MANUAL OF INSTRUCTIONS

for

PROGRAM APPROVAL FOR CERTIFICATION

of

IDAHO

EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION

IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART IV: NEW PROGRAM DESK REVIEW PROCEDURES

APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

SECTION I: AUTHORITY AND RESOURCES USED TO CONDUCT REVIEWS OF IDAHO EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

1. Authority to conduct reviews of Idaho educator preparation programs is given to the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) by Idaho Code § 33-114, Idaho Code §33-1258, and IDAPA 80.02.02.100.01. The PSC is charged with recommending each individual program as approved, conditionally approved, or not approved, to the State Board of Education, with final approval authority resting with the State Board of Education.

2. The official vehicle for the approval of teacher education programs is the approved *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel*, which are based upon the accepted national standards for the accreditation of educator preparation and include state-specific, core teaching requirements. The State Department of Education will disseminate to the head of each Idaho college or department of education a copy of all revisions to the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel*. Such revisions will take effect and must be implemented within a period not to exceed two (2) years after notification of such revision.

3. Idaho maintains a partnership agreement with a national accreditation council. This partnership agreement provides for concurrent on-site educator preparation unit accreditation reviews along with state program approval for certification reviews of each area of the certification and content endorsements offered by the college/university. During a concurrent visit, a national accreditation council team and a state team collaborate to conduct the review. Both teams, however, submit separate reports. Final unit approval rests with the national accreditation council once state program approval is granted through the State Board of Education.

4. When an institution is seeking national accreditation, the national accreditation council determines if the unit charged with professional educator preparation meets the accepted national standards.

5. If the institution is seeking national accreditation, the state team uses the data gathered by the national team in addition to their own data to evaluate the institution's compliance with the national standards and state-specific requirements. If the institution chooses not to seek national accreditation, state team members will be assigned to review the institution's compliance with the accepted national standards in addition to state-specific requirements. State team members reviewing the national standards will have appropriate training.

6. Continuing Approval – The State of Idaho will follow a national accreditation council model by which institutions shall pursue continuing approval through a full program review every seven (7) years. The full program review shall be based upon national standards and the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel.*

7. The state of Idaho will additionally conduct State-Specific Requirement Reviews, not to exceed every third year following the full program review.

8. Payment Responsibilities for Educator Preparation Program Reviews – The PSC is responsible for scheduling and conducting Idaho educator preparation program reviews, including assigning responsibility for paying for program reviews. To implement the reviews, it is necessary that:

   a. The PSC shall pay for all expenses for state team on-site educator preparation reviews from its budget.
   b. Requesting institutions shall pay for all expenses related to on-site teacher preparation program reviews pertaining to national accreditation.

SECTION II: IDAHO STANDARDS FOR INITIAL CERTIFICATION OF PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

1. The official standards used for approval for certification reviews will be the current *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel.* The *Manual of Instructions for Program Approval for Certification of Idaho Educator Preparation Programs* will be used by Idaho institutions in planning for approval for certification reviews of educator preparation programs.

2. The PSC Administrator will provide the institution a copy of the standards to be used during the visit prior to the program review. In addition, the PSC Administrator will annually notify all institutions of revisions to the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel.* Such revisions will take effect and must be implemented within a period not to exceed two (2) years after notification of such revision.

3. The Idaho Core Teaching standards and current State-Specific Requirements apply to **ALL** teacher certification areas. These are the standards and requirements that all teachers must be accountable for, regardless of their specific content areas. However, School Administrator and Pupil Personnel Programs address only content specific standards (school administrators, school psychologists, school nurses, school social workers, etc.).

4. The *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel* require candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills for each standard. Program

performance assessments by the institution ensure that candidates meet the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel*.
   a. <u>Knowledge</u> (what the candidate needs to know)
   b. <u>Performance</u> (what the candidate is able to do)

5. An important component of the teaching profession is a candidate's disposition. Professional dispositions are how the candidate views the teaching profession, their content area, and/or students and their learning. Every educator preparation program at each institution is responsible for establishing and promoting a comprehensive set of guidelines for candidate dispositions.

6. Institutions are responsible for assessing candidate knowledge and ability to use that knowledge effectively in guiding the learning of students.

7. Program approval for certification review teams assess the sufficiency of the evidence collected and used by institutions to reach decisions about whether institutions are able to recommend candidates for initial certification.

   a. NOTE: If a candidate is currently certified in Idaho and wishes to add an endorsement in a new content area, the institution is able to work with the candidate to develop a plan to include: content, pedagogy, and performance.

8. A Rubric is used to evaluate the extent to which educator preparation programs are preparing candidates relative to the Idaho educator preparation standards (See Appendix A: Rubric for State Approval for Certification).

9. Levels of performance (Unacceptable, Acceptable, and Target) are described for each of *the Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel* and recorded using the rubric. Performance indicators provide the lens through which the state program approval review team judges the institution's evidence that candidates meet the Idaho standards.

   a. **Unacceptable**
   Institutional evidence is not sufficiently comprehensive to make the necessary distinction between a rating of Acceptable and Unacceptable with confidence. An Unacceptable rating on an element of a program standard, however, does not mean the program is not approved.

   State team members shall note areas for improvement without making specific suggestions.

   b. **Acceptable**
   Institutional evidence is judged to be sufficient to enable institutions to distinguish between the candidates who have knowledge and skill at a level expected of a beginning teacher from candidates who have not yet reached the level of a

beginning teacher. An Acceptable finding requires that institutions demonstrate a candidate's use of assessment results in guiding student instruction.

State team members shall note specific evidence and artifacts that indicate that candidates demonstrate an acceptable level of knowledge and skill.

c. **Target**
Must have evidence that the institution has a mature system of assessing candidate knowledge and skills and that triangulation of data sources and psychometric methods have confirmed the credibility of the decisions regarding candidate progress. Additionally, institutions must demonstrate the use of this data in guiding the unit's program improvement decisions.

State team members shall note specific evidence and artifacts that indicate that candidates demonstrate an acceptable level of knowledge and skill at minimum, and that the institution credibly defends the decisions regarding candidate progress.

FOR SPECIFIC PROCEDURES BY REVIEW TYPE, CLICK BELOW

PART I: FULL UNIT APPROVAL FOR CERTIFCATION REVIEW
PART II: STATE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS REVIEW
PART III: FOCUSED VISIT
PART IV: NEW PROGRAM DESK REVIEW

PART I: FULL UNIT APPROVAL FOR CERTIFICATION REVIEW PROCEDURES
When national accreditation is sought, national accreditation reviews will be held concurrently with the State Program Approval for Certification Review process. Idaho maintains a partnership with a national accreditation council. This partnership agreement provides for concurrent on-site educator preparation unit accreditation reviews along with state program approval for certification reviews of each area of the certification and content endorsements offered by the institution. During a concurrent visit, a national accreditation council team and a state team collaborate to conduct the review. Both teams, however, submit separate reports. Final unit approval rests with the national accreditation council once state program approval for certification is granted through the State Board of Education.

A State-Specific Requirements Review shall be conducted concurrently with every Full Unit Review. If programs are conditionally approved during the full unit review, the Focused Visit for said programs shall be held concurrently with the State-Specific Requirements Review within three years of the Full Unit Approval for Certification Review. (See Appendix F: Full Unit Review Procedures and Possible Outcomes)

PART I, SECTION I: NOTIFICATION AND PREPARTATION FOR UNIT APPROVAL FOR CERTIFICATION REVIEW

1. The institution notifies the PSC Administrator with a letter of intent **no later than one year** prior to the anticipated Full Unit Review. The letter of intent shall include a preferred month of visit as well as anticipated programs to be reviewed (using Appendix B: Programs to be Evaluated)

2. Upon receiving the letter of intent, the PSC Administrator contacts the institution. The following information is discussed and documented:

   a. The purpose of the review and the procedures described in the *Manual of Instructions for State Approval for Certification of Idaho Educator Preparation Programs.*

   b. Guidelines for writing the Institutional Report (IR) for state approval for certification (See Appendix C)

   c. Timelines and general provisions for the pre-visit (See Appendix D)

   d. Timelines and general provisions for the on-site review

   e. Timelines and general provisions for the post-site review

   f. Confirmation of programs that require program approval for certification (Appendix B: Programs to be Evaluated)

   g. Composition of review team

3. **Approximately one year** prior to the date of the anticipated on-site visit, the PSC Administrator, in collaboration with the institution and the national accreditation council where appropriate, will establish the dates for the pre-visit and on-site visit.

4. Idaho maintains a partnership agreement with a national accreditation council. Therefore, institutions seeking national accreditation coordinate their accreditation visit by the national team with their program approval for certification visit by the state team. Both the state approval team and the national accreditation team visit the campus and conduct reviews at the same time. Institutions that are not nationally accredited must write an Institutional Report addressing all national standards (See Appendix C: Institutional Unit, and Program Report Guidelines). For institutions that are not nationally accredited, the state team will review and evaluate both state and national standards.

5. **Approximately six months** prior to the on-site Review, the PSC Administrator, in consultation with the chair of the PSC, and the institution, will appoint the chair of the Review team. The chair will be selected from a pool of trained chairs.

PART I, SECTION II: PRE-VISIT PROCEDURES (ON-SITE or VIRTUAL)

1. The PSC Administrator will coordinate with the state review chair, the institution, and when appropriate the national chair, to schedule a pre-visit to discuss arrangements, requirements, and schedules for the on-site visit (See Appendix D: Pre-Visit Guidelines for On-Site Program Approval Reviews). If all parties agree, the pre-visit may be conducted via video, web, or telephone conferencing. The pre-visit should take place approximately six months prior to the on-site visit.

2. The pre-visit will provide guidance for the following activities during the visit:

   a. Development of a tentative schedule for the visit

   b. Identification of faculty, staff, candidates, completers, and school partners to be interviewed during the on-site visit

   c. Identification of work space, technology support, transportation needs, and other general requirements for the on-site visit

   d. Provisions for access to documents and Electronic Exhibit Room to verify the Institutional Report including the Unit and Program reports

   e. Identification of unique features of institution/programs that need to be considered by the visiting team and/or the PSC (i.e., pilot programs, off-campus centers, etc.)

3. If the institution is not seeking national accreditation, an assistant chair familiar with national standards and the accreditation process will be appointed by the PSC Administrator, in collaboration with the state team chair and the institution.

   a. The assistant chair will supervise the team reviewing the national standards

   b. The assistant chair will be involved in the pre-visit in place of the national accreditation chair

4. **Approximately six months** prior to the on-site visit, the PSC Administrator, in consultation with the institution, the chair of the PSC, and the state review chair, will appoint the remaining members of the state review team and establish the team training date. If the institution is not seeking national accreditation, additional team members familiar with national standards and review procedures will be appointed to review the institution's compliance with those standards.

   a. All team members will be trained as evaluators for each program review

b. If possible, at least one national accreditation council trained team member will serve on all program review teams, other team members may be chosen from any of the following:
   i. Public school teachers and administrators
   ii. State Department of Education personnel
   iii. Higher education faculty or administrators
   iv. Retired teachers/administrators
   v. National accreditation council trained

c. The size of the team will be dependent upon the number of programs and the size of the institution being evaluated.
   i. Typically the team consists of 8-16 members, plus at least one (1) member of the Division of Certification and Professional Standards serving as state observer.
   ii. If a national accreditation council is not reviewing the unit, the team may be larger to accommodate the review of national standards.

PART I, SECTION III: THE FULL UNIT REVIEW

1. Prior to the on-site review, the team members will familiarize themselves with The *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel* manual and rubrics used for program assessment for their assigned content areas.

2. The *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel*, National Accreditation Standards, and State-Specific Requirements will be the criteria for evaluating all programs. Team member bias and personal preferences will not influence the review of the institution. Any areas for improvement will specifically address the standards.

3. Individual State Team Members Shall:

   a. Be provided with the Rubric for State Approval for Certification document for the program they are reviewing.

   b. Follow a visitation/interview schedule as determined by the state chair and the institution.

   c. Work collaboratively with other members of the team.

   d. Determine the institution's compliance with standards by reviewing evidence from the following sources:
      i. Exhibits
      ii. Observations
      iii. Interviews of candidates, student teachers, cooperating teachers, program completers, employers of recent completers, and faculty

e. Consider evidence presented by the institution relative to the standards. The standards will be the only lens through which the programs are evaluated. Team member bias and personal preferences will not influence the review.

f. Determine if the institution is doing what it purports to be doing and if it is in compliance with the standards. Statements a team member makes regarding the institution's programs will be substantiated with specific facts and directly related to the standards.

g. Document all visits, interviews, and interviewees and submit the list to the state review chair.

h. Discuss any areas of concern with the state review chair prior to speaking with institution faculty or staff.

i. Keep all gathered information confidential and within the team.

j. Use appropriate rubrics to determine if a standard is judged to be Unacceptable, Acceptable, or Target (See Appendix A: Rubric for State Approval).

k. Use the institution's evidence and artifacts to provide a written response for each requirement and judge if the institution's compliance with the requirement is Unacceptable, Acceptable or Target.

l. Document all sources of evidence.

4. When data gathering and analysis are complete, the state team shall:

a. Recommend Approved, Not Approved, or Conditionally Approved for each program. Not approved and/or conditionally approved programs must include a summary of all areas found Unacceptable with accompanying rationale. Areas for improvement will be stated objectively without opinion or specific recommendation as to how the area for improvement should be addressed.

b. Make all reasonable attempts to reach consensus on recommendations for each program before the end of the on-site visit. If consensus is not reached, a vote may be taken to determine the recommendation. If that occurs, it must be reported as a note to the PSC.

c. Make all reasonable attempts to come to a consensus on recommendations for each national accreditation council standard, if the team is reviewing national standards. If consensus is not reached, a vote may be taken to determine the recommendation. If that occurs it must be reported as a note to the PSC.

d. Submit the final version of the portion of the report for which he/she is responsible to the team chair prior to leaving campus. An agreed upon word

processing program will be used, and the document will be formatted according to the template(s) provided. It is recommended that the team chair receive these portions of the report in both electronic and hard copy.

5. The state team chair will conduct an exit interview with the institution to discuss the team's preliminary findings.

PART I, SECTION IV: POST REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. After the On-Site Review:

    a. The state team chair compiles the individual program summaries, rationales and recommendations in the state team report within 30 days of the review.

    b. The state team chair will submit the compiled state team report to the state team members for review to ensure accuracy. The team members will have one week to respond before the chair submits the state team report to the institution.

    c. Prior to submitting the state team report to the PSC Administrator, the state review chair will send the report to the institution to provide an opportunity to review the document and suggest corrections of factual error. The institution will return the copy with suggestions for correction to the team chair within two weeks. Suggestions of corrections will be made in the margins of the document and not in the actual text. The team chair will make the final decision regarding changes in the team report.

    d. The state team chair shall submit the final state team report to the PSC Administrator.

    e. The PSC Administrator will review the report and format as necessary. Changes will be made in consultation with the team chair.

    f. Prior to submitting the report to the PSC, the PSC Administrator will send the final copy of the report to the institution.

2. **Within 30 working days after** receipt of the report from the PSC Administrator, the institution may submit a rejoinder to the PSC Administrator for consideration by the PSC. The rejoinder will include points or documents possibly overlooked by the state team or clarification of concerns outlined in the report. The rejoinder shall address the program as it existed at the time of the review.
    a. An institution may also add program improvements. For example, if a program is recommended Not Approved, an institution may include information on plans to revise the program so that it would meet standards. This plan would be reviewed along with the state team report, allowing the possibility of a conditional approval.

9

3. **Approximately 90 calendar days after** the on-site review the PSC Administrator will submit, in coordination with the team chair, the final team report, the rejoinder, the national accreditation council report, and the national accreditation council rejoinder (if one has been submitted by the institution) to the PSC.

4. At the next regularly scheduled meeting of the PSC, the Standards Committee (subcommittee of the PSC) reviews the state report to consider the information contained in the final report and the institutional rejoinder. The Standards Committee will review the findings and recommendations of the state team and the rejoinder, as well as the national accreditation council team report and rejoinder. The chair of the state review team and the institution are invited to the meeting of the Standards Committee and may be asked to respond to questions concerning either the content of the report or the rejoinder.

5. The Standards Committee makes recommendations to the PSC regarding individual program approvals for certification. A recommendation of Approved, Conditionally Approved, or Not Approved is determined for each program. The PSC will not submit the final report for program approval until the national accreditation council has posted their decision. If the institution chooses to appeal the national accreditation council's decision, the PSC will wait until the appeal has been resolved to issue their final recommendation to the State Board of Education.

6. The PSC considers the recommendations of the Standards Committee. The PSC shall take action on the recommendations of the Standards Committee and submit their recommendation to the State Board of Education.

7. The PSC will submit to the State Board of Education the team report and recommendations concerning the institution's performance, based on state and national accreditation council standards. The institution's performance on national accreditation council standards can impact the approval of all programs offered by the institution. If an institution fails to meet the national accreditation council standards the PSC will recommend either conditional approval or non-approval of all programs. Institutions not seeking national accreditation will be reviewed by the state team and those decisions will be treated the same as if there had been national accreditation council partnership reviews.

8. The State Board of Education has the authority and responsibility to make the final program approval for certification decision and notifies the institution of the official action via the PSC Administrator.

9. The decision of the State Board of Education regarding the educator preparation unit and/or its programs is effective immediately. A State Board approved educator preparation program allows the institution to recommend education graduates initial Idaho certification.

10. Programs that are Conditionally Approved require a subsequent, Focused Visit. The Focused Visit will be scheduled and conducted on-site in conjunction with the State-Specific Requirements review within three years of the Full Unit Review.

PART I, SECTION V: PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT APPROVED

1. Any institution wishing to appeal a unit or program standard decision by the State Board of Education will submit the appeal in writing to the State Board of Education. The appeals process of the State Board of Education will be followed.

2. The State Board of Education will notify the PSC Administrator and the institution of the appeal decision.

3. If the State Board of Education maintains their decision to issue the Not-Approved status of a program, that program may reapply as a new program through the New Program Desk Review process.

4. If a program is not approved, candidates currently enrolled in the institution's program are still eligible for certification in Idaho as long as the program is completed within a two-year period from the State Board's decision to deny approval. No new candidates may be admitted to a program that is not approved.

   a. All candidates enrolled in programs denied approval by the State Board of Education will be immediately informed by the institution of the State Board's decision with a notification letter.

   b. A copy of the institution's notification letter, with a list of candidates who were sent the letter, will be provided to the PSC by the institution.

PART II: STATE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS REVIEW PROCEDURES
Concurrent with every Full Unit Review, then every third year following the unit's full review, a State-Specific Requirements Review shall be conducted. If programs are conditionally approved during the above-mentioned full review, the Focused Visit for said programs shall be held concurrently with the State-Specific Requirements Review.

PART II, SECTION I: NOTIFICATION OF AND PREPARATION FOR A STATE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

1. **Approximately one year** after the Full Unit review the institution contacts the PSC Administrator regarding the approaching State-Specific Requirements Review. The following information will be discussed:

   a. The purpose of the Review and the procedures described in the *Manual of Instructions for State Approval of Idaho School Personnel Preparation Programs*

   b. Time lines and general provisions for the State Specific Review team

   c. Composition of review team.

   d. The dates for the State Specific Requirement review and team training.

2. **Approximately six months** prior to the on-site Review, the PSC Administrator, in consultation with the chair of the PSC, and the institution, will appoint the chair of the Review team. The chair will be selected from a pool of trained chairs.

3. **Approximately three months** prior to the on-site Review, the PSC Administrator, in consultation with the institution, and the state review chair, will appoint the remaining members of the state review team.

   a. All team members will be trained as evaluators for each state-specific requirement.

   b. Team members may be chosen from any of the following:
      i. Public school teachers, administrators, and school board members
      ii. Business or community representatives
      iii. Higher education faculty or administrators
      iv. Retired teachers/administrators
      v. National accreditation council trained

PART II, SECTION II: THE STATE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

1. Prior to the on-site visit, the team members will familiarize themselves with their assigned state-specific requirements and rubric.

2. The State-Specific Requirements will be the sole criteria for evaluating all programs. Team member bias and personal preferences will not influence the review of the institution.

3. Individual State Team Members shall:

   a. Be provided with the Rubric for State-Specific Requirements for the requirements they are reviewing.

   b. Follow a visitation/interview schedule as determined by the state chair and the institution.

   c. Work collaboratively with other members of the team.

   e. Determine the institution's compliance with standards by reviewing evidence from the following sources:
      i. exhibits
      ii. observations
      iii. interviews of candidates, student teachers, cooperating teachers, program completers, employers of recent completers, and faculty

   d. Consider evidence presented by the institution relative to the State-Specific Requirements. The State-Specific Requirements will be the only lens through which the programs are evaluated. Team member bias and personal preferences will not influence the review.

   e. Determine if the institution is doing what it purports to be doing and if it is in compliance with the State-Specific Requirements. Statements a team member makes regarding the institutions programs will be substantiated with specific facts and directly related to the State-Specific Requirements.

   f. Document all visits, interviews, and interviewees and submit the list to the state review chair.

   g. Discuss any areas of concern with the state review chair prior to speaking with institution faculty or staff.

   h. Keep all gathered information confidential and within the team.

   i. Use the appropriate rubric to determine if a requirement is judged to be Unacceptable, Acceptable, or Target (See Appendix A: Rubric for State Approval).

j. Use the Institution's evidence and artifacts to provide a written response for each requirement and judge if the institution's compliance with the requirement is Unacceptable, Acceptable, or Target.

k. Prepare a written summary for each State-Specific Requirement, including a rationale for any area found Unacceptable with areas for improvement cited.

l. Include evidence with multiple sources of documentation.

4. When data gathering and analysis are complete, the state team shall:

a. Recommend Approved, Not Approved, or Conditionally Approved for each State-Specific Requirement. Not approved and/or conditionally approved requirements must include a summary of all areas found Unacceptable with accompanying rationale. Areas for improvement will be stated objectively without opinion or specific recommendation as to how the area for improvement should be addressed.

b. Make all reasonable attempts to come to a consensus on recommendations for each State-Specific Requirement before the end of the on-site review. If consensus is not reached, a vote may be taken to determine the recommendation. If that occurs it must be reported as a note to the PSC.

c. Submit the final version of the portion of the report for which he/she is responsible to the team chair prior to leaving campus. An agreed upon word processing program will be used and the document will be formatted according to the template(s) provided. It is recommended that the team chair receive these portions of the report in both electronic and hard copy.

5. The chair shall conduct an exit interview with the institution discussing the team's preliminary findings.

PART II, SECTION III: POST STATE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

1. After the On-Site Review:

a. The state team chair compiles the state-specific requirements summaries, rationales, and recommendations in the state team report within 30 days of the visit.

b. The state team chair will submit the compiled state team report to the state team members for review to ensure accuracy. The team members will have one week to respond before the chair submits the state team report to the institution.

c. Prior to submitting the state team report to the PSC Administrator, the state review chair will send the report to the institution to provide an opportunity to review the document and suggest corrections of factual error. The institution will return the copy with suggestions for correction to the team chair within two weeks. Suggestions of corrections will be made in the margins of the document and not in the actual text. The team chair will make the final decision regarding changes in the team report.

d. The state team chair shall submit the final state team report to the PSC Administrator.

e. The PSC Administrator will review the report. Changes may be made to the format in consultation with the team chair.

f. Prior to submitting the report to the PSC, the PSC Administrator will send the final copy of the report to the institution.

2. **Within 30 working days** after receipt of the report from the PSC Administrator, the institution may submit a rejoinder to the PSC Administrator for consideration by the PSC. The rejoinder will include points or documents possibly overlooked by the state team or clarification of concerns outlined in the report. The rejoinder shall address the program as it existed at the time of the review.
   a. An institution may also add program improvements. For example, if a program is recommended Not Approved, an institution may include information on plans to revise the program so that it would meet standards. This plan would be reviewed along with the state team report, allowing the possibility of a conditional approval.

3. **Approximately 90 calendar days after** the on-site Review, the PSC Administrator will submit, in coordination with the team chair, the final team report, and the rejoinder, to the Standards Committee of the PSC.

4. At the next regularly scheduled meeting of the PSC, the Standards Committee (subcommittee of the PSC) will review the state report to consider the information contained in the final report and the institutional rejoinder. The Standards Committee will review the findings and recommendations of the state team and the rejoinder. The chair of the state review team and the institution are invited to the meeting of the Standards Committee and may be asked to respond to questions concerning either the content of the report or the rejoinder.

5. The Standards Committee makes recommendations to the PSC regarding each State-Specific Requirement. A recommendation of Approved, Conditionally Approved, or Not Approved is determined for each State-Specific Requirement standard under review.

6. The PSC considers the recommendations of the Standards Committee. The PSC shall take action on the recommendations of the Standards Committee and submit their recommendation to the State Board of Education.

7. The State Board of Education has the authority and responsibility to make the final program approval for certification decision and notifies the institution of the official action via the PSC Administrator.

8. The decision of the State Board of Education regarding the educator preparation unit and/or its programs is effective immediately. A State Board-educator preparation program for certification allows the institution to recommend education graduates for initial Idaho certification.

PART II, SECTION IV: PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT APPROVED

1. Any institution wishing to appeal a State Specific Requirements Review decision by the State Board of Education will submit the appeal in writing to the State Board of Education. The appeals process of the State Board of Education will be followed.

2. The State Board of Education will notify the PSC Administrator and the institution of the appeal decision.

3. If the State Board of Education maintains their decision to issue the Not-Approved status of a program, that program may reapply as a new program through the New Program Desk Review process.

4. If a program is not approved by the State Board of Education, or loses its approved status after a State Specific Review, candidates currently enrolled in the institution's program are still eligible for certification in Idaho as long as the program is completed within a two-year period from the State Board's decision to deny approval. No new candidates may be admitted to a program that is not approved.

   a. All candidates enrolled in programs denied approval by the State Board of Education will be immediately informed by the institution of the State Board's decision with a notification letter.

   b. A copy of the institution's notification letter, with a list of candidates who were sent the letter, will be provided to the PSC by the institution.

PART III: FOCUSED VISIT PROCEDURES
Units or programs that are Conditionally Approved during a full on-site unit review require a subsequent, Focused Visit. The Focused Visit must be scheduled and completed within three years of the on-site unit review.

In addition to the Focused Visit, a State-Specific Requirements Review shall be conducted. ([See State-Specific Requirements Review procedures](#))

As a result of a Focused Visit, Conditionally Approved programs or unit standards can only receive a decision of Approved or Not Approved unless the conditional approval is based solely on the lack of program completers.

PART III, SECTION I: NOTIFICATION OF AND PREPARATION FOR A FOCUSED VISIT

1. **Approximately one year prior** the anticipated Focused Visit in which a Conditional Approval/s was issued to the unit and/or program during a Full Unit Review, the institution contacts the PSC Administrator regarding the approaching Focused Visit. The following information will be discussed:

   a. The purpose of visit and the procedures described in the *Manual of Instructions for State Approval of Idaho School Personnel Preparation Programs*

   b. Timelines and general provisions for the Focused Visit.

   c. Composition of Focused Visit team.

   d. The dates for the Focused Visit and team training.

   e. The version of the *[Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel](#)*. The institution may choose the version that was used at the time of the Full Unit Review or the current version.

4. **Approximately six months** prior to the on-site Focused Visit, the PSC Administrator, in consultation with the chair of the PSC, and the institution, will appoint the chair of the Focused Visit team. The chair will be selected from a pool of trained chairs.

5. **Approximately three months** prior to the on-site Focused Visit, the PSC Administrator, in consultation with the institution, and the state review chair, will appoint the remaining members of the state review team.

   a. All team members will be trained as evaluators for each Focused Visit.

   b. Team members may be chosen from any of the following:
      i. Public school teachers, administrators, and school board members

    ii. Business or community representatives
   iii. Higher education faculty or administrators
   iv. Retired teachers/administrators
    v. National accreditation council trained

PART III, SECTION II: THE FOCUSED VISIT

1. Prior to the on-site visit, the team members will familiarize themselves with the entire Focused Visit Program Report and carefully review their assigned content areas and the response to the standards where there are areas of improvement cited. The *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel* manual and the rubrics used for program assessment shall also be carefully reviewed.

2. The *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel* will be the sole criteria for evaluating all programs. Team member bias and personal preferences will not influence the review of the institution.

3. Individual State Team Members shall:

   a. Be provided with the Rubric for State Approval for Certification document for the program they are reviewing.

   b. Follow a visitation/interview schedule as determined by the state chair and the institution.

   c. Work collaboratively with other members of the team.

   f. Determine the institution's compliance with standards by reviewing evidence from the following sources:
       i. Exhibits.
      ii. Observations.
     iii. Interviews of candidates, student teachers, cooperating teachers, program completers, employers of recent completers, and faculty.

   d. Consider evidence presented by the institution relative to the standards. The standards will be the only lens through which the programs are evaluated. Team member bias and personal preferences will not influence the review.

   e. Determine if the institution is doing what it purports to be doing and if it is in compliance with the standards. Statements a team member makes regarding the institutions programs will be substantiated with specific facts and directly related to the standards.

   f. Document all visits, interviews, and interviewees and submit the list to the state review chair.

g. Discuss any areas of concern with the state review chair prior to speaking with institution faculty or staff.

h. Keep all gathered information confidential and within the team.

i. Use appropriate rubrics to determine if a standard is judged to be Unacceptable, Acceptable, or Target (See Appendix A: Rubric for State Approval).

j. Use the Institution's evidence and artifacts, to provide a written response for each standard and judge if the institution's compliance with the standard is Unacceptable, Acceptable, or Target.

k. Prepare a written summary for each program, including a rationale for any area found Unacceptable with areas for improvement cited.

l. Include evidence with multiple sources of documentation.

4. When data gathering and analysis are complete, the state team shall:

a. Recommend Approved, Not Approved, or Conditionally Approved for each program. Not approved and/or conditionally approved programs must include a summary of all areas found Unacceptable with accompanying rationale. Areas for improvement will be stated objectively without opinion or specific recommendation as to how the area for improvement should be addressed.

b. Make all reasonable attempts to reach consensus on recommendations for each program before the end of the on-site visit. If consensus is not reached, a vote may be taken to determine the recommendation. If that occurs it must be reported as a note to the PSC.

a. Make all reasonable attempts to come to a consensus on recommendations for each national accreditation council standard, if the team is reviewing national standards. If consensus is not reached, a vote may be taken to determine the recommendation. If that occurs it must be reported as a note to the PSC.

b. Submit the final version of the portion of the report for which he/she is responsible to the team chair prior to leaving campus. An agreed upon word processing program will be used, and the document will be formatted according to the template(s) provided. It is recommended that the team chair receive these portions of the report in both electronic and hard copy.

5. The chair shall conduct an exit interview with the institution discussing the team's preliminary findings.

PART III, SECTION III: POST FOCUSED VISIT PROCEDURES

1. After the On-Site Focused Visit:

   a. The state review chair compiles the individual program summaries, rationales, and recommendations in the state team report within 30 days of the visit.

   b. The state review chair will submit the compiled state team report to the state team members for review to ensure accuracy. The team members will have one week to respond before the chair submits the state team report to the institution.

   c. Prior to submitting the state team report to the PSC Administrator, the state review chair will send the report to the institution to provide an opportunity to review the document and suggest corrections of factual error. The institution will return the copy with suggestions for correction to the team chair within two weeks. Suggestions of corrections will be made in the margins of the document and not in the actual text. The team chair will make the final decision regarding changes in the team report.

   d. The state review chair shall submit the final state team report to the PSC Administrator.

   e. The PSC Administrator will review the report. Changes may be made to the format in consultation with the team chair.

   f. The PSC Administrator will send the final copy of the report to the institution and to each member of the Standards Committee of the PSC for consideration prior to the next regularly PSC meeting.

2. **Within 30 working days after** receipt of the report from the PSC Administrator, the institution may submit a rejoinder to the PSC Administrator for consideration by the PSC. The rejoinder will include points or documents possibly overlooked by the state team or clarification of concerns outlined in the report. The rejoinder shall address the program as it existed at the time of the review.
   a. An institution may also add program improvements. For example, if a program is recommended Not Approved, an institution may include information on plans to revise the program so that it would meet standards. This plan would be reviewed along with the state team report, allowing the possibility of a conditional approval.

3. **Approximately 90 calendar days after** the on-site Focused Visit, the PSC Administrator will submit, in coordination with the team chair, the final team report, and the rejoinder, to the Standards Committee of the PSC.

4. At the next regularly scheduled meeting of the PSC, the Standards Committee reviews the state report to consider the information contained in the final report and the institutional rejoinder. The Standards Committee will review the findings and

recommendations of the state team and the rejoinder. The chair of the state review team and the institution are invited to the meeting of the Standards Committee and may be asked to respond to questions concerning either the content of the report or the rejoinder.

5. The Standards Committee makes recommendations to the PSC regarding individual program approvals. A recommendation of Approved, Conditionally Approved, or Not Approved is determined for each program under review.

6. The PSC considers the recommendations of the Standards Committee. The PSC shall take action on the recommendations of the Standards Committee and submit their recommendation to the State Board of Education.

7. The State Board of Education has the authority and responsibility to make the final program approval decision and notifies the institution of the official action via the PSC Administrator.

8. The decision of the State Board of Education regarding the educator preparation unit and/or its programs is effective immediately. A State Board-educator preparation program for certification allows the institution to recommend education graduates for initial Idaho certification.

PART III, SECTION IV: PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT APPROVED

1. Any institution wishing to appeal a unit or program standard decision by the State Board of Education will submit the appeal in writing to the State Board of Education. The appeals process of the State Board of Education will be followed.

2. The State Board of Education will notify the PSC Administrator and the institution of the appeal decision.

3. If the State Board of Education maintains their decision to issue the Not-Approved status of a program, that program may reapply as a new program through the New Program Desk Review process.

4. If a program is not approved, candidates currently enrolled in the institution's program are still eligible for certification in Idaho as long as the program is completed within a two-year period from the State Board's decision to deny approval. No new candidates may be admitted to a program that is not approved.

    a. All candidates enrolled in programs denied approval by the State Board of Education will be immediately informed by the institution of the State Board's decision with a notification letter.

b. A copy of the institution's notification letter, with a list of candidates who were sent the letter, will be provided to the PSC by the institution.

PART IV: NEW PROGRAM DESK REVIEW PROCEDURES

PART IV, SECTION 1: NEW PROGRAM DESK REVIEW PROCEDURES
Institutions interested in adding new programs for certification that have not yet been approved shall undergo a New Program Desk Review by the PSC.

1. The institution completes New Program for Certification Request (Appendix I) and submits to the PSC Administrator. No on-site visit is required for a desk review. The information to include in the request consists of the following:

   a. Evidence that the program will cover the knowledge and performances outlined in the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel*. Pupil Personal Preparation programs will only need to address content specific standards.

   b. New Program Course Requirements

2. The Standards Committee of the PSC reviews the proposal at their next regularly scheduled meeting. The Standards Committee will make a recommendation of Conditionally Approved or Not Approved to the full PSC.

3. The PSC will make their recommendation to the State Board of Education.

4. Once a program is granted Conditional Approval the institution may admit candidates to the program.

APPENDIX A: FULL UNIT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Full Unit Review Checklist

One Year Prior to On-site Visit
- ☐ Institution notifies the PSC Administrator with a letter of intent to include list of programs for review.
- ☐ PSC Administrator and institution discuss the Full Unit Review process.
- ☐ Establish dates for the pre-visit and on-site visit (in collaboration with national accreditation council, PSC Administrator, and institution).

Approximately Six months prior to Full Unit Review
- ☐ Appoint the chair of the Full Unit Review team and state review team members (in collaboration with PSC Administrator, chair of PSC and institution).

Pre-visit
- ☐ Discuss arrangements, requirements, and schedules for the on-site visit.

On-site Visit
- ☐ State review team reviews evidence and will make recommendation for Approved, Conditionally Approved, or Not Approved for each program.
- ☐ Exit interview with institution to discuss preliminary findings.

Post-visit
- ☐ State team chair submits draft of state team report to state review team within 30 days of the on-site visit.
- ☐ State review team will respond to state team chair within one week any corrections.
- ☐ State team chair sends state team report to the institution to review the document and suggest corrections of factual error.
- ☐ Institution to provide correction of factual error in the margins within two weeks.
- ☐ State team chair will submit the final state team report to the PSC Administrator.
- ☐ PSC Administrator submits final state team report to the institution.
- ☐ Institution may submit a rejoinder to the PSC Administrator for consideration by the PSC within 30 working days of receiving the final state team report.
- ☐ The PSC Administrator will submit the final state team report, the rejoinder, the national accreditation council report, and the national accreditation council rejoinder to the PSC.
- ☐ At the next regularly scheduled PSC meeting, the Standards Committee reviews the reports, findings, and recommendations of the state team. The Standards Committee makes recommendations to the PSC. The PSC considers the recommendation and will submit their recommendation to the State Board of Education. The decision of the State Board of Education is effective immediately.

The rubric that follows is an example of a rubric for program approval for certification for Elementary Education programs. The rubric for each program will be similar; the difference is that each rubric is based on the individual program standards. For example, the standards that are indicated in the Elementary Education rubric are the enhancement standards for Elementary Education found in the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel*. If the program is mathematics, then the standards would be the enhancement standards for mathematics.

Rubrics for the Idaho Standards for Elementary Education Teachers

State Program Approval Rubric for Teacher Preparation Programs

Candidate Performance Relative to the Idaho Standards

The *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel* provides the framework for the approval of educator preparation programs. As such, the standards/principles set the criteria by which teacher preparation programs are reviewed for state program approval.

The following rubric is used to evaluate the extent to which teacher preparation programs prepare teachers who meet the standards. The rubric is designed to be used with each individual preparation program (i.e., Elementary, Special Education, Secondary English, Secondary Science–Biology, etc.).

Consistent with NCATE accreditation standards, the rubric describes three levels of performance (i.e., unacceptable, acceptable, and target) for each of the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel*. The rubric shall be used to make holistic judgments. Performance indicators provide the lens through which the State Program Approval Team evaluates the institution's evidence that candidates meet the Idaho standards. The institution is expected to provide information about candidate performance related to the Idaho Standards for Elementary Teachers.

Standards 1: Knowledge of Subject Matter - The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline taught and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Knowledge

1. *The teacher understands concepts of language arts and child development in order to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas.*
2. *The teacher understands the importance of providing a purpose and context to use the communication skills taught across the curriculum.*
3. *The teacher understands how children learn language, the basic sound structure of language, semantics and syntactics, diagnostic tools, and test data to improve student reading ability.*
4. *The teacher understands the fundamental concepts and the need to integrate STEM disciplines including physical, life, and earth and space Sciences, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics as well as the applications of STEM disciplines to technology, personal and social perspectives, history, unifying concepts, and inquiry processes used in the discovery of new knowledge.*

5. The teacher understands major concepts, procedures, and reasoning processes of mathematics that define number systems and number sense, computation, geometry, measurement, statistics and probability, and algebra in order to foster student understanding and use of patterns, quantities, and spatial relationships that represent phenomena, solve problems, and manage data. The teacher understands the relationship between inquiry and the development of mathematical thinking and reasoning.

6. The teacher knows the major concepts and modes of inquiry for social studies: the integrated study of history, geography, government/civics, economics, social/cultural and other related areas to develop students' abilities to make informed decisions as global citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society and interdependent world.

7. The teacher understands the content, functions, aesthetics, and achievements of the arts, such as dance, music, theater, and visual arts as avenues for communication, inquiry, and insight.

8. The teacher understands the comprehensive nature of students' physical, intellectual, social, and emotional well-being in order to create opportunities for developing and practicing skills that contribute to overall wellness.

9. The teacher understands human movement and physical activities as central elements for active, healthy lifestyles and enhanced quality of life.

10. The teacher understands connections across curricula and within a discipline among concepts, procedures, and applications. Further, the teacher understands its use in motivating students, building understanding, and encouraging application of knowledge, skills, and ideas to real life issues and future career applications.

11. The teacher understands the individual and interpersonal values of respect, caring, integrity, and responsibility that enable students to effectively and appropriately communicate and interact with peers and adults.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1.1 Knowledge Understanding Subject Matter	The program provides minimal evidence that candidates have an adequate knowledge of elementary subject content, and understand the importance of integrated curriculum The program provides minimal evidence that candidates understand the relationship between inquiry and the development of thinking and reasoning.	The program provides evidence that candidates have adequate knowledge of elementary subject content, and understand the importance of integrated curriculum. The program provides evidence that candidates understand the relationship between inquiry and the development of thinking and reasoning. These indicators are further defined in the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel.*	The program provides evidence that candidates have an in-depth understanding of elementary subject content, and the importance of implementing an integrated curriculum. The program provides evidence that candidates have an in-depth understanding of the relationship between inquiry and the development of thinking and reasoning. These indicators are further defined in the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel.*

1.1 (INSERT YOUR TEXT HERE) SAMPLE: Candidate work samples, unit plans, graded reflection papers, and instructional units demonstrate attention to understanding the importance of integrated curriculum and the relationship between inquiry and the development of thinking and reasoning.

Performance
1. *The teacher models the appropriate and accurate use of language arts.*
2. *The teacher demonstrates competence in language arts, reading, STEM disciplines, social studies, the arts, health education, and physical education. Through inquiry the teacher facilitates thinking and reasoning.*
3. *The teacher provides a purpose and context to use the communication skills taught. The teacher integrates these communication skills across the curriculum.*
4. *The teacher conceptualizes, develops, and implements a balanced curriculum that includes language arts, reading, STEM disciplines, social studies, the arts, health education, and physical education.*
5. *Using his/her integrated knowledge of the curricula, the teacher motivates students, builds understanding, and encourages application of knowledge, skills, and ideas to real life issues, democratic citizenship, and future career applications.*
6. *The teacher models respect, integrity, caring, and responsibility in order to promote and nurture a school environment that fosters these qualities.*

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1.2 Performance: Making Subject Matter Meaningful	The program provides minimal evidence that candidates demonstrate an adequate ability to use materials, instructional strategies and/or methods that promote relevant application of knowledge and skills. The program provides minimal evidence that candidates make learning and subject matter experiences meaningful to students. The program provides minimal evidence that candidates teach using inquiry and exploration.	The program provides evidence that candidates demonstrate an adequate ability to use materials, instructional strategies and/or methods that illustrate and promote relevance and real life application making learning experiences and subject matter meaningful to most students. The program provides evidence that candidates teach using inquiry and exploration.	The program provides evidence that candidates demonstrate an in-depth ability to use, create, and evaluate materials, instructional strategies and/or methods for relevance and comprehensiveness. The program provides evidence that candidates develop and implement learning activities that foster multiple viewpoints making learning experiences and subject matter meaningful to all students. The program provides evidence that candidates integrate inquiry and exploration across the curriculum.

1.2 (INSERT YOUR TEXT HERE) SAMPLE: Observing language arts teacher candidates, analyzing teacher lesson plans, and interviewing university supervisors provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an adequate ability to use resources and learning activities that support instructional and curriculum goals that reflect effective teaching practice, and accurately reflect language arts content.

Standard 2: Knowledge of Human Development and Learning - The teacher understands how students learn and develop, and provides opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.

Knowledge
1. *The teacher understands that young children's and early adolescents' literacy and language development influence learning and instructional decisions.*
2. *The teacher understands the cognitive processes of attention, memory, sensory processing, and reasoning, and recognizes the role of inquiry and exploration in developing these abilities.*

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2.1 Knowledge Understanding Human Development and Learning	The program provides minimal evidence that candidates understand how young children and early adolescents learn. The program provides minimal evidence that candidates understand how literacy and language development influence learning and instructional decisions. The program provides minimal evidence that candidates understand the role of cognition, inquiry and exploration in learning.	The program provides evidence that candidates understand how young children and early adolescents learn. The program provides evidence that candidates understand how literacy and language development influence learning and instructional decisions. The program provides evidence that candidates understand the role of cognition, inquiry and exploration in learning.	The program provides evidence that candidates have an in-depth understanding of how young children and early adolescents learn. The program provides evidence that candidates have an in-depth understanding of how literacy and language development influence learning and instructional decisions. The program provides evidence that candidates have an in-depth understanding of the role of cognition, inquiry and exploration in learning.

2.1 (INSERT YOUR TEXT HERE) SAMPLE: Interviews with cooperating teachers, Praxis II scores, checking student files and transcripts, and perusing student work samples provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate adequate knowledge of English language arts, including the nature, value, and approaches to a variety of literary texts, print and non-print media, composing processes, and language study.

Performance
1. *The teacher designs instruction and provides opportunities for students to learn through inquiry and exploration.*

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2.2 Performance: Provide Opportunities for Development	The program provides minimal evidence that candidates demonstrate knowledge of how young children and early adolescents learn. The program provides minimal evidence that candidates design instruction or provide opportunities for students to learn through inquiry and exploration.	The program provides evidence that candidates demonstrate adequate knowledge of how young children and early adolescents learn. The program provides evidence that candidates design instruction and provide opportunities for students to learn through inquiry and exploration.	The program provides evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth understanding of how young children and early adolescents learn. The program provides evidence that candidates design instruction and provide multiple opportunities for students to learn through inquiry and exploration across the curriculum.

2.2 (INSERT YOUR TEXT HERE) SAMPLE: Observing language arts teacher candidates, analyzing teacher lesson plans, and interviewing university supervisors provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an adequate ability to use resources and learning activities that support instructional and curriculum goals that reflect effective teaching practice, and accurately reflect language arts content.

Standard 3: Modifying Instruction for Individual Needs - The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities to meet students' diverse needs and experiences.

Knowledge
1. *The teacher understands the necessity of appropriately and effectively collaborating with grade level peers, school intervention teams, parents/guardians, and community partners to meet differentiated needs of all learners.*
2. *The teacher understands that there are multiple levels of intervention and recognizes the advantages of beginning with the least intrusive.*

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3.1 Knowledge Understanding of Individual Learning Needs	The program provides little or no evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an adequate understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning.	The program provides evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an adequate understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning.	The program provides evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth understanding of how students differ in their approaches to learning.

3.1 (INSERT YOUR TEXT HERE) SAMPLE: Interviews with cooperating teachers, Praxis II scores, checking student files and transcripts, and perusing student work samples provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate in-depth knowledge and understanding of English language arts, including the nature, value, and approaches to a variety of literary texts, print and non-print media, composing processes, and language study.

Performance
1. *The teacher appropriately and effectively collaborates with grade level peers, school intervention teams, parents/guardians, and community partners to meet differentiated needs of all learners.*
2. *The teacher systematically progresses through the multiple levels of intervention, beginning with the least intrusive.*

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3.2 Performance Modifying Instruction for Individual Learning Needs	The program provides little or no evidence that teacher candidates modify instructional opportunities to support students with diverse needs.	The program provides evidence that teacher candidates modify instructional opportunities to support students with diverse needs.	The program provides evidence that teacher candidates create, evaluate, and redesign instructional opportunities to support students with diverse needs.

3.2 (INSERT YOUR TEXT HERE) SAMPLE: Observing language arts teacher candidates, analyzing teacher lesson plans, and interviewing university supervisors provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an adequate ability to use resources and learning activities that support instructional and curriculum goals that reflect effective teaching practice, and accurately reflect language arts content.

Standard 4: Multiple Instructional Strategies - The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to develop student learning. *(Same as core standard)*

Standard 5: Classroom Motivation and Management Skills - The teacher understands individual and group motivation and behavior and creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Knowledge
1. *The teacher understands the importance of teaching and re-teaching classroom expectations.*
2. *The teacher recognizes the importance of positive behavioral supports and the need to use multiple levels of intervention to support and develop appropriate behavior.*

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5.1 Knowledge Understanding of Classroom Motivation and Management Skills	The program provides little or no evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an adequate understanding of the principles of motivation and management for safe and productive student behavior.	The program provides evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an adequate understanding of the principles of motivation and management for safe and productive student behavior.	The program provides evidence that candidates display an in-depth understanding of the principles of motivation and management for safe and productive student behavior.

5.1 (INSERT YOUR TEXT HERE) SAMPLE: Interviews with cooperating teachers, Praxis II scores, checking student files and transcripts, and perusing student work samples provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate in-depth knowledge and understanding of English language arts, including the nature, value, and approaches to a variety of literary texts, print and non-print media, composing processes, and language study.

Performance
1. *The teacher consistently models and teaches classroom expectations.*
2. *The teacher utilizes positive behavioral supports and multiple levels of intervention to support and develop appropriate behavior.*

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5.2 Performance Creating, Managing, and Modifying for Safe and Positive Learning Environments	The program provides little or no evidence that teacher candidates are able to create, manage, or modify learning environments to ensure they are safe and productive.	The program provides evidence that teacher candidates are able to create, manage, and modify learning environments to ensure they are safe and productive.	The program provides evidence that teacher candidates are able to create, manage, and modify learning environment to ensure they are safe and consistently productive.

5.2 (INSERT YOUR TEXT HERE) SAMPLE: Observing language arts teacher candidates, analyzing teacher lesson plans, and interviewing university supervisors provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate an adequate ability to use resources and learning activities that support instructional and curriculum goals that reflect effective teaching practice, and accurately reflect language arts content.

Standard 6: Communication Skills - The teacher uses a variety of communication techniques to foster learning and communication skills in the classroom. *(Same as core standard)*

Standard 7: Instructional Planning Skills - The teacher plans and prepares instruction based on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, curriculum goals, and instructional strategies. *(Same as core standard)*

Standard 8: Assessment of Student Learning - The teacher understands, uses, and interprets formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and advance student performance and to determine teaching effectiveness. *(Same as core standard)*

Standard 9: Professional Commitment and Responsibility - The teacher understands, uses, and interprets formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and advance student performance and to determine teaching effectiveness. *(Same as core standard)*

Principle 10: Partnerships - The teacher interacts in a professional, effective manner with colleagues, parents, and other members of the community to support students' learning and well-being. *(Same as core standard)*

Areas for Improvement:

Recommended Action on the Elementary Education Program:

_____Approved

_____Conditionally Approved

        ☐   Insufficient Evidence

        ☐   Lack of Completers

        ☐   New Program

_____Not Approved

APPENDIX C: PROGRAMS TO BE REVIEWED

Directions for the Institution: Indicate the programs to be reviewed. Please note that the program must have already been an approved or conditionally approved program.

Initial Certification

Program	Approval Status	To be Reviewed (Y/N)
Bilingual Education		
English as a New Language (ENL)		
Communication Arts		
Journalism		
Computer Science		
Blended Early Childhood		
Elementary Education		
Engineering		
English Language Arts		
Gifted and Talented		
Health		
Literacy (Reading)		
Mathematics		
Online Teacher		
Physical Education		
Professional Technical	████████████	
Agriculture Science & Technology		
Business Technology		
Family & Consumer Sciences		
Marketing Technology		
Technology Education		
Science	████████████	
Biology		
Chemistry		
Earth and Space Science		
Natural Science		
Physical Science		
Physics		
Social Studies		
Economics		
Geography		
Government/Civics		
History		
Exceptional Child Generalist		

Blind and Visually Impaired		
Deaf/Hard of Hearing		
Teacher Leader		
Special Education Consulting Teacher		
Math Consulting Teacher		
Teacher Librarians		
Visual/Performing Arts		
Drama		
Music		
Visual Arts		
World Languages		
French		
German		
Russian		
Spanish		
School Administrators		
School Principals		
School Superintendents		
Special Education Directors		
Pupil Personnel		
School Counselors		
School Nurses		
School Psychologists		
School Social Workers		
Speech-Language Pathologist		

<u>APPENDIX D: INSTITUTIONAL REPORT GUIDELINES</u>

For national accreditation council institutions undergoing a joint review: Complete Institutional Report from the national accreditation council.

For non-national accreditation council institutions undergoing a Full Unit Review: An Institutional Report addressing all national accreditation council standards is required. See Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) website for information.

Complete Institutional Report Components
- Table of Contents
- Introduction and organization of report
- Overview: institution and its history, programs, and candidate demographics
- Overview of Educator Preparation Programs Framework including dispositions
- CAEP Standards
    - Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
    - Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
    - Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
    - Standard 4: Program Impact
    - Standard 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity
- CAEP Cross-cutting themes: Diversity and Technology and Digital Learning

APPENDIX E: PRE-VISIT GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL REVIEWS

Institution: _____

Date and Type of Visit: _____

Program(s): _____

The following items, including but not limited to, need to be addressed through the pre-visit meeting.

ROLES OF PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE VISIT
- Review the team members and their assignments
- Review the institution personnel and their assignments
- Morning meetings- institution, state review chair, and State Department of Education representative
- Decide on a final date when the institutional report is to be submitted to the Standards PSC Administrator

TRANSPORTATION
- Who will make travel arrangements? If direct billed, SDE/PSC personnel will make the arrangements. Will state team members be met and returned to the airport (if applicable)?
- Will the state team be assigned a team vehicle for transportation or will a driver be assigned?
   *To and from campus
   *To school sites

LODGING
- Hotel arrangements – If direct billing to the state is possible and when the institution has determined the lodging site, SDE/PSC personnel can make the necessary arrangements.
- Private rooms are needed for each team member.
- A team workroom is required on the institution campus.
      *Available for all days of the review

MEAL ARRANGEMENTS
- First night poster session & dinner: location, format, participants
- On-campus eating facilities
- Off-campus eating establishments
- Hotel/motel eating arrangements
- Break refreshments/snacks

Note: If any meal is organized by the college for which the state will pay, these meals and all other meals ordered by the team members will be reimbursed according to State Department of Education guidelines. It is necessary to give team members reimbursement guidelines.

SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS

- Church
- Dietary Restrictions
- Other

ASSISTANCE ARRANGEMENTS

- On-Site Work Area
  - Computers- Microsoft Office
  - Internet access
  - Printer
  - Copy machine
  - Telephone
  - Refreshments/snacks
- General Supplies
  - Name Tags
  - Pens, pencils, note pads, post-its, stapler, 3-hole punch, paper clips, flip charts and stand, shredder
- Information Items
  - Names and direct numbers of key contact people
  - Area/campus maps
    - Location of faculty offices
  - Class schedule during visit time
  - Itinerary for the visit
- Personnel Assistance
  - Secretarial assistance
  - Student assistance
  - Technical assistance for the computers

SECURITY

- For state team work room and equipment
- State review chair needs a key to the locked work area

ON-SITE WORK AREA/EXHIBIT ROOM

- Available in the afternoon of the first day
- Hard copies of the Institutional and/or Program Report and access to web-based electronic reports
- Documents that support the institutional report
- Index of documents
- Minutes of all major meetings
- Other information/reports that support the work of the institution related to preparation of school personnel
  - i.e., student work samples, portfolios, assessment plan

OVERVIEW AND ORIENTATION

- Day 1: Team training and informal institutional overview and presentation of conceptual framework
- Day 2: campus and institution tour, and evening poster session prior to dinner

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
- Interviews shall not convene sooner than the afternoon of the second day
    - Staff/faculty interviews
    - Candidate/completer interviews
    - Cooperating teachers and building administrators
    - School site visits
    - Other visits to support institution

EXIT INTERVIEW
- Location
- Participants
    - Education Chair/Director/Dean
    - President and/or Provost
    - National Accreditation Council Chair
    - State Review Chair
    - State Department Representative

APPENDIX F: STATE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

State Specific Requirements (SSRs)

SSR 1: Knowledge and Performance Foundation for the application of Instructional Shifts for Language Arts

1. Building Knowledge through Content–rich Nonfiction
   - Candidates prepare students to build knowledge and academic language through a balance of content rich, complex nonfiction and literary texts.
   - Candidates understand how to evenly balance informational and literary reading in all content areas to ensure that students can independently build knowledge in all disciplines through reading and writing.
2. Reading, writing and speaking grounded in evidence from text, both literary and informational
   - Candidates facilitate student Reading/Writing/Speaking that is grounded in evidence from the text, across the curriculum.
   - Candidates create lessons for students that require use of evidence from texts to present careful analyses, well-defended claims, and clear information
3. Regular practice with complex text and its academic language
   - Candidates understand how to build a staircase of complexity in texts students must read to be ready for the demand of college and careers
   - Candidates provide opportunities for students to use digital resources strategically, and to conduct research and create and present material in oral and written form.
   - Candidates foster an environment in which students collaborate effectively for a variety of purposes while also building independent literacy skills.

SSR 2: Knowledge and Performance Foundation for the application of Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Standards

1. Phonics
2. Phonological Awareness
3. Fluency
4. Vocabulary
5. Comprehension
6. Writing
7. Assessment Strategies
8. Intervention Strategies

SSR 3: Knowledge and performance foundation for the application of Instructional Shifts for Mathematics

1. Focus strongly on the math Standards for Practice.
   - Candidates understand how to significantly narrow and deepen the focus on the major work of each grade so that students can gain strong foundations: solid conceptual understanding, a high degree of procedural skill and fluency, and the ability to apply the math they know to solve problems inside and outside the math classroom.
2. Coherence- Thinking across grades and linking to major topics within grades
   - Candidates understand the progression of standards from grade to grade and can carefully connect learning across the grades.

3. *Rigor- In major topics pursue conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application with equal intensity.*
   - *Candidates understand how to support conceptual understanding and promote student's ability to access and apply complex concepts and procedures from a number of perspectives across core content areas.*

SSR 4: Knowledge and Performance Foundation for the application of Instructional Technology and Data Literacy
1. *Fluency using Student Data Systems Evidence that candidates are able to access and analyze data to make data-driven curricular decisions*
   - *Candidates understand how to support conceptual understanding and promote student's ability to access and apply complex concepts and procedures from a number of perspectives across core content areas.*
2. *Appropriate Integration of Educational Technology*
   - *Candidates meet pre-service technology requirement in the [Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel](#).*

SSR 5: Units demonstration of robust Clinical Practice and use of Performance Assessments
1. *Robust Clinical Practice and Internships*
   - *Educator preparation program implements the Idaho Standards for Model Preservice Clinical Teaching Experience as written and approved by ICEP.*
2. *Accurate and Informative Performance Assessments*
   - *Candidates receive accurate performance evaluations which include formative and summative assessments. A proficient score on a summative evaluation using the Danielson Framework is required in order to recommend a candidate for certification.*

SSR 6: Candidates meet Idaho state certification requirements per IDAPA Rule
1. *Random selection of candidates' institutional recommendations provides verification of Idaho state certification requirements per IDAPA Rule.*
   - *Random selection of institutional recommendations for initial certification, including alternative authorizations.*
   - *The institution must have a State Board approved program in order to issue the candidate an institutional recommendation for initial certification.*
   - *Random selection of institutional recommendations for adding endorsements, including alternative authorizations.*
     - *If a candidate is currently certified in Idaho and wishes to add an endorsement in a new content area, the institution is able to work with the candidate to develop a plan to include: content, pedagogy, and performance.*
     - *The institution may issue the candidate an institutional recommendation once the content, pedagogy, and performance has been demonstrated by the candidate regardless of whether the institution has a State Board approved program in the new content area. This is for adding endorsements only.*

APPENDIX G: FOCUSED VISIT CHECKLIST

Focused Visit Checklist

One Year Prior to On-site Visit
- ☐ Institution contacts the PSC Administrator to discuss the Focused Visit process.
- ☐ Establish dates for the pre-visit and on-site visit (in collaboration with national accreditation council, PSC Administrator and institution).

Approximately Six Months Prior to On-site Visit
- ☐ Appoint the chair of the Focused Visit review team (in collaboration with PSC Administrator, chair of PSC and institution).

Approximately Three Months Prior to On-site Visit
- ☐ Appoint state review team members (in collaboration with PSC Administrator, state review chair and institution).

On-site Visit
- ☐ State review team reviews evidence and will make recommendation for Approved, Conditionally Approved, or Not Approved for each program.
- ☐ Exit interview with institution to discuss preliminary findings.

Post-visit
- ☐ State team chair submits draft of state team report to state review team within 30 days of the on-site visit.
- ☐ State review team will respond to state team chair within one week any corrections.
- ☐ State team chair sends state team report to the institution to review the document and suggest corrections of factual error.
- ☐ Institution to provide correction of factual error in the margins within two weeks.
- ☐ State team chair will submit the final state team report to the PSC Administrator.
- ☐ PSC Administrator submits final state team report to the institution.
- ☐ Institution may submit a rejoinder to the PSC Administrator for consideration by the PSC within 30 days of receiving the final state team report.
- ☐ The PSC Administrator will submit the final state team report, the rejoinder, the national accreditation council report and the national accreditation council rejoinder to the PSC.
- ☐ At the next regularly scheduled PSC meeting, the Standards Committee reviews the reports, findings, and recommendations of the state team. The Standards Committee makes recommendations to the PSC. The PSC considers the recommendation and will submit their recommendation to the State Board of Education. The decision of the State Board of Education is effective immediately.

APPENDIX H: FULL UNIT REVIEW PROCEDURES AND POSSIBLE OUTCOMES

When national accreditation is sought, Full Unit Reviews will be held concurrently with the State Program Approval for Certification process. Idaho maintains a partnership with a national accreditation council. This partnership agreement provides for concurrent on-site educator preparation unit accreditation reviews along with state program approval for certification reviews of each area of the certification and endorsement offered by the institution. During a concurrent visit, a national accreditation council team and a state team collaborate to conduct the review. Both teams, however, submit separate reports. Final unit approval rests with the national accreditation council once state program approval for certification is granted through the State Board of Education. When national accreditation is not sought, a separate state team will be assigned to review the Unit according to national standards. Full Unit Reviews include reviews of all of the following: Unit Standards, Content Program Standards, and State-Specific Requirements.

	Fall-Spring (Full Review Visit)	1 year Post-Visit	2 years Post-Visit	Fall-Spring (3yrs. Post-Visit)	Fall-Spring (4yrs. Post-Visit)	5 years Post-Visit	6 years Post-Visit	Fall-Spring (7yrs. Post-Visit)
National Standards Reviewed	Possible Outcomes							
	APPROVED							Full Review
	CONDITIONALLY APPROVED							Full Review
	NOT APPROVED (Unit Loses Approval. May Apply as a New Unit)							
State-Specific Requirements Reviewed	Possible Outcomes			State-Specific Requirements Review concurrent with Focused Visit Review (if needed)				Full Review
	APPROVED			APPROVED				Full Review
				CONDITIONALLY APPROVED				Full Review
				NOT APPROVED (Unit Loses Approval. May Apply as a New Unit)				
	CONDITIONALLY APPROVED			APPROVED				Full Review
				CONDITIONALLY APPROVED				Full Review
				NOT APPROVED (Unit Loses Approval. May Apply as a New Unit)				
	NOT APPROVED (Unit Loses Approval. May Apply as a New Unit)							
Content Program Standards Reviewed	Possible Outcomes			Program Standards Focused Visit (if needed) Concurrent w/ State-Specific Requirements Review				Full Review
	APPROVED							Full Review
	CONDITIONALLY APPROVED			FOCUSED VISIT: APPROVED				Full Review
				CONDITIONALLY APPROVED				Full Review
				FOCUSED VISIT: NOT APPROVED (Program Loses Approval. May Apply as a New Program)				
	NOT APPROVED (Program Loses Approval. May Apply as a New Program)							

APPENDIX I: NEW PROGRAM FOR CERTIFICATION REQUEST

Institution:_____Date of Submission_____

Program Name:_____Certification & Endorsement_____
_____

All new educator preparation programs from public institutions require Program Review and Approval by the State Board of Education.

    Is this a request from an Idaho **public** institution?
       Yes_____No_____

       If yes, on what date was the Proposal Form submitted to the State Board of Education?_____

Section I: Evidence that the program will cover the knowledge and performances outlined in the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel*.   Pupil Personal Preparation programs will only need to address content specific standards.

The table below includes the overall standards. Complete the table by adding the specific knowledge and performance enhancement standards that are applicable to the program. Pupil Personal Preparation programs will need to revise the standards to address the content specific standards. Standards can be found in the *Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel.*

STANDARD	Enhancement Standards Knowledge & Performance	Coursework
Standard 1 Learner Development		
Standard 2 Learning Difference		
Standard 3 Learning Environments		

STANDARD	Enhancement Standards Knowledge & Performance	Coursework
Standard 4 Content Knowledge		
Standard 5 Application of Content		
Standard 6 Assessment		
Standard 7 Planning for Instruction		
Standard 8 Instructional Strategies		
Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice		
Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration		

Section II: New Program Course Requirements

College Chair/Director/Dean (Institution): _____ Date: _____

Graduate Chair/Director/Dean or other official (Institution; as applicable): _____ Date: _____