and click the “submit” button. This takes you to a page to complete a survey. Once you complete this brief survey your reports are posted.

CAEP manages the PRS system, so any issues using the system should be directed to Sabata Morris at CAEP at [Sabata@CAEP.org](mailto:Sabata@CAEP.org). You can also direct questions to the IRA SPA coordinator, Diane Kern.

**Becoming an IRA Audit Team Member**

Audit team members are selected from qualified IRA program reviewers on an as needed basis by the SPA Coordinator and/or the Professional Standards and Ethics Committee chairs. These individuals regularly attend or participate as presenters at IRA training sessions, consistently participate in the CAEP review cycles, consistently post quality reports, and demonstrate a commitment to the IRA/CAEP Program Review process.

Auditors work in pairs to review their assigned reports. They use the same process review teams use in that they immediately notify each other when they receive their assignments and work out a feasible schedule for getting reports audited and posted.
Assessment Model: Reading Specialist Practicum Folio, 2010 Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Assessment and Use in Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Reading Specialist Practicum Folio is a five-part compilation of cumulative artifacts that reflect candidates’ pedagogical and professional knowledge in a comprehensive six-credit practicum. Throughout the practicum experience, candidates complete specific requirements in literacy teams of two to three members. Consequently, Parts I-V of the Reading Specialist Practicum Folio requires documentation of thoughtful and reflective team collaboration and a range of literacy coaching activities. Part I requires the candidates’ analysis of student performance through the implementation of an assessment-instruction-reflection framework. Part II documents the use of developmentally appropriate instructional techniques and details the effectiveness of instructional materials, technology-based sources, and print/non-print resources to address the reading, word study, and writing needs of diverse learners. Part III describes and synthesizes results from analytic-reflective literacy coaching cycles in collaborative teams. Part IV documents the development of engaging and meaning-oriented literate environments within the context of a professional learning community. Part V includes final reports that describe each unique reader, specific instructional goals as linked to formal and informal assessment data, and a summary of effective instructional techniques. Further recommendations for classroom teachers and parents as well as additional materials for summer reinforcement are incorporated within Part V of the Reading Specialist Practicum Folio. Candidates complete this comprehensive practicum requirement in Phase III, RDS: 552 Reading Specialist Practicum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IRA 2010 Standards Measured: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, and 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRA Standard/Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary (04)</th>
<th>Proficient (03)</th>
<th>Developing (02)</th>
<th>Not Met (01)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Student Work Samples (25%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Understands and uses assessments according to their purposes, strengths, and limitations.</td>
<td>Effectively uses, interprets, and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to diagnose and to comprehensively monitor student performance and learning outcomes. Provides substantial analysis of assessment data and work samples. Provides reflective evidence of reflective team collaboration.</td>
<td>Uses, interprets, and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to diagnose and to monitor student performance and learning outcomes. Provides analysis of assessment data and work samples. Provides consistent evidence of team collaboration.</td>
<td>Uses and recommends relevant assessment tools and practices to diagnose and to monitor student performance and learning outcomes. Provides some analysis of assessment data and work samples. Provides evidence of some team collaboration.</td>
<td>Appropriate assessment tools and practices are not demonstrated. Analysis of assessment data and work samples is limited. Team collaboration is not evident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Selects, administers, and interprets assessments for specific purposes.</td>
<td>Effectively selects, administers, and interprets assessments to examine strengths and limitations of struggling readers and writers. Systematically uses assessments to design and modify instruction and to monitor student progress.</td>
<td>Administers and interprets assessments to examine strengths and limitations of struggling readers and writers. Uses assessments to design instruction and to monitor student progress.</td>
<td>Determines strengths and limitations of instructional group. Some use of assessments to monitor student progress.</td>
<td>Proficiencies and limitations of students are not identified or used to monitor student progress.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Uses assessment information to plan, evaluate, and revise instruction.</td>
<td>Effectively analyzes in-depth assessment data and utilizes results to meet group and individual needs. Provides consistent evidence of team collaboration.</td>
<td>Analyzes assessment data and utilizes results to meet group and individual needs. Provides evidence of team collaboration.</td>
<td>Utilizes some assessment data to meet group and individual needs. Provides evidence of some team collaboration.</td>
<td>Utilizes limited assessment data to meet group needs. Team collaboration is not evident.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA Standard/Criteria</td>
<td>Exemplary (04)</td>
<td>Proficient (03)</td>
<td>Developing (02)</td>
<td>Not Met (01)</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Log, Instructional Lessons and Materials</strong> (30%)</td>
<td>Effectively develops and implements a literacy continuum that meets the needs of all learners. Systematically uses evidence-based professional resources.</td>
<td>Develops and implements a literacy continuum that meets the needs of all learners. Uses evidence-based professional resources.</td>
<td>Implements a literacy continuum that meets the needs of some learners. Uses some professional resources.</td>
<td>A literacy continuum that meets the needs of all learners is not evident. Use of professional resources is not apparent.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Uses foundational knowledge to design and implement an integrated and comprehensive curriculum.</td>
<td><strong>2.2 Uses appropriate instructional approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners.</strong></td>
<td>Effectively implements developmentally appropriate instructional practices to meet the needs of all learners. Provides reflective evidence of team collaboration.</td>
<td>Implies instructional practices to meet the needs of some learners. Provides evidence of some team collaboration.</td>
<td>Use of instructional practices to meet the needs of learners is not apparent. Team collaboration is not evident.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Uses a wide range of texts (narrative, expository, poetry, etc.), print, and online resources.</td>
<td>Effectively implements a range of appropriate instructional materials to meet the needs of all learners. Effectively selects materials that align with individual student’s reading levels, interests, and are sensitive to diverse needs. Provides reflective evidence of team collaboration.</td>
<td>Implements appropriate instructional materials to meet the needs of all learners. Selects materials that align with individual student’s reading levels, interests, and diverse needs. Provides consistent evidence of team collaboration.</td>
<td>Implements instructional materials to meet the needs of some learners. Selects some materials that align with students’ reading levels, interests, and/or diverse needs. Provides some evidence of team collaboration.</td>
<td>Use of instructional materials to meet the needs of a group of learners is not demonstrated. Team collaboration is not evident.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Engages in instructional practices that positively impact students’ knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with features of diversity.</td>
<td>Effectively supports team and engages in practices for differentiating instruction and actively developing students as independent learners. Effectively collaborates with others to build strong school to home connections that are responsive and sensitive to diversity.</td>
<td>Supports team and engages in practices for differentiating instruction and developing independent learners. Collaborates with others to build school to home connections that are responsive and sensitive to diversity.</td>
<td>Supports team in providing some opportunities for differentiating instruction and developing independent learners. Collaborates with others to build some responsive school to home connections.</td>
<td>Options for differentiating instruction and developing independent learners are not evident. School to-home connections are not apparent.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA Standard/Criteria</td>
<td>Exemplary (04)</td>
<td>Proficient (03)</td>
<td>Developing (02)</td>
<td>Not Met (01)</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytic-Reflective Coaching Cycle (10%)</strong></td>
<td>Effectively models fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals. Constructively reflects through self-evaluation as a literacy coach to develop technical competencies as a coach and to improve instructional practices. Assists team member through systematic and thoughtful feedback.</td>
<td>Consistently displays fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals. Reflects through self-evaluation as a literacy coach to develop technical competencies as a coach and to improve instructional practices. Assists team member through systematic feedback.</td>
<td>Displays some fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals. Reflects through some self-evaluation as a literacy coach. Provides some feedback to other professionals.</td>
<td>Inconsistently displays fair-mindedness, empathy, and ethical behavior in teaching students and in working with other professionals. Presents limited feedback and self-evaluation as a literacy coach.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3</strong> Understands and demonstrates the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving students' reading development and achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong> Uses appropriate instructional approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners.</td>
<td>Effectively observes and systematically demonstrates appropriate instructional practices in coaching cycle. Thoughtful analysis and constructive feedback is effectively documented and positively conveyed through the role of a literacy coach. Effectively supports teacher in implementing evidence-based instructional approaches.</td>
<td>Observes and demonstrates appropriate instructional practices in coaching cycle. Constructive feedback is documented and conveyed through the role of a literacy coach. Supports teacher in implementing evidence-based instructional approaches.</td>
<td>Observes and demonstrates instructional practices in coaching cycle. Provides some constructive feedback and support in implementing instructional approaches.</td>
<td>Instructional practices do not meet the needs of learners. Feedback and support is inconsistent or inappropriate.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2</strong> Displays positive dispositions related to reading/writing and pursues the development of professional knowledge and dispositions.</td>
<td>Effectively demonstrates and models positive dispositions toward teaching, reading/writing, and student performance. Enthusiastically and actively pursues the development of professional knowledge and personal learning. Consistently displays effective interpersonal, communication, and strong leadership skills.</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive dispositions toward teaching, reading/writing, and student performance. Actively pursues the development of professional knowledge and personal learning. Displays effective interpersonal, communication, and adequate leadership skills.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some positive dispositions toward teaching, reading/writing, and student performance. Pursues the development of professional knowledge and personal learning. Displays some effective interpersonal, communication, and developing leadership skills.</td>
<td>Positive dispositions toward teaching, reading/writing, and student performance are inconsistent. The development of professional knowledge and personal learning and leadership skills are not evident.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA Standard/Criteria</td>
<td>Exemplary (04)</td>
<td>Proficient (03)</td>
<td>Developing (02)</td>
<td>Not Met (01)</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literate Environment and Learning Community (15%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Designs a physical environment to optimize students’ use of instructional materials and resources.</td>
<td>Effectively selects a range of developmentally appropriate books, materials, and resources in a stimulating and inviting environment. Materials are thoughtfully and purposefully organized to reflect reading abilities, student interests, and/or backgrounds. Materials and arrangements are effectively modified to accommodate students’ changing needs.</td>
<td>Selects a range of developmentally appropriate books, materials, and resources in an inviting environment. Materials are accessible and reflect reading abilities, student interests, and/or backgrounds. Materials and arrangements are modified to accommodate students’ needs.</td>
<td>Some books, materials, and resources are available in the environment. Students have some accessibility to materials. Some materials and arrangements are modified to accommodate students’ needs.</td>
<td>Books, materials, and resources are not readily available. Students have limited accessibility to materials. Materials and arrangements are not modified to accommodate students’ needs.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Designs a socially engaging environment to optimize students’ reading and writing performance.</td>
<td>Effectively creates and maintains a socially engaging learning environment with scaffolded support for all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Effectively reflects on motivational impact of instruction. Reflective team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>Creates and maintains a socially engaging learning environment with appropriate support for all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Reflects on motivational impact of instruction. Consistent team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>Creates and maintains a learning environment with some support for learners. Acknowledges motivational impact of instruction. Some team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>A socially engaging and motivating learning environment is not apparent. Team collaboration is not evident.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Uses instructional routines to support reading and writing instruction.</td>
<td>Effectively creates and maintains a positive learning environment through a variety of successful classroom routines for all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Reflective team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>Creates and maintains a positive learning environment through successful classroom routines for all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Consistent team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>Creates and maintains a learning environment through some classroom routines for learners. Some team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>Classroom routines are not apparent for learners. Team collaboration is not evident.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Uses a variety of classroom configurations to differentiate instruction (e.g., interactive reading, guided reading, individual goals, word study and writing).</td>
<td>Effectively utilizes evidenced-based grouping practices to meet the needs of all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Reflective team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>Utilizes evidenced-based grouping practices to meet the needs of all learners, especially struggling readers/writers and ELL learners. Consistent team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>Utilizes some grouping practices to meet the needs of some learners. Some team collaboration is evident.</td>
<td>Grouping practices to meet the needs of learners are not apparent. Team collaboration is not evident.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA Standard/Criteria</td>
<td>Exemplary (04)</td>
<td>Proficient (03)</td>
<td>Developing (02)</td>
<td>Not Met (01)</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final School Reports &amp; Summer Kits for Parents (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Communicates assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences.</td>
<td>Effectively utilizes clear oral and written communication to document students’ strengths, limitations, and instructional conclusions and implications. Effectively describes and explains how students integrate major components of fluent reading/writing.</td>
<td>Uses consistent oral and written communication to document strengths, limitations, and instructional conclusions and implications. Describes and explains how students integrate major components of fluent reading/writing.</td>
<td>Some use of oral and written communication to document instructional conclusions and implications. Describes and explains how students integrate some components of fluent reading/writing.</td>
<td>Oral and written communication does not effectively document instructional conclusions and implications. An understanding of major components is not evident.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Develop and implement strategies to advocate for diversity.</td>
<td>Effectively provides students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link the community with the school. Collaborates with team, administrators, and parents to promote equity and to develop strong connections between home, school, and community.</td>
<td>Provides students with linguistic, academic, and/or cultural experiences that link the community with the school. Collaborates with team, administrators, and parents to promote equity and to develop appropriate connections between home, school, and community.</td>
<td>Provides students with linguistic, academic, and cultural experiences that link the community with the school. Some collaboration with team, administrators, and parents to promote equity and to develop connections between home, community, and school.</td>
<td>Linguistic, academic, and/or cultural experiences that link the community with the school are not evident. Collaboration to develop connections between home, community, and school is not apparent.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Understands and implements local, state, and federal policies.</td>
<td>Effectively demonstrates an understanding of policies that affect reading and writing instruction and provides comprehensive documentation to meet all Title I guidelines and mandates.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of policies that affect reading and writing instruction and provides adequate documentation to meet Title I guidelines and mandates.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some understanding of policies that affect reading and writing instruction and provides some documentation to meet Title I guidelines and mandates.</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited understanding of policies that affect reading and writing instruction and provides inconsistent documentation to meet Title I guidelines and mandates.</td>
<td>/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IRA Code of Ethics

Revised March 2008

Preamble
The International Reading Association (IRA) is committed to the highest level of ethical conduct for all members. IRA believes that it is every member’s obligation to uphold this ethical responsibility with respect to curriculum and instruction, including using technological resources; assessing, diagnosing, and evaluating; creating a literate environment; valuing diversities; communicating and interacting with families and the community; exhibiting positive dispositions; and exemplifying professionalism, including conducting research, publishing, making professional presentations, communicating and interacting with colleagues, using technology, and honestly representing oneself as a reading professional.

The IRA Code of Ethics identifies the specific ethical responsibilities for all members in each of the areas identified above. The Code is aligned with IRA Standards for Reading Professionals in order to identify ethical responsibilities related to each Standard. Any possible breaches of the IRA Code of Ethics should be referred to Association Headquarters for referral to the IRA Professional Standards & Ethics Committee for review. If any breaches are determined to have taken place, the Committee then recommends appropriate actions to the Association. It is the obligation of all members of the International Reading Association to observe the Code of Ethics of the organization and to act accordingly so as to advance the status and prestige of the Association and of the profession as a whole.

Curriculum and Instruction
It is the ethical responsibility of all IRA members to use curriculum materials and instructional methods that:
- Are consistent with IRA position statements,
- Are based on evidence.
- Differentiate instruction to meet the individual needs of all students.
- Are free from cultural and linguistic bias.
- Represent multiple perspectives and interpretations.
- Are based on valid and reliable print and technological sources of information.

Assessing, Diagnosing, and Evaluating
It is the ethical responsibility of all IRA members to assess, diagnose, and evaluate student growth using instruments that:
- Are valid and reliable.
- Are free from cultural and linguistic bias.
- Are consistent with IRA position statements.
- Are administered in accordance with instrument specifications.
- Are interpreted in a manner consistent with the instruments’ purpose.
- Are used in ways that protect the confidentiality of students and families.

Creating a Literate Environment
It is the ethical responsibility of all IRA members to create literate environments that:
- Include all students.
- Are free from bias.
- Encourage collaboration.
- Provide equitable access to books, technology-based information, and nonprint materials representing multiple levels, broad interests, and diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.
- Are consistent with IRA position statements.
- Are responsive to student interests, reading abilities, and backgrounds.
- Are structured to help students learn to work cooperatively and productively with others.

Exemplifying Professionalism
It is the ethical responsibility of all IRA members to exhibit professionalism by:
- Honestly representing oneself and one’s work.
- Maintaining professional relationships.
- Demonstrating positive dispositions toward reading and the teaching of reading.
- Actively working to advance IRA positions, policies, and practices.
- Conducting research that is:
  - Honest.
  - Respectful of human dignity.
  - Respectful of peer input.
  - Grounded in a strong theoretical and research base.
  - Free from bias.
  - A significant contribution to understanding the reading process and the teaching of reading.
- Publishing research that is:
  - Original, and does not plagiarize previously published research.
  - Honestly represented.
  - Valid and reliable.
  - Respectful of previously published research.
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Conflict of Interest
While representing IRA, program reviewers should conduct themselves as thoughtful, well prepared, and impartial professionals. Program review is sensitive; therefore, objectivity and credibility are essential. Program reviewers should exclude themselves from participating in the review if, to their knowledge, there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to the program, the faculty, the students, the institution, or the state.

Bias
Program reviewers should not advance personal agendas while reviewing programs by attempting to apply personal or partisan interpretations of the IRA Standards for Reading Professionals. They should examine the facts as they exist and not be influenced by past reputation, etc. about the institution or the program being reviewed.

Confidentiality
Program reviewers should treat as confidential all elements of the review and information gathered as part of the process such as documents, interviews, discussions, interpretations, and analyses related to the program and the institution.
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Date____________________________
**Reading Specialists/Literacy Coaches** are professionals whose goal is to improve reading achievement in their assigned school or district positions. Their responsibilities and titles often differ based on the context in which they work, and their teaching and educational experiences. Their responsibilities may include teaching, coaching, and leading school reading programs. They may also serve as a resource in reading and writing for educational support personnel, administrators, teachers, and the community; provide professional development based on historical and current literature and research; work collaboratively with other professionals to build and implement reading programs for individuals and groups of students; and serve as advocates for students who struggle with reading. Many have a specific focus that further defines their duties. For example, a reading specialist can serve as a teacher for students experiencing reading difficulties, as a reading or literacy coach, as a coordinator of reading and writing programs at the school or district level or in several combinations of these roles. Explanations for these roles follow:

- **The specialist may have primary responsibility for working with students who struggle with reading.** These professionals may provide intensive, supplemental instruction to students who struggle with reading at all levels (Pre-K through 12). Such instruction may be provided either within or outside the student’s classrooms. At times these specialists provide literacy intervention instruction designed to meet the specific needs of students or they may provide instruction that enables students who struggle with reading to meet the requirements of the classroom reading program, or both.

- **The specialist may have primary responsibility for working to support teacher learning.** These professionals, often known as literacy or reading coaches, provide coaching and other professional development support that enables teachers to think reflectively about improving student learning and implementing various instructional programs and practices. Often, they provide essential leadership for the school’s entire literacy program by helping create and lead a long-term staff development process that supports both the development and implementation of a literacy program over months and years. Such work requires these specialists to work with individuals and groups of teachers (e.g., working with grade level teams, leading study groups, etc).

- **The specialist may have primary responsibility for developing, leading, or evaluating the school or district reading and writing program (early childhood through grade 12).** These professionals may assume some of the same responsibilities as the specialist who works primarily with teachers, but in addition they have responsibilities that require them to work with systemic change at the school and district levels. These individuals need to have experiences that enable them to work effectively as a coordinator and to be able to develop and lead effective professional development programs. As coordinator, they may work with special educators, psychologists, and various teachers to develop plans for meeting the needs of all students in the school (grouping arrangements, assessments, instructional approaches, etc.)

**For certification as a Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach, the candidate must have:**

- Valid teaching certificate
- Previous teaching experience
- Master’s degree with a concentration in reading and writing education
- Program experiences that build knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to working with students, supporting or coaching teachers, and leading the school reading program
- Typically, the equivalent of 21-27 graduate semester hours in reading, language arts and related courses: The program must include a supervised practicum experience, typically the equivalent of 6 semester hours

The supervised practicum experience should require working with students who struggle with reading, as well as collaborative and coaching experiences with teachers. Note: It is expected that candidates completing the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach program will be at a novice or entry level of expertise.

Note: The role of the Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach remains as one role because IRA expects to see evidence of both in this candidate: reading specialist and literacy coach.
## CAEP Organizing Principles
IRA, 2010 Standards for Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach

### PRINCIPLE ONE: CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Candidates <strong>understand</strong> the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.</td>
<td>2.0 Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</td>
<td>3.0 Candidates <strong>use</strong> a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.</td>
<td>4.0 Candidates <strong>create</strong> and <strong>engage</strong> their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and valuing of differences in our society.</td>
<td>5.0 Candidates <strong>create</strong> a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches, and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</td>
<td>6.0 Candidates <strong>recognize</strong> the importance of, <strong>demonstrate</strong>, and <strong>facilitate</strong> professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Understand major theories and empirical research that describe the foundations of reading and writing development.</td>
<td>2.1 Use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.</td>
<td>3.1 Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.</td>
<td>4.1 Recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society, and their importance in learning to read and to write.</td>
<td>5.1 Design a physical environment to optimize students’ use of traditional print, digital, and online resources in reading and writing instruction.</td>
<td>6.1 Demonstrate foundational knowledge of adult learning, theories, and related research about organizational change, professional development and school culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the reading and writing development.</td>
<td>2.2 Use appropriate and varied instructional approaches for word recognition, language comprehension, reading-writing connections.</td>
<td>3.2 Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes.</td>
<td>4.2 Use a literacy curriculum and engage in instructional practices that positively impact students’ knowledge, beliefs, and engagement with features of diversity.</td>
<td>5.2 Design a social environment that is low risk and includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students’ opportunities for reading and writing.</td>
<td>6.2 Display positive dispositions to their own reading and writing and the teaching, and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students’ reading and writing development.</td>
<td>2.3 Use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.</td>
<td>3.3 Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.</td>
<td>4.3 Develop and implement strategies to advocate for equity.</td>
<td>5.3 Use routines to support reading and writing instruction (e.g., timing, transitions, feedback).</td>
<td>6.3 Participate in, design, facilitate, lead, and evaluate effective and differentiated professional development programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRINCIPLE TWO: PEDAGOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.</td>
<td>3.0 Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.</td>
<td>4.0 Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and valuing of differences in our society.</td>
<td>5.0 Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches, and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</td>
<td>6.0 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRINCIPLE THREE: LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.</td>
<td>4.0 Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and valuing of differences in our society.</td>
<td>5.0 Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches, and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</td>
<td>6.0 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRINCIPLE FOUR: PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and valuing of differences in our society.</td>
<td>5.0 Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches, and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</td>
<td>6.0 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX P

CAEP Organizing Principles
IRA, 2010 Standards for Reading Specialist/Literacy Coach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches, and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.</td>
<td>6.0 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td>7.0 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td>7.0 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td>8.0 Candidates recognize the importance of, demonstrate, and facilitate professional learning and leadership as career-long effort and responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88