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Brief Introduction to the Program Standards

In 2006, the Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE America, then known as NASPE)) assigned a task force to review and revise the set of standards that guide initial level physical education teacher education. These standards, known as the NASPE 2008 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards (NASPE 2008 Standards), guide programs that prepare candidates seeking initial level certification to teach PreK-12 physical education. Based on review of the current literature, feedback from stakeholders, and multiple revisions, the task force has reached consensus in development of a revised set of standards known as the SHAPE America 2017 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards (SHAPE America 2017 Standards). This report will explain work of the task force, including its approach to the revision process; discussion of the findings from the knowledge base; how consensus was reached from stakeholders; descriptions of revised standards and their components; rubrics and criteria for each component; plans for program reviewer training; and resources.

The SHAPE America 2017 Standards are comprised of six standards and 25 components that address knowledge and skills essential of candidates seeking the first teaching license. Each standard has been written to include the language of components that fall below it. The standards are limited to only the most essential knowledge and skills candidates should attain in an initial level program. Knowledge and skills across these standards are specific to the movement-based physical education discipline and do not overlap with CAEP Standards or standards of any other specialty professional association (SPA). CAEP’s cross-cutting themes of diversity and digital learning have been incorporated into the standards. Given that CAEP Standards address candidates’ dispositions, only expectations associated with professional responsibility that are specific to the physical education discipline are addressed.
Evidence of candidates’ knowledge and skills may be provided by programs within six to eight assessments. When a preponderance of evidence is provided, a standard is met. A program can receive national recognition when the preponderance of evidence across all standards has been provided. Rubrics provide criteria to guide programs and program reviewers seeking national recognition from CAEP/SHAPE America.

Review and revision of the SHAPE America 2017 Standards was based on an organizing framework of CAEP’s four principles, SHAPE America’s *National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education*, as well as current literature in physical education and teacher education. Supporting documents to guide task force work included the CAEP Accreditation Manual, the 2011 InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, CAEP’s Guidelines for Writing and Approval of SPA Standards, and significant feedback from stakeholders.

SHAPE America’s 2017 Standards align with CAEP’s framework in the following manner: Standards 1 (Content and Foundational Knowledge) and 2 (Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness) address expectations of CAEP Principle B, Content. Standards 3 (Planning and Implementation), 4 (Instructional Delivery and Management) and 5 (Assessment of Student Learning) address expectations of CAEP Principle C, Instructional Practice. Standard 6 (Professional Responsibility) addresses expectations of CAEP Principle D, Professional Responsibility. Expectations associated with CAEP Principle A, The Learner and Learning, are threaded throughout all SHAPE America Standards 1 – 6. A chart detailing how SHAPE America 2017 Components align with InTASC Performances and Essential Knowledge is provided in Appendix A.
II. STANDARDS

National Standards for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education (2017)
Society of Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE America)

Standard 1: Content and Foundational Knowledge
Physical education candidates demonstrate an understanding of common and specialized content, and scientific and theoretical foundations for the delivery of an effective PreK-12 physical education program.

Components – Candidates will:
1.a Describe and apply common content knowledge for teaching PreK-12 physical education.
1.b Describe and apply specialized content knowledge for teaching PreK-12 physical education.
1.c Describe and apply physiological and biomechanical concepts related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.
1.d Describe and apply motor learning and behavior-change/psychological principles related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.
1.e Describe and apply motor development theory and principles related to fundamental motor skills, skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.
1.f Describe historical, philosophical and social perspectives of physical education issues and legislation.

Standard 2: Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness*
Physical education candidates are physically literate individuals who can demonstrate skillful performance in physical education content areas and health-enhancing levels of fitness.

Components – Candidates will:
2.a Demonstrate competency in all fundamental motor skills, as well as skillful performance in a minimum of four physical education content areas (e.g., games and sports, aquatics, dance and rhythmic activities, fitness activities, outdoor pursuits, individual-performance activities).
2.b Achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program.

^ Skillful: A person’s ability to employ techniques, tactics, strategies, rules and etiquette effectively in the context of the activity.

* To assist individuals with special needs to achieve the intent of Standard 2, physical education teacher education programs are allowed and encouraged to use a variety of accommodations and/or modifications to demonstrate skillful performance (e.g., modified/adapted equipment, augmented communication devices, multi-media devices) and fitness (e.g., weight programs, exercise logs).
**Standard 3: Planning and Implementation**

Physical education candidates apply content and foundational knowledge to plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education through the effective use of resources, accommodations and/or modifications, technology and metacognitive strategies to address the diverse needs of all students.

Components – Candidates will:

3.a Plan and implement appropriate (e.g., measurable, developmentally appropriate, performance-based) short- and long-term plan objectives that are aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education.

3.b Plan and implement progressive and sequential content that aligns with short- and long-term plan objectives and that addresses the diverse needs of all students.

3.c Plan for and manage resources to provide active, fair and equitable learning experiences.

3.d Plan and implement individualized instruction for diverse student needs, adding specific accommodations and/or modifications for all students.

3.e Plan and implement learning experiences that require students to use technology appropriately in meeting one or more short- and long-term plan objective(s).

3.f Plan and implement learning experiences that engage students in using metacognitive strategies appropriately to analyze their own performance results.

---

**Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management**

Physical education candidates engage students in meaningful learning experiences through effective use of pedagogical skills. They use communication, feedback, and instructional and managerial skills to enhance student learning.

Components – Candidates will:

4.a Demonstrate verbal and nonverbal communication skills that convey respect and sensitivity across all learning experiences.

4.b Implement demonstrations, explanations and instructional cues that are aligned with short- and long-term plan objectives.

4.c Evaluate the changing dynamics of the learning environment and adjust instructional tasks as needed to further student progress.

4.d Implement transitions, routines and positive behavior management to create and maintain a safe, supportive and engaging learning environment.

4.e Analyze motor skills and performance concepts in order to provide specific, congruent feedback to enhance student learning.
Standard 5: Assessment of Student Learning
Physical education candidates select and implement appropriate assessments to monitor students’ progress and guide decision making related to instruction and learning.

Components – Candidates will:
5.a Select or create authentic, formal assessments that measure student attainment of short- and long-term objectives.
5.b Implement formative assessments that monitor student learning before and throughout the long-term plan, as well as summative assessments that evaluate student learning upon completion of the long-term plan.
5.c Implement a reflective cycle to guide decision making specific to candidate performance, student learning, and short- and long-term plan objectives.

Standard 6: Professional Responsibility
Physical education candidates demonstrate behaviors essential to becoming effective professionals. They exhibit professional ethics and culturally competent practices; seek opportunities for continued professional development; and demonstrate knowledge of promotion/advocacy strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities that support the development of physically literate individuals.

Components – Candidates will:
6.a Engage in behavior that reflects professional ethics, practice and cultural competence.
6.b Engage in continued professional growth and collaboration in schools and/or professional organizations.
6.c Describe strategies for the promotion and advocacy of physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities.

Note: Throughout the standards, components and rubrics, the term candidate refers to an individual in a preparation program and the term student refers to a PreK-12 pupil or learner.
Supporting Explanations: SHAPE America 2017 Initial Physical Education Standards & Components

Standard 1: Content and Foundational Knowledge

Physical education candidates demonstrate an understanding of common and specialized content, and scientific and theoretical foundations for the delivery of an effective PreK-12 physical education program.

Component 1.a Describe and apply common content knowledge for teaching PreK-12 physical education.

Component 1.b Describe and apply specialized content knowledge for teaching PreK-12 physical education.

Supporting Explanation of Components 1.a and 1.b.

Strong content knowledge (CK) has been identified as an essential prerequisite for teachers’ effectiveness on student learning (e.g., Siedentop, 2002). Physical education teacher education scholars have long recognized that having strong subject matter CK is essential if teachers are to impact student learning in physical education (e.g., Siedentop, 2002; Ward, 2009). More recently, Ward (2012) conceptualized subject matter knowledge in physical education in four domains of knowledge: (a) knowledge of the rules and etiquette, (b) knowledge of technique and tactics, (c) knowledge of skill discrimination, and (d) knowledge of tasks. Borrowing from Ball’s (2008) conceptualization of CK, Ward (2009) situated these four domains of knowledge within Ball’s two forms of CK: (a) common content knowledge (CCK) and, (b) specialized content knowledge (SCK). CCK includes the knowledge of the rules and etiquette, and knowledge of techniques and tactics, and is obtained primarily through participation in the
activity itself. In contrast, SCK includes the knowledge of (a) common errors that students are likely to make when learning the activity, and (b) instructional tasks and representations (i.e., how to plan for and implement developmentally appropriate learning task progressions, being able to accurately assess/diagnose critical performance elements and common errors) (Ward, 2009). Traditionally, Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) Programs in United States have emphasized developing motor skill competency as part of their degree requirements. In physical education, Ward (2012) argued that performing an activity provides teachers with only some of knowledge they need to teach the activity and called for more specialized instruction to strengthen the PETE majors’ SCK.

Developing both CCK and SCK in physical education has been shown to impact student learning (e.g., Iserbyt, Ward, & Li, 2015; Iserbyt, Ward, & Martens, 2015; Sinelnikov, Kim, Ward, Curtner-Smith, & Li, 2015; Ward, Kim, Bo, & Li, 2015). Ward et al. (2015) concluded that both CCK and SCK significantly influence pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) and significantly impact student learning. That is, a lack of CCK and SCK weakens their overall PCK, and, thus, reduces teachers’ ability to create appropriate learning opportunities. However, PETE programs currently place little emphasis on developing PETE majors’ SCK (Kim, Lee, Ward, & Li, 2015). The implication is that PETE programs need to reconsider the current structure of their programs so that additional PETE curriculum time can be allocated to building more robust SCK among future physical educators.

Physical education teachers with strong CK are more likely to use tasks extensions, refinements, and applications than teachers with lower levels of CK (Hastie & Vlaisavljevic, 1999). Such teachers are more likely to hold students accountable for the quality of their skill performance, whereas those teachers with weak CK were found to place more emphasis on
general student participation and effort. Moreover, Schempp, Manross, Tan, and Fincher (1998) suggested that teachers with a thorough knowledge of the subject matter are more comfortable and enthusiastic about their work; better able to plan lessons that are richer in learning activities, identify and resolve student learning problems, and accommodate for individuals’ skill differences and abilities. Siedentop and Eldar (1989) reported that expert teachers exhibit better discrimination of events, anticipate situations more quickly, and have superior teaching repertoires than non-expert teachers. Finally, Ayvazo and Ward (2011) reported physical education teachers teaching units in which they had a strong command of the content were better able to identify and address students’ errors correctly.

Supporting Explanation of Components 1.c. – 1.f

The specialized content knowledge described by Ward (2009) is supported by the foundational knowledge derived from the profession’s related sub-disciplines, such as exercise physiology, biomechanics, motor learning, motor development, and sociological/historical perspectives. As Rink noted, these disciplines “have a contribution to make to the process of teaching physical education content” and provide the type of “knowledge students need to be an effective teacher” (2007, p.103). Through the study of the sub-disciplines, candidates move beyond the “how” of teaching to the “why” of various pedagogical strategies and practices. Furthermore, the K-12 national standards include key concepts from this foundational knowledge that teachers are expected to include in the physical education curriculum, indicating the need for substantive candidate preparation in these sub-disciplines (Society of Health and Physical Educators, 2014; Mohnsen, 2010; Tinning, 2002).
Component 1.c Describe and apply physiological and biomechanical concepts related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.

Supporting Explanation of Component 1.c.

Exercise physiology plays an important role in helping candidates understand the connection between physical activity and health as well as how the body responds to physical activity (NASPE, 2006). In a study of essential concepts in exercise physiology, experts concurred that physical educators needed a basic understanding of the cardiovascular and musculoskeletal systems, energy systems, physiological responses to exercise, influence of lifestyle factors, components of health-related fitness, and how to design fitness and physical activity programs, ideally in the context of working with school-aged children (Bulger & Housner, 2007, p.64; Bulger, Mohr, Robert, & Wiegand, 2000). Another area of exercise science, biomechanics, enables candidates to critically evaluate the mechanics of student movement performance. Using biomechanical principles and functional anatomy, candidates analyze students’ movement technique and determine how to best correct or enhance the execution of the movement (Bulger & Housner, 2007; NASPE, 2003). Both exercise physiology and biomechanics prepare candidates to apply principles across a wide variety of exercise forms and physical activities.

Component 1.d Describe and apply motor learning and behavior-change/psychological principles related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.

Supporting Explanation of Component 1.d.

Motor learning knowledge is essential for candidates to understand the theory associated with learning a motor skill and how to design progressive, sequential learning experiences that
address different ability levels (Boyce, Coker, & Bunker, Magill, 1990; Renshaw, Chow, Davids, & Hammond, 2010; Rukavina & Foxworth, 2009). Concepts such as practice variability, feedback schedules, and transfer and retention of learning, provide the guidance candidates need to develop meaningful practice tasks, vary their complexity, and enhance student performance (Boyce, Coker, & Bunker, 2006; Magill, 1990; Newell & Rovegno, 1990; Ross, Metcalf, Bulger, & Housner, 2014). Behavior-change/psychological theory informs candidates’ instructional decisions and facilitates a positive instructional climate. By implementing goal setting techniques, motivational strategies, and behavior-management practices, candidates can support student engagement in learning experiences and promote self-monitoring practices that are essential to exercise adherence and lifelong physical activity (Bulger & Housner, 2007).

**Component 1.e** Describe and apply motor development theory and principles related to fundamental motor skills, skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 1.e.*

In order for candidates to successfully plan learning experiences, they must understand typical development of movement patterns as well as determine individual students’ levels of readiness (Bulger & Housner, 2007; NASPE, 2004a). This knowledge originates in the sub-discipline of motor development. Ross et al. (2014) identifies four categories of essential motor development knowledge for candidates, including developmental perspective, motor behavior changes across the lifespan, factors affecting movement change; and developmentally appropriate practices. Motor development prepares candidates to consider developmental differences in planning and implementing instruction.
**Component 1.f** Describe historical, philosophical and social perspectives of physical education issues and legislation.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 1.f.*

In order for candidates to be effective teachers and members of the school community, they need to understand the social, historical, and philosophical context of physical education and physical activity in the culture (NASPE, 2004b). This cultural context provides a deeper understanding of how the physical education curriculum is shaped by social values. It also serves as the foundation for key legislation, such as Title IX and IDEA, which impacts instruction and practice in physical education at all levels.

*References for Supporting Explanations for Standard 1*


National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2006). *Guidelines for undergraduate


**Standard 2: Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness*  
Physical education candidates are physically literate individuals who can demonstrate skillful performance in physical education content areas and health-enhancing levels of fitness.
^ Skillful: A person’s ability to employ techniques, tactics, strategies, rules and etiquette effectively in the context of the activity.

* To assist individuals with special needs to achieve the intent of Standard 2, physical education teacher education programs are allowed and encouraged to use a variety of accommodations and/or modifications to demonstrate skillful performance (e.g., modified/adapted equipment, augmented communication devices, multi-media devices) and fitness (e.g., weight programs, exercise logs).

**Component 2.a** Demonstrate competency in all fundamental motor skills, as well as skillful performance in a minimum of four physical education content areas (e.g., games and sports, aquatics, dance and rhythmic activities, fitness activities, outdoor pursuits, individual-performance activities).

*Supporting Explanation of Component 2.a*

According to SHAPE America, “the goal of physical education is to develop physically literate individuals who have the knowledge, skills and confidence to enjoy a lifetime of healthful physical activity” (Society of Health and Physical Educators, 2014). Ideally, candidates should be physically literate themselves, with competencies in a wide variety of movement activities that form the basis of the k – 12 curriculum. Researchers have noted the importance of candidate acquisition of common content knowledge, or movement content, for success in teaching (Kim, Lee, Ward, & Li, 2015; Siedentop, 2002; Tinning, 2002). These researchers have argued that movement content is critical to candidates’ deeper understanding of movement.
techniques and their cultural context. In this sense, physical education can be considered a performance-based discipline, similar to dance, art, and music (NASPE, 2009; Siedentop, 2002). At the same time, physical education teacher education programs have been criticized for the limited time they devote to enhancing candidates’ movement skills. By requiring candidates to demonstrate competence in fundamental motor skills, as well as a variety of movement activity categories, this component ensures that candidates have the common content knowledge they need to be competent in their own profession (Zeigler, 2003).

**Component 2.b** Achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 2.b*

In 2010, the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) convened a panel of experts who concurred that “participating in regular physical activity at a level sufficient to promote health-related physical fitness is an important behavior for professionals.” NASPE cited the importance of these behaviors for role modeling as well as the professionals’ own well-being (p. 1). This position statement was supported by the work of Staffo and Stier (2000), who found that most physical education department chairs believed that candidates “should be physically fit and should project an image that promotes physical activity” (p.50). Cardinal (2001) found that physically active professionals and pre-professionals with lower body mass indexes were more likely than their less-active peers to believe in the importance of role modeling (p. 88). Because role-modeling of fitness and physical activity can positively affect the participation of youth, it may be an important strategy for physical educators and should be reinforced in teacher preparation programs (Melville & Maddalozzo, 1988).
Health-related fitness is also an important aspect of the K-12 national standards (Society of Health and Physical Educators, 2014). However, several studies have shown that physical educators’ may not be well-prepared in this area (Castelli & Williams, 2007; Miller & Housner, 1998; Peterson, Byrne, & Cruz, 2003; Santiago, Disch, & Morales, 2012). Other researchers have found that teachers’ fitness levels may influence their implementation of fitness curriculum (Whitney, Sage, & Butcher, 1988) as well as administrators’ perceptions of elementary program quality (Sallis, McKenzie, Kolody, & Curtis, 1996). By requiring programs to assess the health-related fitness of their candidates, this component supports the content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional dispositions of successful physical educators.

References for Supporting Explanations for Standard 2


Melville, D. & Maddalozzo, J. (1988). The effects of a physical educator’s appearance of body


**Standard 3: Planning and Implementation**

Physical education candidates apply content and foundational knowledge to plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education through the effective use of resources, accommodations and/or modifications, technology and metacognitive strategies to address the diverse needs of all students.

**Component 3.a Plan and implement appropriate (e.g., measureable, developmentally appropriate, performance-based) short- and long-term plan objectives that are aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education.**

*Supporting Explanation of Component 3.a*

Short- and long-term objectives are widely considered essential in the planning and implementation of physical education content (Darst & Pangrazi, 2009; Graham, 2008; Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2010; Himberg, Hutchinson, & Roussell, 2003; Mosston & Ashworth, 2002; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2013; Rink, 2014a; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000; Stillwell &
Wellgoose, 1997). Rink (2014a) described objectives as being student centered, can be written broadly (long-term plans) or specifically (short-term plans), and are written for all three learning domains (psychomotor, cognitive, affective). Rink further described objectives as containing the expected behavior of the student, condition or situation the behavior will be performed in, and criterion or performance level to be met.

Component 3.b Plan and implement progressive and sequential content that aligns with short- and long-term plan objectives and that addresses the diverse needs of all students.

Supporting Explanation of Component 3.b

Providing progressive and sequential content meeting the needs of all students is widely considered essential in teaching physical education (Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2010; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2013; Rink, 2014a). Students of varying ages, skill levels, ability levels, and previous experiences populate physical education classes on a daily basis. The ability to plan and implement progressive and sequential content is essential to address the diverse ability levels of students. While extensive research into the effects progressive and sequential instruction may have on student learning in physical education is limited (Rovengo, 1995), educational research using the term “scaffolding” is vast and can be generalized to physical education.

The importance of progressive and sequential content has been previously explored. Housner and Griffey (1985) reported differences in planning and teaching when comparing experienced and inexperienced teachers. Experienced teachers provided more individual attention to student performance, planned for more instructional decisions, and focused on facilitating student achievement than inexperienced teachers. Results reported by Housner and
Griffey provide evidence for the importance of developing the planning and teaching skills of pre-service candidates in terms of progressive and sequential content. Palmer and Hildebrand (2005) provided additional insight into differentiated instruction based on individual needs. Palmer and Hildebrand identified skill levels using the Generic Levels of Skill Proficiency (Graham, et. al., 2010) and applied the inherent differences in skill proficiency while planning and teaching specific skills. Palmer and Hildebrand offered a model titled the Environmental Management Model (EMM) as a method to plan and teach while considering individual skill level and structuring learning activities for the identified skill levels. The EMM was reported as a means of providing developmentally appropriate learning activities based on skill proficiency.

**Component 3.c** Plan for and manage resources to provide active, fair and equitable learning experiences.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 3.c*

The depth of current research related to Component 3.c. appears to be minimal. Despite this lack of depth, a few studies were discovered pertaining to Component 3.c. Griffey and Housner (1991) examined differences in planning and teaching in experienced and inexperienced teachers. Griffey and Housner reported experienced teachers were more thoughtful and intentional when planning for lesson contingencies. Experienced teachers planned and provided for more options in the instructional environment and equipment choices when compared to inexperienced teachers. The reported data provide rationale for the continuation of Component 3.c. as candidates need opportunities to plan and manage resources in order to provide equitable learning experiences. Xiang, Gao, and McBride (2011) examined implementation of various instructional choices by student teachers. Results indicated student teachers believed these
instructional choices promoted student motivation, autonomy, and overall engagement in the physical education lesson. The results of this study indicate candidates are able to plan for and teach with a variety of instructional choices and are able to interpret the impact on their students. Candidates are able to plan for differentiation in terms of instructional choices and Component 3.c reinforces this as well as other areas of planning and instruction.

**Component 3.d** Plan and implement individualized instruction for diverse student needs, adding specific accommodations and/or modifications for all students.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 3.d*

One only needs to refer to the U.S. Census Bureau (2010) data and compare it with earlier decades to provide an image of how diverse the United States has become. With this increase in diversity throughout the United States, planning and teaching for diversity continues to be an essential component for teaching physical education. The inclusion for diversity includes components such as gender, ethnicity, physical and/or mental disability, socioeconomic status, and race. Within, but not exclusive to physical education, diversity also includes skill level, ability level, and degree of previous experience. It is widely considered essential for effective planning and instruction to be inclusive to all students (Darst & Pangrazi, 2009; Graham, 2008; Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2010; Himberg, Hutchinson, & Roussell, 2003; Kasser & Lytle, 2005; Mosston & Ashworth, 2002; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2013; Rink, 2014a; Sherrill, 2004; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000; Stillwell & Willgoose, 1997; Winnick, 2011) while teaching in physical education.

Columna, Foley, and Lytle (2010) study examined physical education specialists, physical education generalists, and candidates’ attitude towards cultural pluralism and diversity.
Results indicated while study subjects’ valued cultural diversity, they struggled to implement culturally responsive pedagogy. Results reported by the researchers strengthen the need for inclusion of Component 3.d. in the 2017 Initial PETE Standards. The intent of Component 3.d. is to plan and implement physical education content based on inclusion of all students.

**Component 3.e** Plan and implement learning experiences that require students to use technology appropriately in meeting one or more short- and long-term plan objective(s).

*Supporting Explanation of Component 3.e*

The use of technology in physical education has changed substantially since the implementation of the 2008 Initial PETE Standards. At that time, (Silverman, 1997; Townsend & Gurvitch, 2002; Woods, Karp, Miao, & Perlman, 2008) computer-based assessments, email, websites, videotaped clips of skilled performances, heart rate monitors and body composition analyzers were the standard. When comparing these early uses of technology to the technology of today, the variety of options available today are undeniably greater than in the past. The increase in technological options provide additional avenues of application for the profession.

Recent studies (Casey & Jones, 2011; Kretshmann, 2015; Legrain, Gillet, Gernigon, & Lafreniere, 2015) provide empirical evidence of the effectiveness of technology to enhance student learning in physical education. Furthermore, several studies (Gibbone, Rukavina, & Silverman, 2010; Semiz, & Ince, 2012; Varol, 2015; Woods, Karp, Miao, & Perlman, 2008) provide evidence of the importance of perceived competence levels of physical education teachers and his/her usage of technology. Candidates and physical education teachers planned for and implemented more technology into their teaching when their levels of perceived competence were higher. Results such as these provided additional rationale to have Component
3.e. in the 2017 iteration of the Initial PETE Standards. Additionally, Semiz and Ince (2012) found a lack of perceived competence and lack of technology utilization among PETE faculty. These results such as this further reinforce the need for technology infusion within PETE programs for the benefit of the candidates and PETE faculty.

**Component 3.f** Plan and implement learning experiences that engage students in using metacognitive strategies appropriately to analyze their own performance results.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 3.f*

The term metacognition was defined as a method of engaging students in thinking about his/her own thinking (Flavell, 1979). Flavell also defined metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive experiences as components of the metacognitive processes. Metacognitive knowledge was defined as knowledge or beliefs about the factors interacting to affect the learning process. Flavell indicated the person, task, and strategy as the three major categories of metacognitive knowledge. Metacognitive experiences were described by Flavell as situations that induce thought recognition, provoke thoughts and feelings of one’s thinking, and has the potential to induce change in one’s knowledge base. Recent studies (Chatzipanteli, & Digelidis, 2011; Chatzipanteli, Digelidis, Karatzoglidos, & Dean, 2016; Lidor, 2004) provide evidence of the effectiveness of engaging students in metacognition during physical education class. The inclusion of Component 3.f. in the 2017 iteration of the Initial PETE Standards sets forth the expectation of candidates engaging his/her students in metacognition while teaching physical education lessons. The inclusion of Component 3.f. also places the responsibility of teaching the process of metacognition on PETE faculty to prepare candidates for this new expectation.
References for Supporting Explanations for Standard 3


**Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management**

Physical education candidates engage students in meaningful learning experiences through effective use of pedagogical skills. They use communication, feedback, and instructional and managerial skills to enhance student learning.

**Component 4.a** Demonstrate verbal and nonverbal communication skills that convey respect and sensitivity across all learning experiences.
Supporting Explanation of Component 4.a

Communication in a physical education setting presents several challenges when compared to classroom-based subjects. Instructional episodes tend to be short, brief verbal interactions with students, and ending with students being actively engaged in motor tasks (Rink & Hall, 2008, 2014b). Despite these challenges, effective communication is considered a basic tenant of effective physical education instruction (Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2010; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2013; Rink, 2014a; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). Given this wide acknowledgment of effective communication and the inherent challenges of communication during instructional episodes detailed by Rink and Hall (2008) in physical education, inclusion of Component 4.a. is supported in the 2017 version of initial PETE standards.

Component 4.b Implement demonstrations, explanations and instructional cues that are aligned with short- and long-term plan objectives.

Supporting Explanation of Component 4.b

Providing developmentally appropriate demonstrations, explanations, and instructional cues as part of an instructional episode is widely considered essential in teaching physical education (Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2010; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2013; Rink, 2014a; Rink & Hall, 2008; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). Additional challenges are presented with Component 4.b, given that instructional episodes in physical education tend be short in nature, often with brief verbal interactions with students, and end with students actively engaged in skill-based practice (Rink, 2014b; Rink & Hall, 2008). While considering the wide acceptance of using demonstrations, explanations, and cues in instructional episodes and factoring in the challenges
inherent in physical education instruction; Component 4.b. is supported for inclusion in the 2017 iteration of the PETE initial standards.

**Component 4.c** Evaluate the changing dynamics of the learning environment and adjust instructional tasks as needed to further student progress.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 4.c*

The physical education environment is fluid and dynamic requiring physical educators to evaluate student performance and implement modifications to planned learning activities (Rink & Hall, 2008). The instructional skills needed to evaluate and adjust instructional tasks are widely accepted as a requisite skill to effective instruction in physical education (Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2010; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2013; Rink & Hall, 2008; Rink, 2014a; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). Candidates’ skill-level in evaluating and implementing adjustments to the learning experiences were analyzed by McCaughtry and Rovengo (2003). Data revealed candidates experiencing difficulties in evaluating motor performances and implementing lesson adjustments. Smith and Strahan (2004) and Monross and Templeton (1997) provided additional perspectives detailing the importance of effective lesson adjustments based on the physical educators evaluation of skilled performances.

**Component 4.d** Implement transitions, routines and positive behavior management to create and maintain a safe, supportive and engaging learning environment.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 4.d*

Providing an effective learning environment through transitions, routines, and positive behavior strategies was termed by Rink (2014b) as a generic component of teaching. The
position stated by Rink (2014b) is widely accepted throughout physical education and considered essential in teaching physical education (Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2010; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2013; Rink, 2014a, 2014b; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). Lavay, Henderson, French, and Guthrie (2012) and Garrahy, Cothran, and Kulinna (2005) provided additional evidence as to the limited time PETE programs teach behavior management to candidates warranting inclusion of Component 4.d. in the 2017 initial PETE standards.

**Component 4.e** Analyze motor skills and performance concepts in order to provide specific, congruent feedback to enhance student learning.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 4.e*

Content knowledge in physical education has produced a plethora of research in pursuit of evidence of teaching effectiveness. Siedentop (2002) provided commentary as to the important of content knowledge and teaching effectiveness. Ward (2009) offered insight into Ball, Thames, and Phelps (2008) classification of common content knowledge (CCK) and specialized content knowledge (SCK). Ward (2009) described CCK as a teacher’s knowledge of the rules, etiquette, techniques, and tactics inherent in physical education subject matter. Ward (2009) further described SCK as a physical educator’s knowledge of potential student errors while engaged in motor tasks and the analysis of student performance with accompanying movement corrections and feedback to improve student performance. Several studies (Ayvazo & Ward, 2011; Chen, Housner, & Wayda, 2011; Dodds, 1994; Dyson, 2014; Ferry & McCaughtry, 2015; Griffin, Dodds, & Rovengo, 1996; Kim & Ko, 2015; McCullick, Schempp, Hsu, Jung, Vickers, & Schuknecht; 2006; Overdorf & Coker, 2013; Rovengo, Chen, &
Todorovich, 2003; Schempp, Manross, Tan, & Fincer, 1998) detailed the importance and impact of strong content knowledge has on physical education teaching effectiveness.

References for Supporting Explanations for Standard 4


Standard 5: Assessment of Student Learning

Physical education candidates select and implement appropriate assessments to monitor students’ progress and guide decision making related to instruction and learning.

Component 5.a Select or create authentic, formal assessments that measure student attainment of short- and long-term objectives.

Component 5.b Implement formative assessments that monitor student learning before and throughout the long-term plan, as well as summative assessments that evaluate student learning upon completion of the long-term plan.

Component 5.c Implement a reflective cycle to guide decision making specific to candidate performance, student learning, and short- and long-term plan objectives.

Supporting Explanation of Components 5.a – 5.c

Assessment is an essential element to understanding student learning (Brown & Glasner, 1999). Assessment in physical education has been particularly difficult due to the nature of the content areas we cover as well as the knowledge we have regarding improvement in skill development. Often these elements affect assessment results i.e., amount of time with students,
knowledge of skill components. Therefore it is essential that pre-service teachers develop assessment skills that will provide meaningful information for the teacher and the student (Biggs, 1999).

Traditional assessment techniques have been used that focus on product-oriented results i.e., components of fitness or isolated skills. Assessment beyond the practical-based knowledge is essential in order to continue to move pre-service teachers forward in the assessment process. Quality physical education requires the alignment of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment (Lorente-Catalan & Kirk, 2016). Lopez et al. (2013) suggest in assessment techniques such as alternative assessment, authentic assessment, formative assessment, all which aim at providing a wide array of information to the teacher to determine the learning that has occurred. It is essential that pre-service teachers implement and analyze the results of the assessment to inform pedagogical decisions (Lorente-Catalan & Kirk, 2016).

Reflection is a vital component of becoming an effective teacher. In order to become an effective teacher one must reflect on past and present situations in order to learn from each. Posner (1985) stated “we do not actually learn from experience as much as we learn from reflecting on experiences” (p.19). It is important to spend time looking back at the development of the class, replaying the situations, and analyzing the events that occurred. Reflection is a skill that must be taught to pre-service teachers. Teacher preparation programs must plan for meaningful experiences that teach the reflection process so that modifications can occur to planning and instructional phases of the teaching process (Banville & Rikard, 2001). The focus of the reflection should be on making the appropriate modifications to ensure that teacher is effective and efficient and all students are learning (Banville & Rikard, 2001).
References for Supporting Explanations for Standard 5


**Standard 6: Professional Responsibility**

Physical education candidates demonstrate behaviors essential to becoming effective professionals. They exhibit professional ethics and culturally competent practices; seek opportunities for continued professional development; and demonstrate knowledge of promotion/advocacy strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities that support the development of physically literate individuals.
Component 6.a Engage in behavior that reflects professional ethics, practice and cultural competence.

Supporting Explanation of Component 6.a

Candidates are expected to demonstrate professional behavior of the highest ethical standards. Little has changed over the past half century regarding this expectation of educators other than the creation of formal position statements and guidance documents stating as much in a formal, written manner for both educators (InTASC, 2011; NASPE, 2007; NBPTS, 2002; NEA, 1975) and candidates in clinical experiences (CAEP, 2015; NASPE, 2009).

The change that has come to the forefront of professional behavior in the teaching profession is the expectation that teachers possess cultural competence. Similar to professionalism, there is not a single definition of cultural competence that is accepted for use by educators (NCCC, n.d.). However, what is clear is the need for teachers, and candidates, to possess cultural competence to create safe and supportive learning environments, communicate respectfully and sensitively with all members of the school community, and seek out appropriate resources to assist every student with their learning needs.

Component 6.b Engage in continued professional growth and collaboration in schools and/or professional organizations.

Supporting Explanation of Component 6.b

Exemplary practices of high quality physical education teachers include active engagement in professional associations and collaboration in professional learning communities (Patton, Parker, & Pratt, 2013; Sims, Lambdin, VanVolkinburg, Santos, Graham, & Gorwitz, 2010). Professional learning communities are those informal or formal groups of educators with
shared visions of student learning who come together for the purpose of mutual support and collaborative learning to improve their practice (Keay & Lloyd, 2009). While a professional learning community is typically built for candidates during their final capstone experience, based on the mentor teacher, university supervisor, and peer group, this community is typically not in place for the in-service educator. As such, Component 6.b helps ensure programs provide candidates with the knowledge for how to engage in professional development, such as with professional associations, as well as collaborate with colleagues through professional learning opportunities to ensure lifelong learning for improved pedagogical practice.

**Component 6.c** Describe strategies for the promotion and advocacy of physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities.

*Supporting Explanation of Component 6.c*

The role of policy development and/or change in supporting school physical education is now becoming better understood. There is now a growing body of evidence on the impact of (a lack of) policies on the quantity and quality of physical education delivered in schools, as well overall physical activity (PA) opportunities during the school day (e.g., (e.g., Barroso, Kelder, Springer et al., 2009; Center on Education Policy, 2007, 2008; Cawley, Meyerhoefer, & Newhouse, 2007; Evenson, Ballard, Lee, & Ammerman, 2009; Kelder, Springer, Barroso, et al. 2009; Madsen, 2012; Slater, Nicholson, Chriqui, Turner, & Chaloupka, 2012). Physical educators (along with Physical Education Teacher Education [PETE]) faculty and physical education’s national, regional and state associations), all play a key role in proactively promoting the need for effective school physical education programs, and advocating for state level policies that support the delivery of effective physical education. Therefore, it is essential that
prospective physical educators have the needed knowledge and awareness of program promotion and advocacy rationales and related strategies.

Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programming (CSPAP) reflects a fundamental shift, globally and in the USA, in the role that schools play in a) educating children and youth to adopt a healthy and active lifestyle through physical education, and b) creating expanded PA opportunities on campus throughout the school day (e.g., AAHPERD, 2013; CDC, 2013; Institute of Medicine, 2013; Pate et al., 2006; Tannehill, van der Mars, & MacPhail, 2015). The emphasis on promoting PA throughout the school day is in part a consequence of the significant rise (spanning over three decades) in the percentage of children and youth who are overweight or obese (e.g., Ogden, Carroll, Kit, Flegal, 2015; WHO, 2015). This shift is also reflected in the recently unveiled revised National Physical Activity Plan (http://www.physicalactivityplan.org/docs/2016NPAP_Finalforwebsite.pdf).

Education is one of nine societal sectors targeting strategies and tactics aimed at increasing PA levels of children and youth. CSPAP implementation in schools is one seven key strategies targeted in the Education sector.

Standard 3 of SHAPE America’s national K-12 Content Standards along with its Grade-Level Outcomes specifically target students’ PA engagement in physical education, and, more importantly beyond physical education (SHAPE America, 2014). There is now a growing evidence base supporting the implementation of comprehensive and multi-component interventions aimed at increasing school-based physical activity beyond physical education (e.g., Russ, Webster, Beets & Phillips, 2015; Ward, 2011). In 2015, SHAPE America announced its commitment to increasing the PA levels and health of all U.S. school-aged youth with its announcement of the “50 Million Strong by 2029” goal. Consequently, PETE programs play a
critical role in ensuring that prospective physical educators possess the needed knowledge to plan, implement and sustain CSPAPs in school settings.

References for Supporting Explanations for Standard 6


Development of Standards

In 2012, SHAPE America created a task force charged with review and revision of the NASPE 2008 Standards. While members of the task force changed somewhat since the first meeting, the task force who authored SHAPE America’s 2017 Standards and Components was comprised of six physical education teacher educators and one PreK-12 educator. Members have expertise from elementary and secondary levels, adapted physical education, one is an author of SHAPE America’s National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education, two were members of the task force charged with writing the NASPE 2008 Standards, and one has experience with comprehensive school physical activity programming. The task force convened in face-to-face meetings 14 times, held 10 conference calls, and sent dozens of emails regarding discussion items. Finally, the task force solicited feedback from stakeholders at five different points in the process; three through use of an electronic survey and two through presentations at conferences. A detailed list of meeting dates and agenda items, as well as dates of calls for feedback can be found in Appendix C.

Initial work began with ensuring all members were knowledgeable about CAEP’s expectations as delineated in the Guidelines for Writing and Approval of SPA Standards. Following this information, the task force came to agreement regarding the need to structure the work following CAEP’s four principles A-D (with support from the 2011 InTASC Standards), SHAPE America’s National Standards & Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education, updated findings from the knowledge bases in general education and physical education, and feedback from stakeholders. The next action of the task force was to collect feedback from stakeholders regarding the NASPE 2008 Standards. As such, the task force created an electronic survey to collect information regarding comments/suggestions from physical education teacher
educators, PreK-12 physical educators, and other members of the movement-based educational community. This initial call for feedback resulted in 582 written comments that helped shape task force discussion on potential revisions to the 2008 NASPE Standards. Details regarding written comments from electronic surveys can be found in Appendix D.

The task force discussed comments from the initial call for feedback, as well as findings from the literature reviews in general education and physical education. The result of this discussion was draft #1 of SHAPE America’s 2017 Standards and Elements. The task force placed a second call for feedback via electronic survey in October-November 2015; this survey was to solicit information about draft #2. The second call for feedback using an electronic survey, based on draft #1, resulted in 1,184 written comments. A third call for feedback was provided following the task force’s presentation of draft #1 at the PETE & HETE Conference in October 2015. The third call for feedback from audience members following presentation of draft #1 resulted in 19 comments shared verbally or, afterwards, in writing. Following review and discussion of comments, task force members revised standards and elements again during the winter of 2015-2016. The result of this effort was draft #2 of SHAPE America’s 2017 Standards and Elements.

In April 2016, the task force solicited a fourth call for feedback on draft #2. The fourth call for feedback, via an electronic survey, results in 582 comments. The fifth and final call for feedback was following the task force’s presentation of draft #2 at the SHAPE America National Convention & Expo in April 2016. The final call for feedback from audience members following presentation of draft #2 resulted in 13 comments shared verbally or, afterwards, in writing. In late winter and early spring 2016, task force members began writing rubric criteria and defining selected terms for use in the glossary where feedback indicated stakeholders were
satisfied and so not likely to warrant much change, if any, following the fourth and fifth calls for feedback. Following review and discussion of comments solicited in April 2016 from stakeholders, task force members continued to revise some standards and elements in order to address feedback such as concern for how to provide evidence of candidates’ meeting a standard or wording that resulted in confusion. Further, task force members continued to write and revise rubric criteria until agreement was reached. Finally, updates provided from CAEP in late spring 2016 included the need to change from element to component to identify sub-levels of each standard. The result of this work is the SHAPE America 2017 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards and Components.
Potential Duplication or Overlaps in Standards

Duplication or overlap may be found with SHAPE America 2017 Component 3.e and CAEP Component 1.5. The SHAPE America 2017 Component 3.e states candidates “Plan and implement learning experiences that require students to use technology appropriately in meeting one or more short- and long-term plan objective(s).” The CAEP Component 1.5 states “Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.” Specific overlap may be found with expectations that candidates both plan and implement learning experiences for students to use technology. However, SHAPE America Component 3.e does not require candidates to assess learning experiences as stated in CAEP Component 1.5.

The SHAPE America 2017 Component 3.e is written to address CAEP’s cross-cutting theme addressing technology and digital learning and as it applies to students’ use of technology in the dynamic and movement-based physical education learning environment. In addition, rubric criteria for SHAPE America 2017 Component 3.e at the target level state candidates will plan and implement learning activities requiring students to use technology specific to movement-based activity such as Coach’s Eye, a video analysis app, in addition to pedometers and heart rate monitors.
**Standard 1: Content and Foundational Knowledge**

*Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate an understanding of common and specialized content, and scientific and theoretical foundations for the delivery of an effective physical education program.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Statements</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.a Describe and apply common content knowledge for teaching PreK-12 physical education.</strong></td>
<td>Candidate fails to meet the criterion score established by the program on standardized subject-specific content knowledge test.</td>
<td>Candidate meets the criterion score established by the program on standardized subject-specific content knowledge test.</td>
<td>Candidate exceeds the criterion score established by the program on standardized subject-specific content knowledge test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate describes and applies common content knowledge of motor skills, movement concepts, and movement patterns that may contain errors or are not age and developmentally appropriate. Candidate incorrectly describes and applies situation-specific tactics and/or strategies and techniques of skill-based performances. Rules and etiquette described and applied in accordance with the activity/game/sport contain errors and/or inappropriate etiquette.</td>
<td>Candidate correctly describes and applies common content knowledge of developmentally appropriate motor skills, movement concepts, and movement patterns. Candidate describes and applies situation-specific tactics and/or strategies and correct technique of skill-based performances in a developmentally appropriate manner. Rules and etiquette are described and applied in accordance with the activity/game/sport.</td>
<td>Candidate correctly describes and applies common content knowledge of developmentally appropriate motor skills, movement concepts, and movement patterns. Candidate describes and applies situation-specific tactics and/or strategies and correct technique of skill-based performances in an age and developmentally appropriate manner. Rules and etiquette are described and applied in accordance with the activity/game/sport. Candidate can synthesize and integrate concepts and techniques from multiple content areas when planning for physical education content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b. Describe and apply specialized content knowledge for teaching PreK-12 physical education.</td>
<td>Candidate fails to meet the criterion score established by the program on standardized subject-specific content knowledge test.</td>
<td>Candidate meets the criterion score established by the program on standardized subject-specific content knowledge test.</td>
<td>Candidate exceeds the criterion score established by the program on standardized subject-specific content knowledge test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate describes and applies specialized content knowledge by providing skill cues, identifying critical elements and common errors that may contain errors and/or are developmentally inappropriate. Task progressions may not follow a logical sequence and/or are not developmentally or age appropriate.</td>
<td>Candidate describes and applies specialized content knowledge by providing skill cues, identifying critical elements, and predicting common errors. Candidate describes and applies planned and developmentally appropriate task progressions; and uses observed performance as the basis for adjusting learning task(s).</td>
<td>Candidate describes and applies specialized content knowledge by providing skill cues, identifying critical elements, and predicting common errors that are age and developmentally appropriate. Candidate describes and applies planned and developmentally appropriate task progressions; uses observed performance as the basis for adjusting learning task(s); and provides accommodations for varying skill levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.c Describe and apply physiological and biomechanical concepts related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.

| Candidate fails to meet the criterion score established by the program on selected assessments in physiology and/or biomechanics. |
| Candidate meets the criterion score established by the program on selected assessments in physiology and biomechanics. |
| Candidate exceeds the criterion score established by the program on selected assessments in physiology and biomechanics. |

<p>| Candidate applies physiological and biomechanical concepts in planning for and delivering instruction. Skill cues are appropriate in plan, but candidate fails to use the identified skill cues during the lesson. Candidate’s instruction for skillful movement, physical activity or fitness is given using generalized terms and is concerned with the “how” of the movement, physical activity, or fitness. |
| Candidate appropriately applies physiological and biomechanical concepts in planning for and delivering instruction. Skill cues identified in the plan are used during the lesson. Candidate’s instruction for skillful movement, physical activities, or fitness includes the “how” and “why” of the movement, physical activity, or fitness. |
| Candidate appropriately applies physiological and biomechanical concepts in planning for and delivering instruction for all stages of student proficiency. Skill cues are identified in the plan and are consistently used during the lesson. Candidate’s instruction for skillful movement, physical activity, or fitness includes the “how” and “why” of the movement, physical activity, or fitness. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.d Describe and apply motor learning and behavior-change/psychological principles related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate fails to meet the criterion score established by the program on assessments in motor learning and/or behavior-change/psychological principles.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate demonstrates knowledge of the various theories, but fails to apply theories to teaching. Practice conditions used for skill acquisition do not allow for individual differences. Candidate omits behavior-change/psychological principles in planning learning experiences and uses punitive measures to manage behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.e Describe and apply motor development theory and principles related to fundamental motor skills, skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate fails to meet the criterion score established by the program on assessments in motor development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate applies motor development theory and principles in planning for the lesson, but fails to account for developmental differences during instruction and practice activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate applies motor development theory and principles in planning for and delivering instruction. Candidate plans and implements lessons that are developmentally appropriate (neither too hard nor too easy). Candidate demonstrates application of motor development theory by using developmentally appropriate teaching cues, and planning developmentally appropriate practice opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate meets the criterion score established by the program on assessments in motor development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate applies motor development theory and principles in planning for and delivering instruction. Candidate plans and implements lessons that are developmentally appropriate (neither too hard nor too easy). Candidate demonstrates application of motor development theory by using developmentally appropriate teaching cues, and planning developmentally appropriate practice opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate exceeds the criterion score established by the program on assessments of motor development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate applies motor development theory and principles in planning for and delivering instruction for all stages of student proficiency. Candidate demonstrates application of motor development theory by using developmentally appropriate teaching cues, and planning developmentally appropriate practice opportunities for all stages of student proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard 2: Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness*

*Physical education teacher candidates are physically literate individuals who can demonstrate skillful performance in physical education content areas and health-enhancing levels of fitness.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Statements</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.a Demonstrate competency in all fundamental motor skills, as well as skillful performance in a minimum of four physical education content areas (e.g., games, aquatics, dance, fitness activities, outdoor pursuits, individual-performance activities).</td>
<td>Candidate can demonstrate all fundamental movement skills at the automatic stage, but only in isolation (a non-authentic environment; not within a variety of physical activities or in coordination with other movement patterns). Candidate cannot select what to do and/or cannot execute that selection appropriately in the authentic environment. Candidate demonstrates movement skills at the control level across one or more content areas selected for reporting.</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates all fundamental movement patterns at the automatic stage in an authentic environment. Candidate demonstrates the ability to combine movement patterns into a sequence. Candidate correctly selects what to do and executes that selection appropriately in the authentic environment. Candidate demonstrates movement skills at the utilization level in at least four physical education content areas selected for reporting.</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates all fundamental movement patterns at the automatic stage in an authentic environment. Candidate demonstrates the ability to combine and adapt skills during game play or activity performance. Candidate correctly executes advanced strategies at appropriate times and/or appropriate situations. Candidate performs at the proficiency level in at least four physical education content areas selected for reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b Achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate performs below the age- and gender-specific levels on majority health-related fitness components (cardio respiratory endurance, muscular strength, muscular endurance, flexibility, and body composition) using standards established by national, state or program level testing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate meets the age- and gender-specific levels on at least three health-related fitness components (cardio respiratory endurance, muscular strength, muscular endurance, flexibility, and body composition) using standards established by national, state or program level testing throughout the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate exceeds the age- and gender-specific levels on at least three health-related fitness components (cardio respiratory endurance, muscular strength, muscular endurance, flexibility, and body composition) using standards established by national, state or program level testing throughout the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Skillful: A person’s ability to employ techniques, tactics, strategies, rules and etiquette effectively in the context of the activity.

* To assist individuals with special needs to achieve the intent of Standard 2, physical education teacher education programs are allowed and encouraged to use a variety of accommodations and/or modifications to demonstrate skillful performance (e.g., modified/adapted equipment, augmented communication devices, multi-media devices) and fitness (e.g., weight training programs, exercise logs).
Standard 3: Planning and Implementation

Physical education teacher candidates apply content and foundational knowledge to plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education through the effective use of resources, accommodations and/or modifications, technology and metacognitive strategies to address the diverse needs of all students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Statements</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.a Plan and implement appropriate (e.g., measureable, developmentally appropriate, performance-based) short- and long-term plan objectives that are aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education.</td>
<td>Candidate fails to make both long- and short term plans. Planning is limited to daily lesson plans, with no plan for long-term instructional goals for the unit. Short-term objectives are included but not aligned with identified long-term objectives. Planned learning activities are not aligned with instructional or programmatic objectives. Objectives are inappropriate for the short-term topic/developmental level of the students by being either too difficult or too easy. Learning objectives are appropriate but candidate fails to align objectives with local, state and/or national standards/grade-level outcomes.</td>
<td>Candidate designs and implements short- and long-term plans. Learning activities are congruent with short- and long-term objectives and are linked to individual student needs. Short- and long-term objectives inform instruction and learning activities. Objectives are appropriate for short-term topic, age, and developmental level of learners. Objectives identify measurable behaviors, conditions, and criteria.</td>
<td>Candidate designs and implements short- and long-term plans to ensure that learning is sequential. Short- and long-term objectives are linked directly to student learning activities. Short- and long-term objectives inform instruction and learning activities and allow for differentiated instruction. Objectives are appropriate for the short-term topic, age, and developmental level of learners. Objectives incorporate multiple domains of learning. Objectives are measurable, and each contain behaviors, conditions, and criteria for student mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b Plan and implement progressive and sequential content that aligns with short- and long-term plan objectives and that addresses the diverse needs of all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning activities are inappropriate for the age and developmental level of students by being either too difficult or too easy. Candidate fails to make modifications to planned learning activities to accommodate students’ developmental levels by increasing or decreasing task complexity. The sequence of the short-term plan may be illogical, with gaps in progressions. Progressions between learning activities are too difficult or too easy to facilitate skill mastery. Candidate plans without considering pre-assessment data to determine the entry level of the students. Students participating in learning activities fail to achieve short-term plan objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate considers the context of the learning environment that is reflected in the planning and implementation of the short-term plan. Multiple methods are used to convey content. Learning activities are age/developmentally appropriate and are optimally challenging (neither too easy nor too difficult). Progressions are sequential, progressive, and align with short-term plan objectives facilitating skill acquisition. Task complexity is age and developmentally appropriate. Candidate plans to use pre-assessment data to determine the entry level of the students. Learning activities allow students to achieve short-term plan objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning activities are age and developmentally appropriate, and provide appropriate complexity (neither too easy nor too difficult). Candidate implements adjustments to learning activities based on student performance. Adjustments are implemented for individuals and the entire class. Candidate plans and implements a logical sequence aligned with short- and long-term objectives. Candidate provides differentiated instruction in learning activities based on student readiness as determined by pre-assessment data. Progressions are sequential, align with short- and long-term objectives, and provide students with opportunities to extend learning activities matching individual needs. Learning activities allow students to achieve short- and long-term plan objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c Plan for and manage resources to provide active, fair and equitable learning experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate does not plan or plans for short-term plan variations incongruent with individual differences (abilities/needs/interests) represented. Instruction is not individualized, and a “one size fits all” approach is taken. Candidate uses one instructional model/approach throughout the long-term plan. Candidate does not offer choices in equipment, space use or practice tasks based on individual differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate plans for instructional variations for individual differences (abilities/needs/interest). Candidate varies instructional models/approaches throughout the long-term plan to account for differences in learning styles and prior experiences. Candidate provides student choice in equipment, space or level of practice tasks based on individual differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s plans reflect age and developmentally appropriate adaptations for abilities (all levels) and needs (interests and motivations). Candidate uses multiple instructional models/approaches throughout the long-term plan to account for variations in learning styles and prior experiences. Students are given multiple choices (e.g., equipment, space) within practice tasks based on individual differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d Plan and implement individualized instruction for diverse student needs, adding specific accommodations and/or modifications for all students.</td>
<td>Candidate fails to plan for all students within the class based on factors such as gender, class, ethnicity, race, physical or mental disability, or socioeconomic status. Candidate does not make accommodations for the diversity found within the student population. Candidate fails to plan and teach for inclusion through selection of students chosen to demonstrate, inclusive display materials, and grouping of students for instruction and learning activities. Candidate fails to collaborate with the IEP team on the planning and implementation of short-term plans that meet the needs of students with disabilities.</td>
<td>Candidate plans and implements short-term plan accommodations based on factors such as gender, class, ethnicity, race, physical or mental disability, or socioeconomic status for all students within the class. Candidate plans and teaches for inclusion of diversity in displayed materials, using a variety of students to demonstrate and grouping students for instruction and learning activities. Candidate collaborates with the IEP team on the implementation of short-term plans meeting the needs of students with disabilities.</td>
<td>Candidate plans and implements short-term plan accommodations for the diversity found within the student population using differentiate planning and instruction for all students within the class. It is evident from the candidate’s planning and implementation that the components (e.g., selection of long- and short-term plans, materials selected for display, and the selection of students to demonstrate) are inclusive and attend to all students’ needs. Candidate plans and implements inclusive methods of grouping students by creating groups of mixed skill and abilities levels that account for the diversity found with the student population. Candidate collaborates with the IEP team on the planning and implementing of short-term plans that meet the needs of students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.e Plan and implement learning experiences that require students to use technology appropriately in meeting one or more short- and long-term plan objective(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate does not plan and implement use of technology or the technology is not age and/or developmentally appropriate. Candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of current technology and its application in physical education settings. Candidate’s use of technology does not align with long- and/or short-term objectives.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate integrates learning experiences that involve students in the use of 1 form of technology. Candidate plans and implements age and developmentally appropriate use of technology in a physical education setting. Candidate’s plan for student use of technology is aligned with long- and short-term objectives.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate integrates learning experiences that require students to use more than 1 form of technology in a physical education setting. Candidate demonstrates age and developmentally appropriate use of current technologies and uses the technology to enhance student learning. Candidate incorporates more than 1 form of technology (e.g. pedometers, HR monitors, iPads, Coach’s Eye, etc.) to provide feedback to students. Candidate’s use of technology is aligned with long- and short-term objectives.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.f Plan and implement learning experiences that engage students in using metacognitive strategies appropriately to analyze their own performance results.</td>
<td>Candidate does not plan or implement metacognitive knowledge activities or these activities are not age and/or developmentally appropriate. Students are not provided opportunities to analyze, plan, monitor, evaluate, or reflect on their own performance.</td>
<td>Candidate plans and implements age and developmentally appropriate metacognitive activities. Candidate provides opportunities for students to explore knowledge and beliefs on the task (purpose), person (individual variables) and strategy (What, How, Why, When). Students reflect on one’s own declarative and procedural knowledge related to their own performance.</td>
<td>Candidate plans and implements age and developmentally appropriate metacognitive knowledge and strategy learning activities. Candidate allows students to analyze, reflect, and improve skillful performances. Metacognitive knowledge provides means for students to explore the knowledge and beliefs on the task (purpose), person (individual variables) and strategy (What, How, Why, When). Candidate also provides opportunities for students to engage in metacognitive strategies by raising one’s awareness, monitoring, and evaluating the learning process related to skillful performance. Students reflect on declarative, procedural, and strategic knowledge related to their own performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management

Physical education teacher candidates engage students in meaningful learning experiences through effective use of pedagogical skills. They use communication, feedback, and instructional and managerial skills to enhance student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Statements</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.a Demonstrate verbal and nonverbal communication skills that convey respect and sensitivity across all learning experiences.</td>
<td>Candidate’s verbal interactions are professional but contain occasional mistakes in grammar, poor diction, and/or inappropriate language for the age and developmental level of students. Candidate may disregard cultural differences when speaking with his/her students. Candidate uses “slang” terms at times and occasionally “puts down” students. The pacing of verbal communication is consistently too fast or too slow with little variation in tone and inflection. All communication in the short-term plan is verbal with no other form of communication used.</td>
<td>Candidate’s verbal interactions are culturally responsive with an occasional mistake in grammar or the occasional use of a regional colloquialism. Candidate demonstrates respect for cultural differences and is inclusive in his/her teaching. Pacing of verbal communication is age and developmentally appropriate with variation in tone and inflection. Candidate utilizes verbal and nonverbal communication throughout the lesson. Alternative forms of communication such as task sheets, bulletin boards, augmented communication device, etc. are used to communicate short-term plan content.</td>
<td>Candidate uses age and developmentally appropriate grammar and diction in a culturally responsive way. Candidate’s use of communication demonstrates respect for cultural differences and creates an inclusive atmosphere. Pacing of verbal communication is age and developmentally appropriate with variation in tone and inflection used throughout the lesson. Candidate utilizes multiple forms of communication such as task sheets, bulletin boards, augmented communication device, etc. throughout the short-term plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b Implement demonstrations, explanations and instructional cues that are aligned with short- and long-term plan objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provides no demonstration or an incorrect demonstration that is not age and/or developmentally appropriate during the instructional episode. Candidate provides too few or too many instructional cues for the age and developmental level of the students. Instructional cues are incorrect or do not identify the elements of the skill/tactic/strategy. Demonstrations, explanations, and instructional cues are not aligned with the short- and long-term objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provides an age and developmentally appropriate demonstration during the instructional episode. Candidate implements instructional cues that identify elements of the skill/tactic/strategy. Instructional cues are reinforced during the instructional episode. Demonstrations, explanations, and instructional cues are aligned with the short- or long-term plan objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provides age and developmentally appropriate demonstrations during the instructional episode that are aligned with short- and long-term objectives. Demonstrations are short in duration (60-90 seconds) allowing for maximum time-on task. Candidate implements developmentally appropriate instructional cues identifying elements of the skill/tactic/strategy that facilitate learning of short- and long-term objectives for all students. Instructional cues are reinforced throughout the instructional episode and short-term plan. Demonstrations, explanations, and instructional cues are aligned with the short- and long-term plan objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c Evaluate the changing dynamics of the learning environment and adjust instructional tasks as needed to further student progress.</td>
<td>Candidate delivers lessons by remaining on script with the short-term plan despite student responses. Candidate fails to recognize changes in the teaching environment or fails to implement adjustments based on changes in the learning environment. Candidate does not make lesson adjustments for either underperforming or highly performing students.</td>
<td>Candidate implements adjustments to the short-term plan based on student progress and responses. Candidate is flexible in the short-term plan or with students by implementing adjustments to further student learning. Candidate makes lesson modifications for underperforming and highly skilled students alike.</td>
<td>Candidate is flexible and implements developmentally appropriate adjustments based on student progress and responses. Candidate responds in a developmentally appropriate manner to the teachable moments during the short-term plan to enhance student learning. Candidate makes creative lesson modifications for both underperforming and highly skilled students alike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.d Implement transitions, routines and positive behavior management to create and maintain a safe, supportive and engaging learning environment.</td>
<td>Candidate has ineffective rules or has difficulty in implementing class rules. Rules lack clarity or are stated in language inappropriate for the age of the students. Managerial routines are not present and no systems are in place for distribution/return of equipment, attendance, finding a partner or creating a group, and other class routines. Students are arranged in groups/formations that do not maximize the available teaching space. Candidate does not employ a consistent start and stop signal. Behavior issues are either not addressed or not handled in a developmentally appropriate manner. Candidate does not establish a supportive learning environment for all students by demonstrating characteristics of motor elitism, excluding students from lesson activities, and/or by not providing equitable learning activities.</td>
<td>Candidate has established developmentally appropriate rules for the class and enforced the rules systematically. Managerial routines are present and a system is in place for distribution/return of equipment, attendance, finding a partner, creating groups, and other class routines. Candidate employs a clear start and stop signal. Space is used efficiently allowing all students to participate in learning activities. Behavior issues are dealt with immediately in a developmentally appropriate manner by using proactive strategies such as student prompts. Candidate creates a supportive environment by providing feedback (providing more to underperforming and less to high performing) to students, encourages all students to participate, and provides equitable learning opportunities for all students.</td>
<td>Candidate has established developmentally appropriate rules for the class and enforced the rules systematically. Managerial routines are present and maximize learning opportunities by limiting time off task. Candidate employs a clear start and stop signal throughout the lesson. Space is used efficiently allowing all students equal opportunities to participate in learning activities. Behavior issues are not apparent or are dealt with immediately in a developmentally appropriate manner. Candidate creates a supportive environment by distributing feedback (providing more to underperforming and less to high performing) to students, encourages all students to participate, and provides equitable learning opportunities for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.e Analyze motor skills and performance concepts in order to provide specific, congruent feedback to enhance student learning.</td>
<td>Candidate can analyze, detect, and correct critical elements for movement skills in at least one stage of proficiency. Candidate identifies key elements of motor skills, but provides non-specific feedback. Lesson focuses on skills without consideration for the context in which skills are executed. Candidate identifies key elements of motor skills, but feedback on the skills is non-specific. Feedback is general without connecting feedback to specific responses. Feedback is motivational and is provided to the group as a whole. Candidate provides limited feedback to students on the effective use of tactics and strategies.</td>
<td>Candidate analyzes, detects, and corrects elements of movement skills using skill cues linked to the identified critical elements. Lesson focus is on skills with consideration of the context in which skills are performed. Candidate provides specific and corrective feedback on critical elements of skills, movement concepts, and tactics. A combination of positive, specific, and corrective feedback is used. Feedback is provided on developmentally appropriate use of tactics and strategies. Candidate provides individual and group feedback.</td>
<td>Candidate analyzes, detects, and corrects all elements of movement skills using skill cues linked to the identified critical elements. Lesson focus is on skills and context in which skills are performed. Candidate provides specific, corrective feedback on critical elements for both motor skills and tactics. Candidate provides specific, congruent, and corrective feedback to students on the effective use of tactics and strategies. Feedback is linked directly to student responses and is provided to individuals and groups during the lesson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Standard 5: Assessment of Student Learning**

*Physical education teacher candidates select and implement appropriate assessments to monitor students’ progress and guide decision making related to instruction and learning.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Statements</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.a Select or create authentic, formal assessments that measure student attainment of short- and long-term objectives.</td>
<td>Candidate does not plan developmentally appropriate formal and/or informal assessments. Assessments do not align with the stated short-term objectives. Assessments are not planned for all short- and long-term learning objectives.</td>
<td>Candidate selects developmentally appropriate formal and/or informal assessments that directly align with short- and long-term student learning objectives. Assessments are planned for all stated short- and long-term learning objectives.</td>
<td>Candidate selects or creates a variety of developmentally appropriate authentic, formal and/or informal assessments that directly align with short- and long-term learning objectives. Multiple assessments are planned that allow for multiple domains to be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate does not plan for formative assessments within the short- and long-term plans. Pre assessment data are not used when making informed planning and instructional decisions. Assessments do not align with short- and long-term objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate implements formative assessments that monitor student learning before and throughout the long-term plan. Summative assessments are planned that inform candidate of student learning. Data from assessments are used to inform planning and instructional decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate implements ongoing formative assessments that directly aligns to student performance before and throughout the long-term plan. Assessment results are used to inform instruction, provide feedback, communicate progress, and plan for future instructional goals. Pre assessment data are used to design learning experiences that align with planned instructional activities. Summative assessments are planned and implemented that align to long-term objectives and provide evidence of student learning based on previous data collection and individualized instructional goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c Implement a reflective cycle to guide decision making specific to candidate performance, student learning, and short- and long-term plan objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate demonstrates minimal evidence to support their use of the reflective cycle to modify and plan instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate implements a reflective cycle (description of lesson, evaluation of candidate’s performance, analysis of student learning, action plan) to guide decisions for future lessons. Candidate uses the reflective cycle to modify/adapt instruction and implement change to enhance student learning based on short- and long-term objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate implements a reflective cycle (description of lesson, evaluation of candidate’s performance, analysis of student learning, action plan) to guide decisions both during the lesson and future lessons. Candidate uses the reflective cycle to modify/adapt instruction and implement change both during the lesson and for future lessons to enhance student learning based on short- and long-term objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 6: Professional Responsibility

Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate behaviors essential to becoming effective professionals. They exhibit professional ethics and culturally competent practices; seek opportunities for continued professional development; and demonstrate knowledge of promotion/advocacy strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities that support the development of physically literate individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Statements</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.a Engage in behavior that reflects professional ethics, practice and cultural competence.</td>
<td>Candidate attempts to demonstrate ethical behaviors but may make some unprofessional verbal or written comments in private with other school professionals that are considered inappropriate (e.g., gossiping about a student or students’ family). Candidate respects privacy/confidentiality laws as they pertain to students’ medical records and grades. Candidate maintains professional relationships in most cases but may violate candidate-student boundaries (e.g., communicating with a student through Facebook or text messages). Candidate may demonstrate language or behavior that is insensitive to cultural differences but attempts to improve on cultural competence in subsequent opportunities.</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates ethical behaviors in all aspects of practice in the school setting (e.g., classroom; duties, such as recess or bus). Candidate is respectful of privacy/confidentiality laws pertaining to students, students’ families, and colleagues (e.g., teachers, principal, staff). Candidate maintains professional relationships including respect of candidate-student boundaries in and out of the school setting. Candidate demonstrates both verbal and non-verbal skills that reflect cultural competence toward all students.</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates ethical behaviors in all aspects of practice in the school setting and beyond (e.g., faculty room conversations; social media). Candidate is respectful of privacy/confidentiality laws pertaining to students, students’ families, and colleagues (e.g., teachers, principal, staff) and ensures students that assessment results and feedback are private information. Candidate maintains professional relationships including respect of candidate-student boundaries in and out of the school setting. Candidate helps students to demonstrate sensitivity toward one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b Engage in continued professional growth and collaboration in schools and/or professional organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate participates in professional growth opportunities (e.g., major’s club; attendance at state conventions, health fairs, and Jump/Hoops for Heart activities) required by the program when directed to do so. Candidate may or may not grow professionally through collaborative opportunities provided by education professionals (e.g., mentor teacher, university supervisor, principal) based on a defensive posture and/or verbal stance. Candidate may not take subsequent action to implement feedback or may attempt to implement feedback with little effort to improve his own professional knowledge and/or skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate participates in professional growth opportunities (e.g., major’s club; attendance at state conventions, field day, and Jump/Hoops for Heart activities) when they are offered. Candidate grows professionally through collaborative opportunities as displayed by a willingness to receive constructive feedback from education professionals (e.g., mentor teacher, university supervisor, principal) and subsequent actions represent an attempt to improve based on such feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate takes initiative in seeking out opportunities to participate in professional growth opportunities (e.g., major’s club; attendance at state conventions, field day, and Jump/Hoops for Heart activities) and may take a leadership role such as presenting at a convention or serving as an officer in a student group such as a PETE major’s club. Candidate grows professionally through collaborative opportunities sought out to further professional knowledge and/or skills. Candidate is observed implementing new knowledge and/or skills when working with PreK-12 students in the physical education environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c Describe strategies for the promotion and advocacy of physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities.</td>
<td>Candidate fails to demonstrate knowledge of promotional strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities and does not encourage students to practice skills or tactics, and/or other active motor play activities, other than in physical education class. Candidate is unaware of or does not employ any strategies to make students aware of PA opportunities in the community. Candidate does not demonstrate knowledge of how to advocate for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities.</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates knowledge of promotional strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities by encouraging students to practice skills or tactics, and/or other active motor play activities, other than in physical education class. Candidate knows of community locations where students may safely participate in physical activities and communicates using either verbal or non-verbal methods (e.g., school or physical education website; bulletin board; create and distribute newsletter or pamphlet). Candidate demonstrates knowledge of how to advocate for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities while engaged in collaborative discussions with colleagues (e.g., mentor teacher, university supervisor).</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates knowledge of promotional strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities by encouraging students to practice skills or tactics, and/or other active motor play activities, other than in physical education class. When given the opportunity, candidate implements selected expanded physical activity opportunities beyond the planned delivery of physical education lessons. Candidate encourages students to include family members when engaging in physical activity opportunities beyond the school day. Candidate knows of community locations where students may safely participate in physical activities and communicates using verbal and non-verbal methods (e.g., school website, bulletin board, newsletter, pamphlet). Candidate demonstrates knowledge of how to advocate for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities by creating...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
written or visual materials and/or presentations document (letter to principal or school board) that provide valid, up-to-date rationale for developing or improving policies that support physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities.
Analysis of Differences from Current Standards

The SHAPE America 2017 Standards & Components include six standards and 25 components. The NASPE 2008 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Elements (NASPE 2008 Standards) included six standards and 28 elements. Comparison of NASPE 2008 Standards/Elements with SHAPE America 2017 Standards/Components shows that one element from the 2008 version was omitted (6.1) and expectations from five elements were embedded into revised components.

- NASPE 2008 Element 1.5 embedded into SHAPE America 2017 Component 1.b
- NASPE 2008 Element 2.3 embedded into SHAPE America 2017 Component 2.a
- NASPE 2008 Element 3.1 threaded among SHAPE America 2017 Components 3.a – 3.f
- NASPE 2008 Intent of Elements 3.3 and 3.6 embedded into SHAPE America 2017 Component 3.b
- NASPE 2008 Element 4.6 embedded into SHAPE America 2017 Component 4.d

The SHAPE America 2017 version contains three new components (1.a, 3.f, and 6.c). Unlike the NASPE 2008 version, each SHAPE America 2017 Standard contains concepts from each component that falls below it. A side-by-side chart for comparison of NASPE 2008 Standards and Elements with SHAPE America 2017 Standards and Components is provided in Appendix B.

The NASPE 2008 Standard 1 (Scientific and Theoretical Knowledge) included five elements (1.1 – 1.5) while the SHAPE America 2017 Standard 1 (Content and Foundational Knowledge) has six components (1.a – 1.f). The NASPE 2008 Standard 1 addressed candidates’ content knowledge with a focus on sub-disciplinary knowledge (Elements 1.1 – 1.4) and one
element (1.5) addressing candidates’ analysis and correction of motor skills and performance
concepts. In the SHAPE America 2017 version, Standard 1 addresses physical education content
with a focus on common content knowledge (Component 1.a) and specialized content knowledge
(Component 1.b) in addition to sub-disciplinary knowledge (Components 1.c – 1.f). Candidates’
ability to analyze and correct movement is partially addressed by SHAPE America 2017
Components 1.b and 4.e.

The NASPE 2008 Standard 2 (Skill-Based and Fitness-Based Competence) included
three elements (2.1 – 2.3) while the SHAPE America 2017 Standard 2 (Skillfulness and Health-
Related Fitness) has two components (2.a and 2.b). The NASPE 2008 Standard 2 stated
candidates should be physically educated while the SHAPE America 2017 Standard 2 states
candidates should be physically literate individuals. The SHAPE America 2017 Standard 2
focuses on candidates’ skillfulness and health-related physical fitness as partial evidence of
physical literacy. Candidates’ skill-based competence was addressed through motor skills in
NASPE 2008 Element 2.1 and performance concepts in Element 2.3. Both skill-based
expectations are now addressed in one SHAPE America 2017 component (2.a). A point of
confusion among PETE faculty was the number of skills and/or performance concepts data
required as evidence for the variety expectation of NASPE 2008 Elements 2.1 and 2.3. To
address this issue, 2017 SHAPE America Component 2.a specifies that candidates must
demonstrate skillfulness in a minimum four physical education content areas. The NASPE 2008
Element 2.2 focused on health-related physical fitness; this focus is found in the SHAPE
America 2017 Component 2.2 without any revision.

The NASPE 2008 Standard 3 (Planning and Implementation) included seven elements
(3.1 – 3.7) while the SHAPE America 2017 Standard 3 (Planning and Implementation) has six
components (3.a and 3.f). Short- and long-term planning expectations of NASPE 2008 Element 3.1 are now embedded throughout SHAPE America 2017 Elements 3.a – 3.f. The focus on content in both NASPE 2008 Elements 3.3 and 3.6 are now addressed by SHAPE America 2017 Component 3.b. A new component (3.f) addresses students’ active engagement in their own learning through candidates’ intentional planning of metacognitive strategies.

The NASPE 2008 Standard 4 (Instructional Delivery and Management) included six elements (4.1 – 4.6) while the SHAPE America 2017 Standard 4 (Instructional Delivery and Management) has five components (4.a and 4.e). The NASPE 2008 Standards included two different elements (4.1 and 6.4) that addressed candidates’ communication; SHAPE America 2017 Component 4.a addresses both expectations. The NASPE 2008 Standards included two different elements (4.5 and 4.6) that addressed the learning environment; SHAPE America 2017 Component 4.d addresses all expectations from each element.

The NASPE 2008 Standard 5 (Impact on Student Learning) included three elements (5.1 – 5.3) and the revised version has the same number (5.a and 5.c). While SHAPE America 2017 Standard 5 continues to address assessment as did the NASPE 2008 version, the focus is now on assessment for learning rather than assessment of learning. The intentional use of the phrase “monitor students’ progress” helps to frame the need for candidates’ ongoing assessment to help guide the learner in achieving learning outcomes rather than assessment solely for grading purposes. SHAPE America 2017 Component 5.b has been revised from the prior iteration (Element 5.2) to ensure candidates monitor students’ progress throughout the long-term plan using formative assessments as well as capture final student performance using summative assessments. SHAPE America 2017 Component 5.a has been revised from the NASPE 2008 version (Element 5.1) to state learners will be assessed via authentic and formal assessments. The
lack of specificity in the former Element 5.1 could have resulted in candidates using an informal assessment (i.e., through casual observation) as the sole means of assessing student progress. Feedback from stakeholders stated a desire that PETE faculty select the reflective cycle appropriate for their program rather than a specific one prescribed by national standards. As such, the NASPE 2008 Element 5.3 which stated “…the reflective cycle…” is now revised as the SHAPE America Component 5.c to state “…a reflective cycle…” allowing for a range of approaches to candidates’ reflective activity.

The NASPE 2008 Standard 6 (Professionalism) included four elements (6.1 – 6.4) while the SHAPE America 2017 Standard 6 (Professional Responsibility) has three components (6.a--6.c). The SHAPE America 2017 Standard 6 was revised from the NASPE 2008 version in two important ways. First, the term “dispositions” was removed given that these are assessed through CAEP Standards at the educator preparation provider (EPP) level. Second, an additional sentence was added for greater clarity regarding intent of professional responsibilities (e.g., cultural competence, engagement in professional development and collaboration). Programs found it difficult to define observable candidate actions associated with NASPE 2008 Element 6.1 so it was removed from the SHAPE America 2017 version. The intent of NASPE 2008 Element 6.2 remains in SHAPE America 2017 Component 6.b; however, a deeper level of candidate engagement is expected with “engage in…continued professional…” replacing “participate in activities…” As noted above, the expectation that candidates communicate respectfully and sensitively, as per NASPE 2008 Element 6.4, is now embedded within SHAPE America 2017 Component 4.a. However, to ensure programs prepare candidates for teaching diverse learners in diverse learning environments, professional responsibility intentionally includes cultural competence as part of SHAPE America 2017 Component 6.a. Lastly, physical
education literature (Hurley, 2016; Lorson & Mitchell, 2016; Richards, 2015; Solmon & Garn, 2014) is replete with calls for promotion and advocacy of physical education as well as physical activity opportunities within and beyond the school day; as such, the new SHAPE America 2017 Component 6.c acknowledges this important topic.

*References for Analysis of Differences from Current Standards*

Hurley, K.S. (2016). Grassroots efforts: If you plant them, they will grow! *Strategies, 29*(1), 47-49.


*SPA Training and Assistant for Institutions and States*

SHAPE America will provide training and assistance for institutions and states regarding standards and program report preparation. Training and assistance will consist of in-person workshops, webinars, an updated manual, examples of exemplary assessments and program
reports posted on websites, and an online community for web-based support. As in the past, staff at SHAPE America will continue to be available by telephone and email to answer questions either directly or through support from auditors and lead reviewers.

SHAPE America will provide workshops for institutions and states to introduce the 2017 Standards and Components, explain program report preparation, and how to write quality assessments that align with these standards. Two workshops will be provided annually at the national convention to address these needs. A half-day workshop will focus on introducing and unpacking the standards/components and how to write a program report. A second half-day workshop will focus on how to write quality assessments that align with standards/components and provide evidence toward meeting them. SHAPE America will also provide additional workshops, upon request, for district- and state-level conferences as well as on-site for institutions or other stakeholders. In addition to these in-person opportunities, SHAPE America will provide webinars to introduce the 2017 Standards and Components, explain program report preparation, and how to write quality assessments that align with these standards. For members unable to attend a live session, archived webinars will be available for review through the SHAPE America website. All workshops and webinars will be delivered by auditors or lead reviewers with deep knowledge about standards/components, program report preparation, and CAEP guidelines.

A manual, National Standards & Guidelines for Physical Education Teacher Education (4th edition) will be published in 2017. The first chapter of this manual will provide the SHAPE America 2017 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards and Components, rubrics for each component, and supporting explanations for how research was used to guide the new or revised standard. Additional chapters will address how to unpack the standards and components,
how to create or select appropriate assessments that align with standards, and updated program report preparation information. Finally, examples of exemplary assessments that align with SHAPE America 2017 Standards will be provided. The 4th edition of the manual will be available to purchase from SHAPE America’s online store and at the SHAPE America store at each national convention.

Examples of exemplary assessments and program reports will be posted on both CAEP and SHAPE America’s websites. In the past, examples of quality assessments have been provided on both websites without any explanation about them. In the future, examples of assessments will have an accompanying narrative. Narratives will explain how the assessment provides a preponderance of evidence for meeting a standard. These narratives will educate the reader about the new policy that a standard is met through the preponderance of evidence rather than the prior policy stating that a standard is met with all elements below it are met. Further, these narratives will help clarify how the assessment aligns with one or more standards/components but may not, in and of itself, be the sole evidence for meeting a standard.

A unique venue to provide assistance to institutions and states will make use of SHAPE America’s Exchange. The electronic-based Exchange provides members with opportunity to discuss, share files, and blog with one another. Auditors will use the Exchange beginning in 2017 to share information about SHAPE America 2017 Standards and program report preparation. Members may use the Exchange to stay abreast of current CAEP and SHAPE America guidelines for program review, ask questions, and support one another.
Glossary of Terms

Notes:
1. Readers of this document should become familiar with the Glossary of CAEP Terms as found in Appendix I of the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (2016). The following terms are supplemental and specific to SHAPE America’s 2017 National Standards for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education.

2. Throughout the standards, components and rubrics, the term candidate refers to an individual in a preparation program and the term student refers to a PreK-12 pupil or learner.

Advocacy strategies: Activities aimed at developing new or change existing school/district and/or state policies in support of the delivery of effective school physical education programs (Adapted from Tannehill, van der Mars, & MacPhail, 2015).

Aquatics: Might include but are not limited to swimming, diving, synchronized swimming and water polo (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 13)

Assessments/Appropriate Assessments: “Tools and strategies used to gather information about a K-12 students’ level of achievement. Assessments are used to make inferences about the level of student learning and to inform the teacher candidate about the enhancement of student learning. Appropriate assessments are linked to lesson/unit goals and objectives, conducted within the context of instruction, and match the developmental level of both the student and the teacher candidate” (NASPE, 2009).

Authentic Assessment: Process of gathering evidence and documentation of a student’s learning and growth in ways that resemble real life as closely as possible (Mohnson, 2010, p. 22).

Collaboration: “Interaction and communication with other professionals within and outside the physical education discipline. These interactions ultimately increase opportunities for students and/or reduce barriers to a physically active lifestyle” (NASPE, 2009, p. 55).

Common content knowledge: Includes the knowledge of the rules and etiquette, and knowledge of techniques and tactics, and is obtained primarily through participation in the activity itself. (Ward, 2009).

Competency: The ability of candidates to participate at the recreational level with skill and ability in self-selected activities and demonstrate at the appropriate age and developmental level of PreK-12 students they are teaching (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 115).

Congruent feedback: Feedback that is provided to students that is directly related to cues provided previously during instruction.
Content: The subject matter of discipline(s) that candidates are being prepared to teach at the elementary, middle, and/or secondary levels (CAEP, 2015a, p.14).

Control level: Candidate is able to mimic the skill; most attempts are appropriate; requires intense concentration (Graham, Holt/Hale, & Parker, 2013, p. 58).

Critical elements: The key components of a motor skill that can be observed, the sum of which result in movement efficiency (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 116).

Cues: Short, catchy phrases that call the student’s attention to the key components of a skill. Cues may be verbal or non-verbal and serve as a reminder of more complete information presented about a skill (Fronske & Heath, 2015, p. 2).

Cultural competence: The ability to work effectively as a professional across race, class, linguistic, and cultural boundaries based upon a sensitivity to difference and a willingness to withhold judgment. This includes the ability to establish trust and rapport by developing relationships premised on respect and empathy (Noguera, 2016).

Culturally responsive: Culturally responsive teaching is sensitive to the cultural characteristics of students and accommodates these characteristics in the classroom. Culturally responsive candidates are knowledgeable about various cultures, aware of their own biases, and realize that bias and prejudice are learned responses (Kelly & Melograno, 2004, p.13).

Dance and rhythmic activities: Activities that focus on dance or rhythms. Dance and rhythmic activities might include but are not limited to dance forms such as creative movement, ballet, modern, ethnic or folk, cultural, hip hop, Latin, line, ballroom, social and square. Rhythmic activities for early elementary focus on recognizing and moving to rhythm. Rhythmic manipulative activities for elementary include, but are not limited to, lummi sticks, tinikling, Chinese ribbons and ball gymnastics (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 13).

Declarative knowledge: Refers to information pertaining to rules of games, facts (historical, court dimensions), and definitions associated with physical education content (Chatzipanteli, Digelidis, Karatzoglidis, & Dean, 2016, p. 170).

Developmentally appropriate: Instruction or activity that is suitable to the learner’s level of physical, social, emotional and intellectual development. Developmentally appropriate instruction accounts for the fact that “developmental change is qualitative, sequential, directional, cumulative, multifactorial and individual” (NASPE, 1995, p. 17).

Differentiated instruction: (Component 3.a) Differentiating instruction means you use different instructional tasks and techniques for different children based on their developmental levels and other capabilities (Rovegno & Bandhauer, 2013, p. 75).
Diversity: The differences in people’s distinct characteristics and qualities (e.g., ethnicity, culture, language, race, religion, ability, gender, sexual orientation, family lifestyle, beliefs) (Hutchinson & Mendon, 2010, p. 300).

Etiquette: Expectations regarding behavior and social norms associated with specific games or activities; rules of behavior that define and provide parameters for the appropriate participation in the activity or game (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 116).

Expanded physical activity opportunities: Movement-based activities that take place in and beyond the school day as supplements to regularly scheduled physical education classes and that provide learners with opportunities to practice knowledge, skills and dispositions associated with becoming a physically literate individual. Examples of in-school movement-based activities may include, but are not limited to, intramurals, classroom “activity breaks,” walking and running clubs, jump rope clubs, and afterschool sport clubs/teams. Examples of beyond the school day movement-based activities may include, but are not limited to, family fitness nights, staff/student wellness committees, school-sponsored fun runs, and summer fitness/sport camps.

Fitness activities: Activities with a focus on improving or maintaining fitness that might include yoga, Pilates, resistance training, spinning, running, fitness walking, fitness swimming, kickboxing, cardio-kick, Zumba and exergaming (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 13).

Formal assessment: Assessment that produces tangible record of student performance.

Formative assessment: A process used by teachers and learners that provides a continuous stream of evidence of learner growth, empowering teachers to adjust instruction and learners to adjust learning to improve student achievement. Formative assessment findings should be used as a continuous feedback loop to improve teaching and learning (InTASC, 2011, p. 20).

Fundamental motor skills: The locomotor, nonlocomotor or stability, and manipulative skills that provide the foundation for the more complex and sport-specific movement patterns used in games and sports (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 116).

Games and sports: Includes the games categories: Invasion, net/wall, target and fielding/striking (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 13).

Health-enhancing fitness: Intentional and systematic physical activity that positively enhances the components of personal physical fitness (i.e., cardiorespiratory endurance, muscular endurance, muscular strength, flexibility and body composition). Improving these components reduces the risk of disease and illness, and enhances overall health and well-being (NASPE, 2009, p. 55).

Individual-performance activities: Might include gymnastics, figure skating, track and field, multi-sport events, in-line skating, wrestling, self-defense and skateboarding (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 13).
**Individualized instruction:** Includes any pedagogical strategy in which the teacher adjusts objectives, content, instruction, and/or learning experiences to produce the most appropriate match with the characteristics of individual students (Locke & Lambdin, 1976, p. 14; in Kelly & Melograno, 2004, p. 25).

**Informal assessment:** Assessment that provides performance information to students in the form of verbal or non-verbal feedback.

**Instructional approach:** Instructional approaches define the different ways a candidate organizes for the delivery of instruction (rather than what is delivered) (Rink, 2010; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000; in Graham 2013, p. 145).

**Instructional cues and prompts:** Verbal cues that direct or focus students’ attention to the key elements of a skill or that prompt students to perform key movement components of skills (e.g., “platform with arms” for a volleyball forearm pass) (NASPE, 2009, p. 55).

**Learning environment:** A complex setting designed to attend to the learner(s), the context, and the content simultaneously. Regardless of the setting—whether traditional classroom, community-based, virtual, or other alternative format—a learning environment must motivate student learning through establishing interest, providing choices, making relevant connections, building understanding, assessing learning outcomes, developing close teacher-learner relationships, and creating a sense of belonging between and among learners (InTASC, 2011, p. 22).

**Learning experiences:** Planned instructional activities designed to help students meet learning goals and objectives (NASPE, 2009, p. 56).

**Learning Opportunities:** Recommended practices to support all students in attainment the standards. These are presented for access, instruction, assessment, connections, and best practices in the fields of knowledge; represent areas that can be influenced by the teacher; and are supported by current research and best practices (Mohnson, 2003, p. 17).

**Long-term plans:** Refers to unit plans (NASPE, 2009, p.57); may also refer to a learning segment used by edTPA and which is defined as “a set of 3-5 lessons that build one upon another toward a central focus, with a clearly defined beginning and end” (SCALE, 2016, p.54).

**Metacognitive knowledge:** Knowledge and beliefs centered on the interaction of the task, person, and strategy (Flavell, 1979; in Luke & Hardy, 1999, p. 177).

**Metacognitive strategies:** Purpose is to acknowledge, monitor, evaluate, and regulate cognitive progress. Metacognitive strategies provide opportunities for students to integrate new information aiding in the learning process (Luke & Hardy, 1999).

**Movement concepts:** The application of knowledge and concepts related to skillful performance of movement and fitness activities, such as spatial awareness, effort, tactics, strategies and
principles related to movement efficiency and health-enhancing fitness (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 117).


**Non-verbal communication**: Techniques of communication that use expressions, gestures, body posture and/or signals rather than words. Also can include materials, technology, and alternative resources such as task cards or poster boards (NASPE, 2009, p. 56).

**Outdoor pursuits**: Activities that include recreational boating (e.g., kayaking, canoeing, sailing, rowing); hiking; backpacking; fishing; orienteering or geocaching; ice skating; skateboarding; snow or water skiing; snowboarding; snowshoeing; surfing; bouldering, traversing or climbing; mountain biking; adventure activities; and ropes courses. Selection of activities is dependent on the environmental opportunities within the geographical region (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 12-13).

**Pedagogical content knowledge**: A core part of content knowledge for teaching that includes: core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying resources; and deciding among alternative courses of action and analyzing the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities (CAEP, 2015b, p. 126).

**Pedagogical skills**: An educator’s abilities or expertise to impart the specialized knowledge/content of their subject area(s) (CAEP, 2015b, p. 126).

**Performance concepts**: Knowledge and action related to skillful performance of movement and fitness activities. This includes the aspects of (1) correct selection or “what” to do (e.g., when to choose a drop shot or why to choose low repetitions for strength training) when performing a skill; and (2) correct execution or “how” to do a skill (e.g., execute a wrist flick or speed of lowering the weight in a repetition) (Rink, 2003; in NASPE 2009, p.56).

**Performance-based objectives**: Specific statements about what the student should be able to perform. Performance-based objectives break unit outcomes into measurable and observable terms (Lacy, 2011, p.33).

**Physically literate individual**: A physically literate individual is one who has learned the skills necessary to participate in a variety of physical activities; knows the implications and the benefits of involvement in various types of physical activities; participates regularly in physical activity; is physically fit; and values physical activity and its contributions to a healthful lifestyle (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 11).

**Procedural knowledge**: Refers to the respective steps of a skilled/strategic/tactical performance (Chatzipanteli, et al., 2016, p. 170).
**Professional development:** Opportunities for educators to develop new knowledge and skills through professional learning activities and events such as in-service education, conference attendance, sabbatical leave, summer leave, intra- and inter-institutional visitations, fellowships, and work in P-12 schools (CAEP, 2015b, p. 127).

**Proficiency level:** Designated as the mastery or expert level; candidate can perform the skill with automaticity; can combine skills and perform with success in unpredictable environments (Graham, et al., 2013, p. 59).

**Promotion strategies:** Activities aimed at publicizing physical education program accomplishments to broader audiences (e.g., School/district administrators, parents, community organization) (Adapted from Tannehill, et al., 2015).

**Reflective cycle:** A practice by a candidate who recalls an event, teaching method, and/or other school-based occurrence, ponders it to determine effectiveness of his/her personal action(s) based on what is best for student(s) needs, and determination of which action(s) they should repeat and which ones warrant revision for an improved outcome. Many reflective cycles exist with a range of steps, stages, or questions that guide the deliberative thinking process with the ideal outcome that the candidate’s future professional performance improves as a result of intentional, critical review of his/her actions for student(s) needs.

**Resources:** Include materials that may support the delivery of instruction and/or students’ practice of a skill or concept. Resources may include but are not limited to the facility, equipment, materials, technology, alternative communication tools, and translation materials for students who are ESOL.

**Routines:** Standard organizational procedures frequently used in class to organize and manage students, such as routines for lining up for a fire drill, getting out or gathering equipment, and getting in to groups/teams (Adapted from Rovegno & Bandhauer, 2013, p. 177).

**Short-term plans:** Refers to daily lesson plans (NASPE, 2009, p.57).

**Skill themes:** The fundamental movements that form the foundation for success in sport and physical activities in later years (Graham, et al., 2013, p. 16).

**Skillful:** A person’s ability to employ techniques, tactics, strategies, rules and etiquette effectively in the context of the activity (Adapted from Launder & Piltz, 2013).

**Specialized content knowledge:** Includes the knowledge of (a) common errors that students are likely to make when learning the activity, and (b) instructional tasks and representations (i.e., how to plan for and implement developmentally appropriate learning task progressions, being able to accurately assess/diagnose critical performance elements and common errors) (Ward, 2009).

**Specific feedback:** Detailed, non-evaluative information about the performance, product, or outcome of a task or process (Hutchinson & Mendon, 2010, p. 292).

Strategies: All plans, principles of play, and action guidelines decided upon before a game to organize the activity of the team and players during the game (Gréhaigne, et al., 2005, p.27).

Student learning: Educational outcome(s) mastered by P-12 students as set forth in the academic curriculum during a given time period by the school or school system and as provided by the classroom teacher (CAEP, 2015b, p. 132).

Summative assessment: The process of certifying learning at the culmination of a given period of time to evaluate the extent to which instructional objectives have been met. Summative assessment results should be used to make final decisions about gains in knowledge and skills (InTASC, 2011, p. 20).

Tactics: All orientation operations voluntarily executed during the game by the players to adapt to the immediate requirements of an ever-changing opposition, their spontaneous actions, or those organized through predetermined strategy (Gréhaigne, et al., 2005, p.27-28).

Techniques: Execution of specific bodily movement to include movement aimed at controlling an external object (e.g., ball, shuttlecock) when projecting or catching it (Adapted from Launder & Piltz, 2013).

Technology: Software, websites, devices and applications used in a physical education setting to enhance teaching and learning (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 118).

Utilization level: Candidate is able to demonstrate the skill with automaticity such that all attempts are appropriate and without intense concentration; candidate combines several skills together and/or can play in an authentic environment with success (Graham, et al., 2013, p. 59).
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III. Procedures Related to the Implementation of the Standards

SPA Responsibilities under CAEP State Partnerships

This is not applicable to SHAPE America.

SPA Procedures for Selection, Training and Evaluation of Program Reviews Including Diversity Considerations

Selection of program reviewers

Individuals interested in becoming program report reviewers must complete an application form and submit to SHAPE America for review. Review of the application form by SHAPE America staff ensures an individual meets the following requirements:

Educational Level:

- Applicants must have a minimum bachelor’s level degree with preference at master’s level or beyond.
- It is preferred an applicant’s degree is in physical education. However, consideration will be provided to applicants with a degree in a related field (e.g., health education) if the applicant’s recent experience is appropriate.

Experience:

- Applicants should have five or more years’ experience teaching physical education and experience must be current.
- For example, an applicant who have taught physical education in the past three years is considered current while an applicant who taught physical education 25 years ago but taught health education since that time is not considered current.
- Experience may be from teaching PreK-12 physical education or in higher education.
When an applicant has met the requirements stated above, they are eligible to attend training sessions to learn how to become a program reviewer.

In efforts to ensure a diverse pool of program reviewers, SHAPE America will collaborate with the Diversity & Inclusiveness Special Interest Group (of SHAPE America). This special interest group will be asked to recruit and advertise for program reviewers’ representative of diverse personal backgrounds including but not limited to culture, language, race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, family lifestyle, and beliefs. SHAPE America will also seek to provide program reviewers that are affiliated with a diverse range of institutions such as public, private, and faith-based.

Additional advertisements for a diverse pool of program reviewers will be provided through SHAPE America’s online Exchange community, the Momentum newsletter published three times per year, and in both JOPERD and Strategies publications. Finally, emails will be sent to leadership members of each district and state association, physical education supervisors from HBC/U’s, and state-level physical education supervisors, seeking individuals to serve as program reviewers representing diverse backgrounds and institutions.

Training of program reviewers

Individuals who meet application requirements are required to attend two workshops. The first workshop (half-day) is available for everyone and focused on introducing and unpacking the standards/components and how to write a program report. The second workshop is available only for individuals who have met the application requirements and have attended the first half-day workshop. This workshop (full-day) is focused on program reviewer training. While both workshops have been provided annually in-person at the national convention, SHAPE America intends to offer both workshops beginning in 2017 in webinar format, with
archived viewing available at any time. An applicant who meets criteria on the application form but does not complete both workshops will not be selected to review program reports. Individuals who successfully meet application requirements and complete both workshops become reviewers and are assigned to a review team in the subsequent cycle.

Program review teams are comprised of three members; a lead reviewer and two reviewers (reviewer 1 and reviewer 2). Novice reviewers are assigned as reviewer 2 and are considered beginning level for up to 2-3 cycles. After 2-3 cycles, novice reviewers may be moved to reviewer 1 level. Experienced reviewers have completed 2-3 cycles or more of program report review. Experienced reviewers who write quality program reports, apply program review guidelines consistently and accurately, and routinely meet deadlines may be invited to become lead reviewers. Lead reviewer training occurs at a business meeting held annually at the national convention and is conducted by two-three auditors.

Professional development for reviewers (levels 1 and 2) and lead reviewers is provided annually at an in-person meeting for all program reviewers at the national convention. Auditors and SHAPE America staff provide a meeting to share updates from CAEP regarding program report guidelines, discuss issues of concern noted from program report review in prior two cycles, and answer questions. When additional issues arise that cannot be addressed at the convention, SHAPE America staff send out emails to all reviewers, lead reviewers, and auditors to ensure everyone is engaged in program report review using the most up-to-date information. Finally, on-going, informal training occurs during the program review process as the lead reviewer and reviewers 1 and 2 offer feedback and support with one another as they write individual program reports, read one another’s reports, and work together to finalize the team report.
The auditor committee is comprised of eight-to-ten individuals who have significant experience as lead reviewers across multiple cycles as demonstrated by high quality team reports, consistent interpretation of standards and application of guidelines, commitment to meeting deadlines, and recommendations from current auditors and SHAPE America staff.

Evaluation of program reviewers

Program reviewers at all levels (reviewers 1 & 2, lead, auditor) are expected to communicate with teammates in a timely manner, make decisions based on actual guidelines rather than personal beliefs, provide detailed rationale for decisions, and follow the timeline established by CAEP, SHAPE America, and the lead reviewer. Additionally, reviewers are expected to complete a thorough review of the program report and write a recognition report that is based on their own skill set rather than a reiteration of what a teammate has written by a teammate.

Evaluation of all reviewers occurs twice annually at in-person auditor’s meetings. Together, auditors and SHAPE America staff, discuss performance of each reviewer who completed a program review in the prior cycle. Discussion may lead to referrals such as moving a reviewer 1 to reviewer 2 level; reviewer 2 to lead reviewer level; lead reviewer to auditor level; recommendation to attend program reviewer training again; or discontinuance of reviewer.
IV. Supporting Materials

Explicit Suggestions and Examples to Guide Institutions

Currently, the National Standards & Guidelines for Physical Education Teacher Education (3rd ed.) provides supporting material for program faculty seeking to earn national recognition from CAEP/SHAPE America. The 3rd edition provides the following information:

- Chapter 1: The NASPE 2008 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards, Elements, and rubrics;
- Chapter 2: Assessing the initial standards including information about standards-based assessment; developing assessments; aligning assessments with standards; developing scoring guides; use of data for candidate and program improvement; and examples of assessments for use with the NASPE 2008 Standards;
- Chapter 3: The NASPE 2008 Advanced Physical Education Teacher Education Standards, Elements, and rubrics; and
- Appendices: Alignment chart of 2001 and 2008 Initial Standards; Assignment, Scoring Guide, and Data Table Samples (initial level); and some information about NCATE Program Report preparation (initial level)

SHAPE America plans to publish the 4th edition of this book in late 2017 with updated initial level standards and components, rubrics, and glossary. In addition, information found in chapter two will be updated based on revised standards/components as well as CAEP guidelines. Content formerly found in appendices will be updated and moved to chapter three. Since SHAPE does not currently have advanced level standards for physical education teacher education, these will be omitted from the 4th edition.
The optional features of SPA standards include a supplemental document (Guidelines, p. 27, B.8.a) and guidelines for evidence (Guidelines, p. 27, B.8.b). Sections of the 4th edition of SHAPE America’s book will address some expectations of both these features. For example, some material of the book will serve as a “…comprehensive guide for faculty who have responsibilities to develop and implement programs that prepare candidates as professional educators” as per the supplemental document feature (Guidelines, 2015, p.27). Further, some material of the book will “…provide explicit suggestions and examples” to guide institutions toward stronger assessment evidence for meeting SHAPE Standards as per the guidelines for evidence feature (Guidelines, 2015, p.27).
V. Appendices

**Appendix A:** Alignment chart for how SHAPE 2017 Components align with InTASC Performances and Essential Knowledge

**Appendix B:** Side-by-side chart for comparison of NASPE 2008 Initial Physical Education Standards and Elements with SHAPE America 2017 Initial Physical Education Standards and Components

**Appendix C:** List of all meetings by task force (including dates and agenda items) and calls for feedback

**Appendix D:** Details regarding written comments from calls for feedback #1, 2 and 4 via electronic surveys
### Appendix A

**Alignment Chart: SHAPE America 2017 Components & InTASC Performances and Essential Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard/Component</th>
<th>InTASC: Performances</th>
<th>InTASC: Essential Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1: Content and Foundational Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>4(h), 5(b), 5(e)</td>
<td>2(g), 4(j), 4(l), 5(i), 7(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>4(e), 5(b)</td>
<td>2(g), 4(j-l), 4(n), 5(i), 7(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c</td>
<td>4(h), 5(b), 5(e)</td>
<td>2(g), 4(j), 4(l), 5(i), 7(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.d</td>
<td>4(h), 5(b), 5(e)</td>
<td>1(d), 2(g), 3(i), 4(j), 4(l), 5(i), 7(g), 8(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.e</td>
<td>4(h), 5(b), 5(e)</td>
<td>1(e), 1(f), 2(g), 4(j), 4(l), 5(i), 7(g), 7(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.f</td>
<td>9(f)</td>
<td>4(j), 4(l), 5(i), 7(g), 9(j), 10(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2: Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>4(a)</td>
<td>4(j), 4(l), 5(i), 5(n), 7(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b</td>
<td>4(a)</td>
<td>4(j), 4(l), 4(n), 5(i), 7(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3: Planning and Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>4(a), 4(f), 7(a), 7(b), 9(a)</td>
<td>4(n), 7(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b</td>
<td>1(b), 2(a), 2(b), 5(b), 5(c), 7(a-c), 8(c), 8(d)</td>
<td>1(d), 4(n), 7(k), 8(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c</td>
<td>2(b), 2(f), 3(d), 4(f), 5(c), 7(a), 8(a), 8(c), 10(e)</td>
<td>2(h), 2(k), 5(p), 7(k), 7(m), 8(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d</td>
<td>1(b), 2(a), 2(b), 7(a), 8(a), 10(b)</td>
<td>1(d), 1(g), 2(g), 2(h), 7(i), 7(j), 8(k), 8(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.e</td>
<td>3(g), 8(g)</td>
<td>3(m), 5(l), 7(k), 8(n), 8(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.f</td>
<td>6(d), 6(f), 8(c), 8(f)</td>
<td>6(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>2(b), 2(e), 3(c), 3(f), 10(d), 10(g)</td>
<td>3(k), 3(l), 5(n), 8(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>3(d), 4(a), 4(f), 4(h), 5(e)</td>
<td>4(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c</td>
<td>2(a), 2(b), 3(d), 8(b)</td>
<td>3(k), 7(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.d</td>
<td>3(a-d)</td>
<td>3(j), 3(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.e</td>
<td>6(d)</td>
<td>6(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 5: Assessment of Student Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>6(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>1(a), 6(a), 8(b)</td>
<td>6(j), 6(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c</td>
<td>1(a), 6(c), 7(d), 7(f), 9(c), 9(e), 10(a), 10(c)</td>
<td>6(l), 7(l), 9(g), 9(h), 9(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 6: Professional Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a</td>
<td>9(c), 9(f), 10(c)</td>
<td>1(g), 7(i), 9(g), 9(i), 9(j), 10(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b</td>
<td>1(c), 2(f), 3(a), 3(c), 7(a), 7(e), 8(c), 9(a-e), 10(a-f)</td>
<td>7(m), 9(k), 10(l), 10(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c</td>
<td>10(f), 10(h-k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note 1: Critical Dispositions associated with each InTASC Standard have intentionally been omitted from the alignment chart below. Rationale for this omission is based on two recommendations from the Guidelines document stating (1) dispositions are not to be addressed in SPA standards since they are assessed at the EPP-level through CAEP Standards and (2) descriptions of CAEP’s Principles A-D consistently reference what candidates need to know and be able to do but not also value.

Note 2: No alignment found between a SHAPE America 2017 Component and the following InTASC Performances and Essential Knowledge:

- InTASC Standard 1, Learner Development:
- InTASC Standard 2, Learning Differences: 2(c), 2(d), 2(i), 2(j)
- InTASC Standard 3, Learning Environments: 3(e), 3(h)
- InTASC Standard 4, Content Knowledge: 4(b), 4(c), 4(d), 4(i), 4(m)
- InTASC Standard 5, Application of Content: 5(a), 5(d), 5(f), 5(g), 5(h), 5(j), 5(k), 5(m), 5(o)
- InTASC Standard 6, Assessment: 6(e), 6(g), 6(h), 6(i), 6(p)
- InTASC Standard 7, Planning for Instruction: 7(h)
- InTASC Standard 8, Instructional Strategies: 8(e), 8(h), 8(i)
- InTASC Standard 10, Leadership and Collaboration: 10(m)
### Appendix B

#### Side-by-Side Chart for Comparison

2008 NASPE National Standards & Elements for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education and 2017 SHAPE America National Standards & Components for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 NASPE Standards &amp; Elements</th>
<th>2017 SHAPE America Standards &amp; Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1: Scientific and Theoretical Knowledge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard 1: Content and Foundational Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education teacher candidates know and apply discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts critical to the development of physically educated individuals</td>
<td>Physical education candidates demonstrate an understanding of common and specialized content, and scientific and theoretical foundations for the delivery of an effective PreK-12 physical education program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements – Teacher candidates will:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Components – Candidates will:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Describe and apply physiological and biomechanical concepts related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness</td>
<td>1.c Describe and apply physiological and biomechanical concepts related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Describe and apply motor learning and psychological/behavioral theory related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness</td>
<td>1.d Describe and apply motor learning and behavior-change/psychological principles related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Describe and apply motor development theory and principles related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness</td>
<td>1.e Describe and apply motor development theory and principles related to fundamental motor skills, skillful movement, physical activity and fitness for PreK-12 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Identify historical, philosophical and social perspectives of physical education issues and legislation.</td>
<td>1.f Describe historical, philosophical and social perspectives of physical education issues and legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Analyze and correct critical elements of motor skills and performance concepts.</td>
<td>1.b Describe and apply specialized content knowledge for teaching PreK-12 physical education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.a Describe and apply common content knowledge for teaching PreK-12 physical education. (New component for 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Standard 2: Skill-Based and Fitness-Based Competence**

Physical education teacher candidates are physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health-enhancing fitness as delineated in the NASPE K-12 standards.

**Standard 2: Skillfulness and Health-Related Fitness**

Physical education candidates are physically literate individuals who can demonstrate skillful performance in physical education content areas and health-enhancing levels of fitness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements – Teacher candidates will:</th>
<th>Components – Candidates will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Demonstrate personal competence in motor skill performance for a variety of physical activities and movement patterns.</td>
<td>2.a Demonstrate competency in all fundamental motor skills, as well as skillful performance in a minimum of four physical education content areas (e.g., games, aquatics, dance, fitness activities, outdoor pursuits, individual-performance activities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program.</td>
<td>2.b Achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Demonstrate performance concepts related to skillful movement in a variety of physical activities.</td>
<td>(Expectations from 2008 Element 2.3 embedded within 2017 Component 2.a.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard 3: Planning and Implementation

Physical education teacher candidates plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students.

### Elements – Teacher candidates will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Design and implement short- and long-term plans that are linked to program and instructional goals, as well as a variety of student needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Develop and implement appropriate (e.g., measurable, developmentally appropriate, performance-based) goals and objectives aligned with local, state and/or national standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Design and implement content that is aligned with lesson objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Plan for and manage resources to provide active, fair and equitable learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Plan and adapt instruction for diverse student needs, adding specific accommodations and/or modifications for student exceptionalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Plan and implement progressive and sequential instruction that address the diverse needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of current technology by planning and implementing learning experiences that require students to appropriately use technology to meet lesson objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Components – Candidates will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>Plan and implement appropriate (e.g., measurable, developmentally appropriate, performance-based) short- and long-term plan objectives that are aligned with local, state and/or SHAPE America National Standards and Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b</td>
<td>Plan and implement progressive and sequential content that aligns with short- and long-term plan objectives and that addresses the diverse needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c</td>
<td>Plan for and manage resources to provide active, fair and equitable learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d</td>
<td>Plan and implement individualized instruction for diverse student needs, adding specific accommodations and/or modifications for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.e</td>
<td>Plan and implement learning experiences that require students to use technology appropriately in meeting one or more short- and long-term plan objective(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Intent of 2008 Element 3.1 for short- and long-term planning is threaded within 2016 Components 3.a - 3.f.)

(Expectations from 2008 Element 3.6 embedded within 2017 Component 3.b.)
3.f Plan and implement learning experiences that engage students in using metacognitive strategies appropriately to analyze their own performance results.
(New component for 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4 Instructional Delivery and Management</th>
<th>Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical education teacher candidates use effective communication and pedagogical skills and strategies to enhance student engagement and learning.</td>
<td>Physical education candidates engage students in meaningful learning experiences through effective use of pedagogical skills. They use communication, feedback, and instructional and managerial skills to enhance student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements – Teacher candidates will:</th>
<th>Components – Candidates will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Demonstrate effective verbal and non-verbal communication skills across a variety of instructional formats.</td>
<td>4.a Demonstrate verbal and nonverbal communication skills that convey respect and sensitivity across all learning experiences. (Includes content from 2008 Element 6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Implement effective demonstrations, explanations and instructional cues and prompts to link physical activity concepts to appropriate learning experiences.</td>
<td>4.b Implement demonstrations, explanations and instructional cues that are aligned with short- and long-term plan objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Provide effective instructional feedback for skill acquisition, student learning and motivation.</td>
<td>4.e Analyze motor skills and performance concepts in order to provide specific, congruent feedback to enhance student learning. (Includes content from 2008 Element 1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Recognize the changing dynamics of the environment and adjust instructional tasks based on student responses.</td>
<td>4.c Evaluate the changing dynamics of the learning environment and adjust instructional tasks as needed to further student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Use managerial rules, routines and transitions to create and maintain a safe and effective learning environment.</td>
<td>4.d Implement transitions, routines and positive behavior management to create and maintain a safe, supportive and engaging learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Implement strategies to help students demonstrate responsible personal and social behaviors in a productive learning environment.</td>
<td>(Expectations from 2008 Element 4.6 embedded within 2017 Component 4.d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5: Impact on Student Learning</td>
<td>Standard 5: Assessment of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education teacher candidates use assessments and reflection to foster student learning and inform decisions about instruction.</td>
<td>Physical education candidates select and implement appropriate assessments to monitor students’ progress and guide decision making related to instruction and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elements – Teacher candidates will:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components – Candidates will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Select or create appropriate assessments that will measure student achievement of goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Use appropriate assessments to evaluate student learning before, during and after instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Utilize the reflective cycle to implement change in teacher performance, student learning and instructional goals and decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5.a Select or create authentic, formal assessments that measure student attainment of short- and long-term objectives. |
| 5.b Implement formative assessments that monitor student learning before and throughout the long-term plan, as well as summative assessments that evaluate student learning upon completion of the long-term plan. |
| 5.c Implement a reflective cycle to guide decision making specific to candidate performance, student learning, and short- and long-term plan objectives. |
### Standard 6: Professionalism
*Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective professionals.*

### Standard 6: Professional Responsibility
*Physical education candidates demonstrate behaviors essential to becoming effective professionals. They exhibit professional ethics and culturally competent practices; seek opportunities for continued professional development; and demonstrate knowledge of promotion/advocacy strategies for physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities that support the development of physically literate individuals.*

### Elements – Teacher candidates will:

| 6.1 | Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the belief that all students can become physically educated individuals. |
| 6.2 | Participate in activities that enhance collaboration and lead to professional growth and development. |
| 6.3 | Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the professional ethics of highly qualified teachers. |
| 6.4 | Communicate in ways that convey respect and sensitivity. |

### Components – Candidates will:

| 6.b | Engage in continued professional growth and collaboration in schools and/or professional organizations. |
| 6.a | Engage in behavior that reflects professional ethics, practice and cultural competence. |
| 6.c | Describe strategies for the promotion and advocacy of physical education and expanded physical activity opportunities. (New component for 2017) |

(Expectations from 2008 Element 6.4 embedded within 2016 Component 4.a.)
Appendix C

List of all meetings & calls for feedback

2012
Meeting 1: (In-person) Thursday, October 25, 2012, PETE Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada (2 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Introduction of task force members and Kristin Cipriani, NASPE liaison to task force; purpose of task force; timeline for completion of review/revision of the 2008 NASPE Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Elements

Meeting 2: (In-person) Saturday, October 27, 2012, PETE Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada (2 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Begin discussion of 2008 NASPE Initial PETE Standards and Elements starting with Element 1.1 (recommendations by task force members to keep as is, revise, or delete)
Assignment(s) in winter 2012-2013: Task force members conduct stakeholders’ view of current standards (NASPE 2008 Initial PETE) via electronic survey to determine beliefs beyond task force; create survey including decisions about format, types of question(s) to ask, and timeline.

2013
Call for Feedback #1: (Electronic survey) Survey available from April 1 – 30, 2013
Purpose: Seek feedback on the 2008 NASPE Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Elements from stakeholders (Email blast distributed to all AAHPERD members & executive directors of all state associations)

Meeting 3: (In-person) Friday, April 26, 2013, AAHPERD National Convention (2 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Introduction of new committee member (Stevie Chepko); Survey update; Reminders about SASB Guidelines; Discussion of 2008 Standards/Elements (comments/issues/thoughts); Responsibilities and deadlines (for work after convention and in preparation for next meeting; update timeline; discuss potential dates for next meetings
Assignment(s) in summer 2013: Task force members review comments/feedback from call for feedback #1 and prepare discussion items for upcoming in-person meetings

Meeting 4: (In-person) Sunday, September 22, 2013, AAHPERD Headquarters, Reston, VA (all day)
Agenda Item(s): Update on AAHPERD & CAEP; Summary of Survey Themes/Comments; Discussion on comments/issues/thoughts regarding NASPE 2008 Initial PETE Standards and Survey Themes; New P-12 National Standards – Implications for and Alignment with PETE Standards; Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB) Guidelines Quick Reminders; Teams of Two – Work on Specific Standards

Meeting 5: (In-person) Monday, September 23, 2013, AAHPERD Headquarters, Reston, VA (all day)
Agenda Item(s): Continue work in Teams of Two for Work on Specific Standards; Report back to Committee to share work from pairs and discuss; begin Literature Review

Meeting 6: (In-person) Tuesday, September 24, 2013, AAHPERD Headquarters, Reston, VA (all day)
Agenda Item(s): Continue Literature Review; Report back to Committee to share work from pairs and discuss; Begin to formulate draft of revised Standards

2014
n/a

2015
Meeting 7: (In-person) Friday, March 20, 2015, 2015 SHAPE America National Convention & Expo, Seattle, WA (2 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Introduction of task force members and Michelle Carter, SHAPE America liaison to task force; Presentation by Dr. Stevie Chepko, CAEP, titled, “Writing Expectations for Writing/Revising SPA Standards” (with Initial Health Education Teacher Education (HETE) Standards review/revision Task Force); PETE-only Q &A with Dr. Chepko; timeline for completion of work; will receive a Survey Monkey to determine best dates/times for upcoming meetings (in person and by conference call);
Assignment(s): Task force members to conduct literature review based on CAEP Principles A-D

Meeting 8: (In-person) Monday, June 29, 2015, SHAPE America Headquarters, Reston, VA (all day)
Agenda Item(s): Discuss comments/suggestions from call for feedback #1; Review and revise the NASPE 2008 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Elements in groups of 2-3; report back to committee with initial revisions.

Meeting 9: (In-person) Tuesday, June 30, 2015, SHAPE America Headquarters, Reston, VA (all day)
Agenda Item(s): Continue to review/revise the NASPE 2008 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Elements in groups of 2-3; report back to committee with updated work.

Meeting 10: (In-person) Wednesday, July 1, 2015, SHAPE America Headquarters, Reston, VA (half day)
Agenda Item(s): Continue to review/revise the NASPE 2008 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Elements in groups of 2-3; report back to committee with final work toward draft #1; plan dates for upcoming conference calls; & plan presentation title, outline, and role per task force member for October conference.

Meeting 11: (Conference call) Tuesday, September 15, 2015 (2 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Discussion of tabled items that remain from in-person meetings (June 29 – July 1, 2016); finalize standards and elements for draft #1.
Assignment(s) in September 2015: Create survey including decisions about format, types of question(s) to ask, and timeline; begin writing narrative per standard based on literature review.
Call for Feedback #2: Electronic survey (Survey available from October 15 – November 16, 2015)

*Purpose:* Seek feedback from stakeholders on draft #1 of 2016 SHAPE America Initial PETE Standards and Elements (Email blast distributed to all AAHPERD members & executive directors of all state associations; CAEP posted link to the electronic survey in November 5, 2015 CAEP Connections newsletter and in the November 10, 2015 weekly Accreditation Update email)

**Meeting 12:** (In-person) Friday, October 30, 2015, PETE & HETE Conference, Atlanta, GA (2 hours in AM)

*Agenda Item(s):* Finalize slides for presentation; final decision regarding order of task force members for presentation.

Call for Feedback #3: Presentation, “Draft of Initial PETE Standards” (Friday, Oct. 30, 2015; 10-11 am)

*Purpose:* Share draft #1 of 2016 SHAPE America Initial PETE Standards and Elements with participants at the PETE & HETE Conference, Atlanta, GA; answer questions, note comments/suggestions delivered verbally during presentation by participants; solicit requests for participants to provide feedback in writing following presentation and leave on table at rear of room, share verbally with a task force member after presentation, and/or via electronic survey online through the November 16, 2015 deadline.

**Meeting 13:** (In-person) Friday, October 30, 2015, PETE & HETE Conference, Atlanta, GA (2 hours in PM)

*Agenda Item(s):* Discussion of feedback shared verbally during presentation; continued discussion for revising elements; reminder to keep working on literature review for writing narratives per standard.

*Assignment(s) in winter 2015-2016:* Task force members receive results of electronic survey in December 2015; review results; prepare notes based on feedback.

---

**2016**

**Meeting 14:** (Conference call) Thursday, February 25, 2016 (1 hour)

*Agenda Item(s):* Discuss comments/suggestions from electronic survey (and during/following presentation) in fall 2015 beginning with Standard 1; task force members make recommendations for revision, as needed.

**Meeting 15:** (Conference call) Friday, February 26, 2016 (1 hour)

*Agenda Item(s):* Continued discussion of comments/suggestions from electronic survey (and during/following presentation) in fall 2015 beginning with Standard 1; task force members make recommendations for revision, as needed.

**Meeting 16:** (Conference call) Friday, March 4, 2016 (1 hour)

*Agenda Item(s):* Continued discussion of comments/suggestions from electronic survey (and during/following presentation) in fall 2015 beginning with Standard 1; task force members make
recommendations for revision, as needed. Draft #2 is created based on discussions in February-March 2016.

Assignment(s) in March 2016: Create survey including decisions about format, types of question(s) to ask, and timeline.

Call for Feedback #4: Electronic survey (Survey available from April 1 – April 18, 2016)
Purpose: Seek feedback from stakeholders on draft #2 of 2016 SHAPE America Initial PETE Standards and Elements (Email blast distributed to all AAHPERD members, executive directors of all state associations, and state supervisors of physical education)

Meeting 17: (In-person) Thursday, April 7, 2016, 2016 SHAPE America National Convention & Expo, Minneapolis, MN (1.5 hours)
Agenda Items: Finalize slides for presentation; final decision regarding order of task force members for presentation.

Call for Feedback #5: Presentation, “Draft of Initial PETE Standards” (Thursday, April 7, 2016; 2:45-4pm)
Purpose: Share draft #2 of 2016 SHAPE America Initial PETE Standards and Elements with participants at the 2016 SHAPE America National Convention & Expo, Minneapolis, MN; answer questions, note comments/suggestions delivered verbally during presentation by participants; solicit requests for participants to provide feedback in writing following presentation and leave on table at rear of room, share verbally with a task force member after presentation, and/or via electronic survey online through the April 18, 2016 deadline.

Meeting 18: (In-person) Friday, April 8, 2016, 2016 SHAPE America National Convention & Expo, Minneapolis, MN (1.5 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Discussion of feedback shared verbally during presentation; continued discussion for revising elements; plan for upcoming conference calls to discuss feedback from electronic survey of draft #2
Assignment(s): Begin writing rubric criteria for each element

Meeting 19: (Conference call) Tuesday, April 26, 2016 (1.5 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Begin discussion of comments/suggestions from electronic survey (and during/following presentation) in spring 2016 beginning with Standard 1; task force members make final recommendations for revision, as needed.

Meeting 20: (Conference call) Friday, April 29, 2016 (1.5 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Complete discussion of comments/suggestions from electronic survey (and during/following presentation) in spring 2016 beginning with Standard 1; task force members make final recommendations for revision, as needed; final draft of SHAPE America 2016 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Components is completed.

Meeting 21: (Conference call) Wednesday, May 18, 2016 (1.5 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Discussion of rubric criteria beginning with Component 1.a as per final draft
Assignment(s): Revise rubric criteria as per discussion comments; upload revised criteria when completed.
Meeting 22: (Conference call) Thursday, May 19, 2016 (1.5 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Continued discussion of rubric criteria as per final draft
Assignment(s): Revise rubric criteria as per discussion comments; upload revised criteria when completed.

Meeting 23: (Conference call) Monday, May 23, 2016 (1.5 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Continued discussion of rubric criteria as per final draft
Assignment(s): Revise rubric criteria as per discussion comments; upload revised criteria when completed.

Meeting 24: (Conference call) Wednesday, May 25, 2016 (1.5 hours)
Agenda Item(s): Finalize all rubric criteria
Appendix D

Electronic Survey Comments: Call for Feedback #1 (Spring 2013)

The following list provides total number and percentage of comments (for/against; positive/negative) received through electronic survey of stakeholders held in spring 2013 beliefs about the 2008 NASPE Initial Physical Education Teacher Standards & Elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 NASPE Initial Physical Education Standards &amp; Elements</th>
<th>Written comments from spring 2013 (n= 582 comments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # comments for Standard 1 + Elements 1.1 – 1.5:</td>
<td>90 comments of 582 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 comments of 582 total (90/582 or 15.5% of all comments pertain to Standard 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # comments for Standard 2 + Elements 2.1 - 2.3:</td>
<td>110 comments of 582 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 comments of 582 total (110/582 or 18.9% of all comments pertain to Standard 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # comments for Standard 3 + Elements 3.1 – 3.7:</td>
<td>98 comments of 582 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 comments of 582 total (98/582 or 16.8% of all comments pertain to Standard 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # comments for Standard 4 + Elements 4.1 – 4.6:</td>
<td>78 comments of 582 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 comments of 582 total (78/582 or 13.4% of all comments pertain to Standard 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # comments for Standard 5 + Elements 5.1 – 5.3:</td>
<td>82 comments of 582 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 comments of 582 total (82/582 or 14.1% of all comments pertain to Standard 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # comments for Standard 6 + Elements 6.1 – 6.4:</td>
<td>72 comments of 582 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 comments of 582 total (72/582 or 12.4% of all comments pertain to Standard 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # general comments (not specific to any one standard/element):</td>
<td>52 comments of 582 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 comments of 582 total (52/592 or 8.9% of all comments are general in nature)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electronic Survey Comments: Call for Feedback #2 (Fall 2015)

The following list provides total number and percentage of comments (for/against; positive/negative) received through electronic survey of stakeholders held in fall 2015 based on draft #1 of the SHAPE America 2016 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Elements.

Note: Lists do not include comments made verbally during presentation (PETE Conference in October 2015) or those provided in writing following presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft #1 of SHAPE America 2016 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards &amp; Elements</th>
<th>Percentage (# comments / # comments per standard)</th>
<th>Percentage (# comments / Total # all comments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standard 1 (n=353)**  
[Total # comments for Standard.1 + Elements 1.1 – 1.8: 353] |  |  |
| Element 1.1 (n=40) | 11.3% (40/353) | 3.4% (40/1,184) |
| Element 1.2 (n=35) | 9.9% (35/353) | 3% (35/1,184) |
| Element 1.3 (n=48) | 13.6% (48/353) | 4.1% (48/1,184) |
| Element 1.4 (n=51) | 14.4% (51/353) | 4.3% (51/1,184) |
| Element 1.5 (n=19) | 5.4% (19/353) | 1.6% (19/1,184) |
| Element 1.6 (n=31) | 8.8% (31/353) | 2.6% (31/1,184) |
| Element 1.7 (n=29) | 8.2% (29/353) | 2.4% (29/1,184) |
| Element 1.8 (n=34) | 9.6% (34/353) | 2.9% (34/1,184) |
| Standard 1 (n=66) | 18.7% (66/353) | 5.6% (66/1,184) |
| **Standard 2 (n=151)**  
[Total # comments for Standard 2 + Elements 2.1 & 2.2: 151] |  |  |
| Element 2.1 (n=66) | 43.7% (66/151) | 5.6% (66/1,184) |
| Element 2.2 (n=50) | 33.1% (50/151) | 4.2% (50/1,184) |
| Standard 2 (n=35) | 23.2% (35/151) | 3% (35/1,184) |
| **Standard 3 (n=168)**  
[Total # comments for Standard 3 + Elements 3.1 – 3.5: 168] |  |  |
| Element 3.1 (n=29) | 17.3% (29/168) | 2.4% (29/1,184) |
| Element 3.2 (n=23) | 13.7% (23/168) | 1.9% (23/1,184) |
| Element 3.3 (n=26) | 15.5% (26/168) | 2.2% (26/1,184) |
| Element 3.4 (n=21) | 12.5% (21/168) | 1.8% (21/1,184) |
| Element 3.5 (n=44) | 26.2% (44/168) | 3.7% (44/1,184) |
| Standard 3 (n=25) | 14.9% (25/168) | 2.1% (25/1,184) |
| **Standard 4 (n=104)**  
[Total # comments for Standard 4 + Elements 4.1 – 4.5: 104] |  |  |
<p>| Element 4.1 (n=14) | 13.5% (14/104) | 1.2% (14/1,184) |
| Element 4.2 (n=15) | 14.4% (15/104) | 1.3% (15/1,184) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element 4.3 (n= 16)</th>
<th>15.4% (16/104)</th>
<th>1.4% (16/1,184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element 4.4 (n= 18)</td>
<td>17.3% (18/104)</td>
<td>1.5% (18/1,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 4.5 (n= 20)</td>
<td>19.2% (20/104)</td>
<td>1.7% (20/1,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4 (n= 21)</td>
<td>20.2% (21/104)</td>
<td>1.8% (21/1,184)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 5 (n= 129)**

[Total # comments for Standard 5 + Elements 5.1 – 5.4: 129]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element 5.1 (n= 22)</th>
<th>17.1% (22/129)</th>
<th>1.9% (22/1,184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element 5.2 (n= 20)</td>
<td>15.5% (20/129)</td>
<td>1.7% (20/1,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 5.3 (n= 26)</td>
<td>20.2% (26/129)</td>
<td>2.2% (26/1,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 5.4 (n= 43)</td>
<td>33.3% (43/129)</td>
<td>3.6% (43/1,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5 (n= 18)</td>
<td>14% (18/129)</td>
<td>1.5% (18/1,184)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 6 (n= 87)**

[Total # comments for Standard 6 + Elements 6.1 – 6.3: 87]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element 6.1 (n= 14)</th>
<th>16.1% (14/87)</th>
<th>1.2% (14/1,184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element 6.2 (n= 9)</td>
<td>10.3% (9/87)</td>
<td>0.8% (9/1,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 6.3 (n= 42)</td>
<td>48.3% (42/87)</td>
<td>3.5% (42/1,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6 (n= 22)</td>
<td>25.3% (22/87)</td>
<td>1.9% (22/1,184)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments (n= 192)**

[Total # general comments (not specific to any one standard/element): 192]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.2% (192/1,184)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electronic Survey Comments: Call for Feedback #4 (Spring 2016)

The following list provides total number and percentage of comments (for/against; positive/negative) received through electronic survey of stakeholders held in spring 2016 based on draft #2 of the SHAPE America 2016 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards & Elements.

Note: Lists do not include comments made verbally during presentation (SHAPE American National Convention & Expo in April 2016) or those provided in writing following presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft #2 of SHAPE America 2016 Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards &amp; Elements</th>
<th>Percentage (# comments / # comments per standard)</th>
<th>Percentage (# comments / Total # all comments) (n= 602 comments total across all standards/elements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1</strong> (n= 171) [Total # comments for Standard 1 + Elements 1.1 – 1.8: 171]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.1 (n= 22)</td>
<td>12.9% (22/171)</td>
<td>3.7% (22/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.2 (n= 13)</td>
<td>7.6% (13/171)</td>
<td>2.2% (13/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.3 (n= 17)</td>
<td>9.9% (17/171)</td>
<td>2.8% (17/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.4 (n= 34)</td>
<td>19.9% (34/171)</td>
<td>5.6% (34/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.5 (n= 16)</td>
<td>9.4% (16/171)</td>
<td>2.7% (16/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.6 (n= 13)</td>
<td>7.6% (13/171)</td>
<td>2.2% (13/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.7 (n= 13)</td>
<td>7.6% (13/171)</td>
<td>2.2% (13/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1.8 (n= 12)</td>
<td>7% (12/171)</td>
<td>2% (12/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1 (n= 31)</td>
<td>18.1% (31/171)</td>
<td>5.1% (31/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 2</strong> (n= 80) [Total # comments for Standard 2 + Elements 2.1 and 2.2: 80]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 2.1 (n= 35)</td>
<td>43.8% (35/80)</td>
<td>5.8% (35/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 2.2 (n= 26)</td>
<td>32.5% (26/80)</td>
<td>4.3% (26/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2 (n= 19)</td>
<td>23.8% (19/80)</td>
<td>3.2% (19/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 3</strong> (n= 62) [Total # comments for Standard 3 + Elements 3.1 – 3.5: 62]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3.1 (n= 7)</td>
<td>11.3% (7/62)</td>
<td>1.2% (7/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3.2 (n= 7)</td>
<td>11.3% (7/62)</td>
<td>1.2% (7/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3.3 (n= 12)</td>
<td>19.4% (12/62)</td>
<td>2% (12/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3.4 (n= 9)</td>
<td>14.5% (9/62)</td>
<td>1.5% (9/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3.5 (n= 18)</td>
<td>29% (18/62)</td>
<td>3% (18/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3 (n= 9)</td>
<td>14.5% (9/62)</td>
<td>1.5% (9/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 4</strong> (n= 48) [Total # comments for Standard 4 + Elements 4.1 – 4.5: 48]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 4.1 (n= 7)</td>
<td>14.6% (7/48)</td>
<td>1.2% (7/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 4.2 (n= 9)</td>
<td>18.8% (9/48)</td>
<td>1.5% (9/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 4.3 (n= 12)</td>
<td>25% (12/48)</td>
<td>2% (12/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 4.4 (n= 2)</td>
<td>4.2% (2/48)</td>
<td>0.3% (2/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 4.5 (n= 10)</td>
<td>20.8% (10/48)</td>
<td>1.7% (10/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4 (n= 8)</td>
<td>16.7% (8/48)</td>
<td>1.3% (8/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 5 (n= 60)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 5.1 (n= 9)</td>
<td>15% (9/60)</td>
<td>1.5% (9/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 5.2 (n= 10)</td>
<td>17% (10/60)</td>
<td>1.7% (10/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 5.3 (n= 12)</td>
<td>20% (12/60)</td>
<td>2% (12/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 5.4 (n= 19)</td>
<td>31.7% (19/60)</td>
<td>3.2% (19/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5 (n= 10)</td>
<td>17% (10/60)</td>
<td>1.7% (10/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 6 (n= 62)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 6.1 (n= 17)</td>
<td>27.4% (17/62)</td>
<td>2.8% (17/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 6.2 (n= 11)</td>
<td>17.7% (11/62)</td>
<td>1.8% (11/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 6.3 (n= 23)</td>
<td>37.1% (23/62)</td>
<td>3.8% (23/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6 (n= 11)</td>
<td>17.7% (11/62)</td>
<td>1.8% (11/602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comments (n= 119)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.8% (119/602)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidelines Reference and Review Criteria Table

Please complete the following for SPACAC records

Association SHAPE America - Society of Health and Physical Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item with GUIDELINES reference and Review Criteria</th>
<th>Page ref.</th>
<th>CAEP staff comments prepared for the Standards Committee</th>
<th>SPACAC audit team review and decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Title page</td>
<td>p. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brief introduction to the program standards for SPACAC use</td>
<td>p. 2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Statement on development of the standards
Evidence that the standards draw on developments in the SPA’s field (C.1.b and C.2.3).
- Is there an explicit description of the context for the SPA’s field?
- Is there a description of how that context influenced the standards?
Evidence the standards are based on empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice (C.1.c, and C.2.3)
- Is there an explicit description of the findings from the knowledge base that have influenced the SPA’s standards (that is, not just citations, but findings and how they were used in the SPA’s standards)?
Evidence of consensus development process (C.1.a and C.1.d, and C.2.3).
- Do the efforts at consensus development appear to be genuine, extensive, and evidenced in the final SPA standards?
- Has the SPA responded to CAEP comments or concerns, as well as to those from other SPAs, professional associations, institutions and states?

4. Potential duplication and/or overlaps in standards
SPA submissions are to include a written analysis of commonalities and differences with existing CAEP program standards or accreditation standards indicating areas of duplication and/or overlap (C.2.4).
- Has potential duplication or overlap with standards of other SPAs been identified and adequately addressed?

A. As appropriate for the specialty field, SPACAC strongly encourages attention to CAEP’s cross-cutting theme on diversity (B.6.d).
- Standards do not duplicate CAEP standards except where emphasis is necessary for the specialty area
- Do standards describe the knowledge and skills candidates need to create instructional opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pp. 11-14, 44-84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pp. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Paragraph 3, sentence 5), 10-11, 61, 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
adapted to diverse learners? A yes or no answer needs to be followed with Committee reviewer comments.

**B. As appropriate for the specialty field, SPACAC strongly encourages attention to CAEP’s cross-cutting theme on technology (B.6.d)**
- Standards do not duplicate CAEP standards except where emphasis is necessary for the specialty area
- Do the SPA standards specify appropriate and effective integration of technology and information literacy in instruction to support student learning?

**5. Analysis of differences from current standards (C.2.5)**
- Is the analysis of differences sufficiently clear for program faculty?
- Will the analysis be understandable by others in an institution?

| STANDARDS—including principles, elements, formatting, proposed waivers and programmatic standards |
| Implementation of the Guidelines |
| **6. Approach to implementation of the SPACAC Guidelines** (the rationale for decisions and interpretations made to apply the Policy on Guidelines to SPA-unique standards, Checklist, item C.2.6) |
| • Has the SPA developed standards that are consistent with the Policy? |
| • Do the SPA standards focus on the most essential knowledge and skills that should be attained by well-prepared candidates in the specialty field? |
| • Are there any dispositions (stated in terms of candidate behavior)? If so, is there a justification explaining why these cannot appropriately be examined at the unit level instead? (C.2.6) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pp. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Paragraph 3, sentence 5), 4, 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 7-11, 103-108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(paragraph 2, sentence 2), 4-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(paragraph 2, sentence 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(paragraph 2, last sentence), 10 (1st full paragraph, sentence 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposals for waivers and SPACAC actions on those proposals
7. Decisions on waivers

There are three cases for which the Policy on Guidelines provides for waivers when a SPA makes a case to SPACAC one year in advance. In all cases, SPACAC makes a decision based on its conclusions about the merits of the SPA’s case.

- **If a one-year-in-advance case for a waiver is pending**, then SPACAC (B.5) “will consider each case on its merits, will consider possible implications for SPAs in other specialty fields, and will provide a response at the annual meeting.”

- **If the final SPA submission is pending** and such a waiver was granted the previous year, what was the outcome of the SPACAC review? How has the prior SPACAC decision been implemented in the final SPA standards?

A. For any SPA, there may be a determination that a **field and clinical programmatic standard** is necessary for its specialty. If that determination is made, then the SPA should construct a case around the language of CAEP Standard 2, Clinical Partnerships and Practice. The SPA case is to describe the clinical and field experience expectations for the settings or the nature of such experiences. It is to detail how the expectations for clinical and field experiences of candidates in the SPA’s field are sufficiently different from the “norm” for education preparation to justify their status as a programmatic standard. If approved by SPACAC, this would be an eighth standard (B.6.c). In addition, SPACAC will consider:

- Has the SPA made a compelling case that needs in its field “are sufficiently different from the ‘norm’ by their variety of placements, qualifications of supervisors, or the sequence of experiences (B.6.c)?” Why or why not?
If the SPA has already made its case to SPACAC in the previous year, what was the outcome and how is that reflected in the final SPA standards?

B. For any SPA that finds that the principles “have no explicit provision for an attribute that is important for their specialty field, or where the principles have a provision that a SPA finds incongruent with their specialty field,” they may make a case for a waiver to SPACAC a year in advance of submitting their standards (Guidelines, B.5). The usual instance of this finding is likely to be for a SPA that writes standards for “other school professionals.” SPACAC policy prescribes that SPACAC “will interpret the principles . . . as a general guide . . . that requires flexible interpretation” (B.5).

Do the SPA standards for other school professionals demonstrate a focus on student learning or creating supportive environments for student learning?

Do the SPA standards demonstrate a foundation in the knowledge base of the specific field (B.5)?

C. SPAs preparing “other school professional” standards that believe there are unique circumstances for their field that can only be adequately addressed through a programmatic standard (other than field and clinical experiences that all SPAs may seek), may make a case explaining to SPACAC why such a programmatic standard is believed necessary (B.5).

Do the Standards Committee auditors find a compelling SPA case that state activities, national legislation, research findings, or other circumstances are unique to the specialized professional association’s field so that a separate programmatic standard is required (B.5)?
- What are the possible implications for SPA standards in other specialty fields if SPACAC concurs with this “unique circumstances” request and what action should SPACAC take at its annual meeting (B.5)?

### Standards, elements and formatting

8. **The SPA Standards**
   
   **A. SPA standards are written around the four principles and the principles are “a structure or organizing framework” (B.4.a)**
   - For teachers, do the content of the SPA standards introductory material and the principles text and supporting explanations focus on student learning in some obvious way (B.1)? Committee reviewers should say on what basis they choose yes or no.
   - For other school professionals, do the content of the SPA standards introductory material and the principles text and supporting explanations focus on creating supportive environments for student learning, as appropriate to the specialty field (B.5)? Committee reviewers should say on what basis they choose yes or no.
   - Do the principles explicitly appear in the structure of the proposed SPA standards?
   - Does the content of the standards clearly reflect the principles?

   | p. 3, 12, 101-102 |

**B. SPAs have included standards and elements, but no additional layers of specificity (B.4.b)**
- Standards and elements can be answered yes or no
- Has the SPA followed CAEP policy in only specifying standards and elements? If any additional layers of description are included, are they provided as explanations, not as requirements for evidence?

| pp. 2 (paragraph 2, sentence 2), 15-17 |
### C. SPA standards are written so that each concept that is to be an element appears in the language of the standard (B.4.c)
- Can be answered yes or no, but calls for a supporting comment from the Committee reviewer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Sentence Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pp. 2</td>
<td>(paragraph 2, sentence 2)</td>
<td>15-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Are the number and complexity of standards and components sufficiently limited to be comprehensively evaluated in six to eight assessments? (B.4.d). [This is a judgment call. The Committee reviewers should be able to say what the basis is for any judgments they reach in this area.]
Are there no more than seven standards and no more than 28 components in total? [Can be answered yes or no]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Sentence Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pp. 2</td>
<td>(paragraph 2, sentence 1), 3 (paragraph1 sentence 1)</td>
<td>15-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Reviewer decisions on whether standards are met or not are based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level; decisions on national recognition are based on preponderance of evidence that standards are met (B.4.e).
- “Preponderance of evidence” means an overall confirmation of candidate performance on the standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence.
- Programs are required to submit data at the standard level, but not at the element level, and they may disaggregate data by elements to better make their case, but that is not required.
- Program reviewers weigh the evidence presented in SPA program reports, and when there is a greater weight of evidence in favor, they should conclude that a standard is met or that a program is recognized.
- The elements are used by programs and reviewers to help determine how standards are met. This means that a standard could be met, even though evidence related to one or more elements is weak.
- Reviewers make judgments that “overall” there is/is not sufficient evidence that the standard is met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Sentence Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pp. 3</td>
<td>(paragraph1), 18-43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Questions for SPACAC:
- Do the rubrics and guidance for reviewers developed by the SPA for use by program reviewers address this policy?
- Does the SPA explain how reviewers are trained to review evidence and make judgments based on the preponderance of evidence that standards are met?

### F. Standards are limited to the special knowledge and skills that candidates should acquire and demonstrate in the SPA’s field (B.4.f)
- This is a judgment call, and actually a good one to have someone outside the SPA’s own area make. The Committee should be able to say what the basis is for any judgments they reach in this area. For example, education foundations and generic pedagogy would not be unique for a SPA’s field.

### G. Standards are limited to what education professionals who are completing preparation programs must know and be able to do, related to the principles (B.4.g)
- This is a judgment call, also. Again, the Committee should be able to say what the basis is for any judgments they reach in this area.

### H. SPA standards make clear distinctions on types of education professionals for whom they are written: initial teaching credential, advanced teaching, or other school professionals. (B.4.h)
- Is the SPA explicit as to (1) the institutional degrees or certificates that are appropriate to programs addressing their standards and (b) the types of state licensure or certification programs that are compatible with their standards?
I. SPA standards include rubrics or criteria that guide reviewer judgments and supporting explanations that can assist reviewers and program faculty (B.4.i).

Two overarching questions will be considered by the SPACAC:

- Do the rubrics or guidelines define how reviewers will review and make decisions on standards?
- Do the rubrics or guidelines clearly articulate elements that are essential or not essential for reviewers to determine that a preponderance of evidence exists that program candidates meet a standard?

Three auditor questions address clarity in the meaning of SPA standards:

- Do the supporting explanations adequately elaborate on the meaning of the SPA’s standards, discuss the impact of pertinent research findings that shape the standards, or describe appropriate candidate performance assessments for the standards? (B.4.i)
- Are the rubrics or guidelines clear to a non-SPA reader?
- Does the supporting explanation make the intent of the standard clear?

Finally, three questions address the qualities of assessments that would provide evidence for SPA standards (B.4.i):

- Do the supporting explanations, together with the rubrics, provide useful suggestions about ways the standard can be assessed?
- Do the supporting explanations and rubrics support assessments that are aligned with standards?
- Do the characteristics of assessments that are implied or explicit in the rubrics and explanations adhere to good assessment practices for the particular standard?

| pp. 18-43, 44-84, 85-93 |  |  |
SUPPORTING MATERIAL—including state partnership responsibilities, training for faculty and states, resources that SPAs make available, and training for reviewers

### 9. Information on conduct of SPA responsibilities under CAEP State Partnerships

(for details, see Responsibilities Under State Partnerships, SASB Policies and Procedures Handbook, Section IV.A.3, items a-d)

Under SASB policies, the SPA compares state standards submitted with Partnership applications with their own CAEP-approved program standards and indicates: (a) that there is alignment, or (b) there is not sufficient alignment and explaining why alignment is not achieved. The SPA standards are the principal basis for conducting reviews of alignment between state and SPA standards.

The SPACAC may ask such questions as these:

- If a SPA creates any additional guidance (e.g., criteria, interpretations, significant topics to be covered) has that guidance been made widely available to CAEP and to states?
- Has the SPA described its process for selecting reviewers who are experienced in application of SPA standards as well as in state practices, policies and procedures?
- Has the SPA described its procedures for nominating a pool of reviewers who are experienced in application of the SPA’s standards and who have experience and/or training in state practices, policies, procedures, lawmaking and regulation by which standards are prepared and administered?
- Has the SPA described its procedures for quality assurance in selection, training and evaluation of state partnership standards reviewers, and procedures to avoid conflicts of interest or bias?
- Has the SPA provided evidence that it responds to state requests in a collaborative and collegial manner,

| p. 94 |  |  |
especially during development of state standards, and by identifying points of contact and training opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Training and resources (section C.2, item 10 in the Guidelines and SASB policy for SPA Responsibilities under State Partnership Programs, guidelines 1-4). On training for faculty and states, and in other resources that SPAs make available to institutions and states:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Has the descriptive information been provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are the SPA training and assistance practices in accord with CAEP requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p. 4-6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Information on SPA procedures for selection, training, and evaluation of program reviewers and representation of diversity within the profession (see text paragraph in item k of the Guidelines, section C.2 in the Checklist for components of SPA standards submissions to SPACAC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Is the information provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it explicitly address diversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p. 94-97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTIONAL FEATURE—SPACAC might comment if the SPA proposes these**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Optional supplemental document (B.6.a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SPACAC does not attempt to standardize such documents. Committee reviewers may, voluntarily, look at them sufficiently to reach their own conclusions about the value of these documents for program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pp. 98-99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPACAC invites SPAs to provide explicit suggestions and examples that could guide institutions toward stronger assessment evidence (B.6.b)

- If there are any suggested examples, do Committee auditors have any observations about the usefulness of those examples?
- Are any of the examples problematic from the perspective of good assessment practices?
• Do the examples contain exemplary features that adhere to good assessment practices and that should be brought to the attention of other SPAs?
Addendum from SHAPE America to CAEP’s SPA Standards Advisory Committee

In January 2017, the SHAPE America SPA Coordinators met with the chair of the PETE standards revision task force to follow up from the motions received from CAEP’s SPA Standards Advisory Committee (from November 2016). The PETE standards addendum was fully approved in December by the committee and CAEP’s BOD. To clarify preponderance of evidence from Modification 2 of the PETE Addendum from November, it was decided to modify the descriptions. The modifications are addressed below.

Modification 2: The SPA needs to explain how ‘preponderance of evidence’ will be operationalized across all standards.

Decisions at the level of the standard:

Programs must address every component in a program report submitted to CAEP/SHAPE America seeking to achieve or maintain national recognition. However, there is no requirement that every component be met in order for a standard to be met. Instead, a standard is met holistically and this is determined when a preponderance of evidence for meeting it has been provided in the program report. A preponderance of evidence “means an overall confirmation of candidate performance on the standard in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence” (CAEP Guidelines Revised-2016, p. 25). If there is a greater weight of evidence in favor, reviewers should determine the standard is met. As such, a standard may be met even while information for one component that has been addressed is not met. SHAPE America has not designated any component as one that must be met (not simply addressed) in order for a standard to be met.

Met with conditions - If the evidence provided by the program, via its strength or quality, offers insufficient proof that more than one component per Standard is at the acceptable level or higher on the rubric, the reviewer should conclude that the related Standard is “met with conditions.” In that situation, the program has offered insufficient evidence and the preponderance of evidence indicates that the intent and integrity of the Standard is sacrificed. In this case, the standard could be ‘met with conditions’ or ‘not met’ depending on the level of insufficiency of the evidence. In the case that multiple components demonstrate weaknesses, a standard should be ‘met with conditions’. If the reviewer or review team determines that the weight of the evidence for only one component is addressed but not met, yet, the preponderance of evidence confirms that the intent of the wording of the Standard is still upheld by the strength of the other components, the Standard can still be met. Program report reviewers will use rubric criteria as part of their professional judgment to determine decisions about a standard. First, rubric criteria provided for each component will help guide reviewers’ decisions regarding whether every component below a standard has been addressed or not. The rubric item for each component provides three performance levels (Target, Acceptable, Unacceptable) with the acceptable level serving as the minimum level of acceptable performance. Second, rubric criteria will help guide professional judgement in determination as to whether there is a preponderance of evidence that a standard is met or not.

Decisions about national recognition:

To receive a “nationally recognized” decision, all Standards must be met. When all Standards receive a ranking of “met,” the preponderance of evidence indicates that the program has submitted sufficient evidence to confirm program performance on the PETE Standards in strength, weight or quality.
Program Report Reviewer Training:

Program report reviewers will be trained to review evidence and make judgments based on a preponderance of evidence that a standard is met. Training for program report reviewers will include, but is not limited to the following:

(a) The definition of preponderance of evidence;
(b) Application of ‘preponderance of evidence’ as it applies toward meeting (or not) a standard;
(c) Use of rubric criteria for use in determining whether sufficient evidence has been provided for meeting a standard holistically;
(d) Discussion of professional judgment as it applies to how a program report might address each component versus provides sufficient evidence for meeting a standard; and
(de) Examples of assessments will be provided that demonstrate sufficient, insufficient, and difficult-to-determine evidence for meeting a standard.
(f) Provide adequate training to existing and newly recruited reviewers to develop a shared understanding of the SPA’s criteria in evaluating standards and weighing evidence to meet SPA standards to ensure fairness and consistency in recognition decision.

Program reviewer training will be required for both novice reviewers and experienced reviewers to ensure that each one has practiced applying the concept of preponderance of evidence in decisions regarding whether a standard is met or not.