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**PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION**

SPA decision on national recognition of the program(s):
- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

**Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)**
The program meets or exceeds SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:
- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

**Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:**

Data findings indicate that one hundred percent of completers passed the OSAT; however, interpretation of data evidence by program provider indicates candidates received failing scores on sub-areas of the certification exam (7 out of 45 total sub-area scores). Feedback from candidates highlight their frustration with a lack of practice taking standardized tests and identifying distracters in multiple-choice tests. Most evidence shared throughout the document was often not supported by findings presented or activities described.

**Summary of Strengths:**

Oklahoma Subject Area Tests (OSAT) requires that library media specialists take and pass a comprehensive exam which covers eleven specific competencies and 60 topics within four Sub Areas. A constructed response section of the test covers Information Literacy Inquiry Skills. Data table was shown which was purported, by the program, to demonstrate an alignment of specific ALA standards and test competencies. Support from the state is an important asset which may be used to measure candidate performance and guide program improvements, as needed.
PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1: Teaching for Learning

Candidates are effective teachers who demonstrate knowledge of learners and learning and who model and promote collaborative planning, instruction in multiple literacies, and inquiry-based learning, enabling members of the learning community to become effective users and creators of ideas and information. Candidates design and implement instruction that engages students’ interests and develops their ability to inquire, think critically, gain and share knowledge.

1.1 Knowledge of learners and learning. Candidates are knowledgeable of learning styles, stages of human growth and development, and cultural influences on learning. Candidates assess learner needs and design instruction that reflects educational best practice. Candidates support the learning of all students and other members of the learning community, including those with diverse learning styles, physical and intellectual abilities and needs. Candidates base twenty-first century skills instruction on student interests and learning needs and link it to the assessment of student achievement.

1.2 Effective and knowledgeable teacher. Candidates implement the principles of effective teaching and learning that contribute to an active, inquiry-based approach to learning. Candidates make use of a variety of instructional strategies and assessment tools to design and develop digital-age learning experiences and assessments in partnership with classroom teachers and other educators. Candidates can document and communicate the impact of collaborative instruction on student achievement.

1.3 Instructional partner. Candidates model, share, and promote effective principles of teaching and learning as collaborative partners with other educators. Candidates acknowledge the importance of participating in curriculum development, of engaging in school improvement processes, and of offering professional development to other educators as it relates to library and information use.

1.4 Integration of twenty first century skills and learning standards. Candidates advocate for twenty-first century literacy skills to support the learning needs of the school community. Candidates demonstrate how to collaborate with other teachers to plan and implement instruction of the AASL Standards for the 21st-Century Learner and state student curriculum standards. Candidates employ strategies to integrate multiple literacies with content curriculum. Candidates integrate the use of emerging technologies as a means for effective and creative teaching and to support P-12 students’ conceptual understanding, critical thinking and creative processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

Assessments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were presented as evidence that candidates met this standard. A review of these assessments indicate the following:

Assessment 1 - Strengths and weaknesses were discussed in the narrative but were not clearly displayed in data table. It is unclear if 80% pass rate was met. 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. 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. There was no explanation how test data would be used to improve program.

Assessment 2 - Analysis of data findings only includes a discussion of candidate’s overall performance, instead of relative performance on assessment components as aligned to standards. Rubric is insufficiently developed to serve as a guide for the consistent and accurate evaluation of candidate performance. Data may not provide program with information needed for program improvement.

Assessment 3 - Description indicates alignment with 4.4, but that element is not included in report. Rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not on performance skills or possession of knowledge as described by standards. Rubrics are
essentially a checklist of items to be turned in to complete the assessment. Rubrics do not appear to be grounded in a basic agreement of what constitutes unacceptable, acceptable, and target performance. No analysis of data provided.

Assessment 4 - Rubric is insufficiently developed to serve as a guide for the consistent and accurate evaluation of candidate performance. Course grades are used as an assessment. Rubrics are essentially checklist of items to be turned in to complete an assessment.

Assessment 5 - The program submitted a description of a course and its activities as an assessment; however, without information on how candidates are evaluated on linked assignments in the course, accompanied by a standards-based scoring guide and data, this is not a suitable assessment submission. Data should be disaggregated by semester and year for candidates.

Assessment 6 - Data findings represented the overall score of grades received by candidates, and not performance on each standards-based item included in the assessment. Data provided in such a way that cannot be used by the program for analysis of candidate strengths and weaknesses related to the assessment.

Assessment 7 - Data were not referenced to the standards, making it difficult for reviewers to interpret findings in relation to standards or performance implied. Rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not performance skills or possession of knowledge.

Standard 2: Literacy and Reading

Candidates promote reading for learning, personal growth, and enjoyment. Candidates are aware of major trends in children's and young adult literature and select reading materials in multiple formats to support reading for information, reading for pleasure, and reading for lifelong learning. Candidates use a variety of strategies to reinforce classroom reading instruction to address the diverse needs and interests of all readers.

2.1 Literature. Candidates are familiar with a wide range of children's, young adult, and professional literature in multiple formats and languages to support reading for information, reading for pleasure, and reading for lifelong learning.

2.2 Reading promotion. Candidates use a variety of strategies to promote leisure reading and model personal enjoyment of reading in order to promote habits of creative expression and lifelong reading.

2.3 Respect for diversity. Candidates demonstrate the ability to develop a collection of reading and information materials in print and digital formats that support the diverse developmental, cultural, social, and linguistic needs of P-12 students and their communities.

2.4 Literacy strategies. Candidates collaborate with classroom teachers to reinforce a wide variety of reading instructional strategies to ensure P-12 students are able to create meaning from text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

Assessments used to meet this standard were: 1, 3, 5 and 7.

Assessment 1 - Strengths and weaknesses were discussed in the narrative but were not clearly displayed in data table. It is unclear if 80% pass rate was met. Data should be disaggregated by the semester or year represented by data, as opposed to grouping multiple semesters or years of data in a single tabulation. Because assessment and/or rubric are designed to evaluate performance across multiple standards in some cases, resultant data cannot be
used as evidence of successful candidate performance on individual standards or elements. There was no explanation how test data would be used to improve program.

Assessment 3 - Description indicates alignment with 4.4, but this element is not included in report. Rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not on the performance skills or possession of knowledge as described by standards. Rubrics are essentially a checklist of items to be turned in to complete an assessment. Rubrics do not appear to be grounded in a basic agreement of what constitutes unacceptable, acceptable, and target performance. No analysis of data provided.

Assessment 5 - The program submitted a description of course activities as an assessment; however, without information on how candidates are evaluated on linked assignments in the course, accompanied by a standards-based scoring guide and data, this is not a suitable assessment submission. Data should be disaggregated by semester and year for candidates.

Assessment 7 - Data reported were not referenced to the standards, making it difficult for reviewers to interpret findings in relation to standards or performance implied. Rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not performance skills or possession of knowledge.

**Standard 3: Information and Knowledge**

Candidates model and promote ethical, equitable access to and use of physical, digital, and virtual collections of resources. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of a variety of information sources and services that support the needs of the diverse learning community. Candidates demonstrate the use of a variety of research strategies to generate knowledge to improve practice.

3.1 Efficient and ethical information-seeking behavior. Candidates identify and provide support for diverse student information needs. Candidates model multiple strategies for students, other teachers, and administrators to locate, evaluate, and ethically use information for specific purposes. Candidates collaborate with students, other teachers, and administrators to efficiently access, interpret, and communicate information.

3.2 Access to information. Candidates support flexible, open access for library services. Candidates demonstrate their ability to develop solutions for addressing physical, social and intellectual barriers to equitable access to resources and services. Candidates facilitate access to information in print, non-print, and digital formats. Candidates model and communicate the legal and ethical codes of the profession.

3.3 Information technology. Candidates demonstrate their ability to design and adapt relevant learning experiences that engage students in authentic learning through the use of digital tools and resources. Candidates model and facilitate the effective use of current and emerging digital tools to locate, analyze, evaluate, and use information resources to support research, learning, creating, and communicating in a digital society.

3.4 Research and knowledge creation. Candidates use evidence-based, action research to collect data. Candidates interpret and use data to create and share new knowledge to improve practice in school libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met with Conditions</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Assessments used to meet this standard were: 1, 2, 5 and 7.

Assessment 1 - Strengths and weaknesses were discussed in the narrative but were not clearly displayed in the data table. It is unclear if 80% pass rate was met. 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. 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. There was no explanation how test data would be used to improve program.

Assessment 2 - An analysis of data findings includes a discussion of candidate's overall performance, instead of relative performance on assessment components as aligned to standards. Rubric is insufficiently developed to serve as a guide for the consistent and accurate evaluation of candidate performance. Data may not provide program with information needed for program improvement.

Assessment 5 - The program submitted a description of course activities as an assessment; however, without information on how candidates are evaluated on linked assignments in the course, accompanied by a standards-based scoring guide and data, this is not a suitable assessment submission. Data should be disaggregated by semester and year for candidates.

Assessment 7 - Data reported were not referenced to the standards, making it difficult for reviewers to interpret findings in relation to standards or performance implied. Rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not performance skills or possession of knowledge.

**Standard 4: Advocacy and Leadership**

Candidates advocate for dynamic school library programs and positive learning environments that focus on student learning and achievement by collaborating and connecting with teachers, administrators, librarians, and the community. Candidates are committed to continuous learning and professional growth and lead professional development activities for other educators. Candidates provide leadership by articulating ways in which school libraries contribute to student achievement.

4.1 Networking with the library community. Candidates demonstrate the ability to establish connections with other libraries and to strengthen cooperation among library colleagues for resource sharing, networking, and facilitating access to information. Candidates participate and collaborate as members of a social and intellectual network of learners.

4.2 Professional development. Candidates model a strong commitment to the profession by participating in professional growth and leadership opportunities through membership in library associations, attendance at professional conferences, reading professional publications, and exploring Internet resources. Candidates plan for ongoing professional growth.

4.3 Leadership. Candidates are able to articulate the role and relationship of the school library program's impact on student academic achievement within the context of current educational initiatives. Utilizing evidence-based practice and information from education and library research, candidates communicate ways in which the library program can enhance school improvement efforts.

4.4 Advocacy. Candidates identify stakeholders within and outside the school community who impact the school library program. Candidates develop a plan to advocate for school library and information programs, resources, and services.

**Met** | **Met with Conditions** | **Not Met**

Comment:

Assessments used to address this standard were: 1, 5, 6, and 7.
Assessment 1 - Strengths and weaknesses were discussed in the narrative but were not clearly displayed in the data table. It is unclear if 80% pass rate was met. 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. 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. There was no explanation how test data would be used to improve program.

Assessment 5 - The program submitted a description of a course activities as an assessment; however, without information on how candidates are evaluated on linked assignments in the course, accompanied by a standards-based scoring guide and data, this is not a suitable assessment submission. Data should be disaggregated by semester and year for candidates.

Assessment 6 - Data provided represent the overall score of grades received by candidates, and not performance on each standards-based item included in the assessment. Data provided in such a way that cannot be used by the program for analysis of candidate strengths and weaknesses related to the assessment.

Assessment 7 - Data reported were not referenced to the standards, making it difficult for reviewers to interpret findings in relation to standards or performance implied. Rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not performance skills or possession of knowledge.

Standard 5: Program Management

Candidates plan, develop, implement, and evaluate school library programs, resources, and services in support of the mission of the library program within the school according to the ethics and principles of library science, education, management, and administration.

5.1 Collections. Candidates evaluate and select print, non-print, and digital resources using professional selection tools and evaluation criteria to develop and manage a quality collection designed to meet the diverse curricular, personal, and professional needs of students, teachers, and administrators. Candidates organize school library collections according to current library cataloging and classification principles and standards.

5.2 Professional Ethics. Candidates practice the ethical principles of their profession, advocate for intellectual freedom and privacy, and promote and model digital citizenship and responsibility. Candidates educate the school community on the ethical use of information and ideas.

5.3 Personnel, Funding, and Facilities. Candidates apply best practices related to planning, budgeting, and evaluating human, information, and physical resources. Candidates organize library facilities to enhance the use of information resources and services and to ensure equitable access to all resources for all users. Candidates develop, implement, and evaluate policies and procedures that support teaching and learning in school libraries.

5.4 Strategic Planning and Assessment. Candidates communicate and collaborate with students, teachers, administrators, and community members to develop a library program that aligns resources, services, and standards with the school's mission. Candidates make effective use of data and information to assess how the library program addresses the needs of their diverse communities.

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

Comment:

Assessments used to address this standard were: 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7.
Assessment 1 - Narrative prepared by program indicates that 100% of candidates passed the test while further explanation actually shows that a majority of candidates had failing scores in several sub areas. 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. 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.

Assessment 3 - Description says aligned with 4.4, but that is not indicated in report on page 10. Data should be disaggregated by semester or year represented by the data. No analysis of data provided.

Assessment 5 - 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 in such a way that it cannot be used by the program for analysis of candidate strengths and weaknesses related to the assessment. 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. 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.

Assessment 6 - Data provided represent overall score or grades received by candidates and not performance on each standards-based item. Data provided in such a way that it cannot be used for analysis of candidate strengths and weaknesses related to an assessment. Data should be disaggregated by the semester or year, as opposed to grouping multiple semesters or years of data in a single tabulation. No analysis of data findings or a discussion of how data will be used to improve performance.

Assessment 7 - Data reported are not referenced to standards. Rubrics are not aligned to standards.
C.1. Candidates’ knowledge of content
ALA/AASL standards addressed in this entry could include Standards 1-5. Information from Assessments #1 and #2 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on content knowledge.)

The program did not provide sufficient evidence that demonstrates candidate's ability and knowledge needed to develop, deliver, and assess ALA/AASL standards in a school library media program. See comments on Assessments 1, 2 and 6 in Part B of the report.
See comments on Assessments 1, 2, 6, & 7.

Assessment 1 - Oklahoma Subject Area Tests (OSAT) requires that library edia specialist take and pass a comprehensive exam which covers eleven specific competencies and 60 topics within four Sub Areas. A constructed response section of the test covers Information Literacy Inquiry Skills. Data findings indicated that one hundred percent of completers passed the OSAT. However, interpretation of data evidence indicates candidates received failing scores on sub-areas of the certification exam (7 out of 45 total sub-area scores). Feedback from candidates highlight their frustration with a lack of practice taking standardized tests and identifying distracters in multiple-choice tests.

Assessment 2 This assessment is completed in LCBSC 5823 Administration of School Library and Technology Programs. Candidates are challenged to develop a professions presentation on a school library issue of their choice for eventual submission to the Oklahoma Technology Association Encyclomedia Conference which was the premiere conference for school librarians, teachers, instructional technology specialists, and administrators in the state." Course grades are used as an assessment. Insufficient information was provided on how course content aligns to standards.

Assessment 6- The Social Studies Text Set Project is assigned in CIED 5730 Teaching Reading and Literature, a required course. The project is designed to teach library media specialist candidates how to 1) develop a text set to support diverse students' different reading levels and needs, and 2) how to provide the necessary comprehension instruction to facilitate students' meaningful engagement with informational texts. Data provided represent the overall score of grades received by candidates, and not performance on each standards-based item included in the assessment. Data provided in such a way that cannot be used by the program for analysis of candidate strengths and weaknesses related to the assessment. Rubrics do not appear to be grounded in a basic agreement of what constitutes unacceptable, acceptable, and target performance. Rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not on the performance skills or possession of knowledge as described by standards.
Assessment 7 - Data are not referenced to standards, making it difficult for reviewers to interpret the meaning of data in relation to standards or performance reflected by the data. Rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to assessment products and not performance skills or possession of knowledge.

C.2. Candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions
ALA/AASL standards that could be addressed in this entry include Standards 1-5. Information from Assessments #3 and #4 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.)

The rubrics used to assess candidates’ ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions were addressed using Assessments 3, 4 and 6. Data from Assessment 3 (Unit Plan), 4 (Student Teaching Evaluation) and 6 (Social Studies Text Set Project) provided were weak or provide insufficient evidence of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills specific to school librarianship.

Assessment 3 - Public Relations Plan - Candidates are challenged to prepare a 9-month plan to provide an overview of all school activities, meetings, outreach activities, community involvement plans, and administrative contact scheduled each month. Plan should align with the mission of the school, include significant time for faculty collaboration and curriculum development including tools and materials available in the library to promote reading. Plans should meet the needs of diverse students with multiple developmental levels and a variety of interests while integrating technology and multi-modal opportunities to meet 21st century literacy skills.
Rubric provided evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not on the performance skills or possession of knowledge as described by standards.

Assessment #4 - Integrated Field Experiences - "Candidates are asked to work in collaboration with a school library media program that will broaden their individual perspectives in the areas of school size, district size, grade level, socioeconomic level, and effectiveness of library media program. Candidates will complete a checklist of items, conduct action research, interview a library media specialist, prepare a 3-5 page, double-spaced (12-point font) report addressing a list of items given in class and the conclusions made from the interview and research, and include a bibliography of resources used. Mean scores for the field experiences across candidates were a 4, or Exceptional. The success candidates experienced, as evidenced by high ratings from instructors as well as cooperating school library media specialists, indicates strong evidence for meeting standards, according to program.

Assessment #6 - The Social Studies Text Set Project is assigned in CIED 5730 Teaching Reading and Literature, a required course. The project is designed to teach library media specialist candidates how to 1) develop a text set to support diverse students' different reading levels and needs, and 2) how to
provide the necessary comprehension instruction to facilitate students' meaningful engagement with informational texts. Rubrics do not appear to be grounded in a basic agreement of what constitutes unacceptable, acceptable, and target performance. The rubric evaluates candidates on qualities related to the assessment product (organization, writing skills, etc.) and not on the performance skills or possession of knowledge as described by standards.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning
ALA/AASL standards that could be addressed in this entry include but are not limited to Standards 1-5. Information from Assessment #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on student learning.)

Assessment #5 (Information Literacy Lesson and Student Learning Evaluation) project allows students to redesign or create a lesson focused on the skills, dispositions and responsibilities inherent in the Standards for the 21st Century Learner, as well as state and national content-area skills and objectives. It requires the candidates to gather and evaluate student learning data and encourages collaboration between the librarian and classroom teacher. The program submitted a description of a course and its activities as an assessment; however, without information on how candidates are evaluated on linked assignments in the course, accompanied by a standards-based scoring guide and data, this is not a suitable assessment submission. Minimal data were provided to demonstrate impact on student learning, even though 3 years of data were suggested in the narrative. The program has not provided sufficient evidence of how student learning or progress will be determined. It was unclear how these data were aligned to standards.
Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

Assessments submitted by the program need further revision in order to make them effective for the collection and analysis of standards-based data. Data should be disaggregated by semester/year and aligned to specific standards in order to provide further information for reviewers and for self-assessment of candidate performance and program improvement. Data should provide clear evidence of the degree to which candidates perform on each part of the rubric, rather than one total score for the entire rubric.

Narratives and analyses should be evidenced based. Data should not reflect overall scores or grades received by candidates. Demonstrating how the program uses data to strengthen program and candidate performance are critical components of the review process.
### Areas for consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

It was unclear if field experiences were practicum placements. Activities associated with field experiences seemed to encompass more than observations, interviews, etc. More information is needed on the number of hours candidates are required to complete for field experiences and practicum placements.

### F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the CAEP site visitors:

Assessments nor activities reflect standards. It is unclear how candidates are assigned field placement opportunities. Impact on student learning was not evident in activities described or assessments used to monitor performance. More evidence is needed to demonstrate how data, feedback from cooperating school librarians and P-12 student performance, and candidates are used to improve course offerings, candidate performance, and program integrity.
PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.
**Terms and Subsequent Actions**

**National Recognition with Probation** The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **up to two opportunities** to submit a Revised Report addressing unmet standards and other concerns in accordance with the dates provided on this Recognition Report. *A program should NOT submit a Revised Report until it has the required data and is confident that it has addressed all of the unmet standards and any other critical concerns cited in this recognition report.* If no reports are submitted by the noted date, the program's recognition status will expire and revert to Not Recognized. In case the status expires, the program will not be able to submit a Revised Report, but may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review if time permits for the current CAEP accreditation cycle. Otherwise, the program may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review for the next CAEP accreditation cycle, three years before the site visit.

**Comment on decision:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognized Thru Date: 08/01/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted By Date: 03/15/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.