

## **Crosswalk of the Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Special Educators (2020) with the Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Early Interventionists /Early Childhood Special Educators (2020)**

In summer 2023, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) in collaboration with the Division for Early Childhood (DEC) supported development of a crosswalk of the Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Special Educators ([K-12 Standards](#)) (2020) and the Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Early Interventionists/Early Childhood Special Educators ([EI/ECSE Standards](#)) (2020). This crosswalk was completed to assist institutions of higher education (IHE) faculty integrate the Standards into their preservice (i.e., initial preparation) curriculum and also to assist professional development (PD) providers to integrate the Standards into PD content. It is also designed to facilitate the development of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) assessments in programs that prepare candidates for the birth to three, three-to-eight-year age ranges (preschool to third grade), and a grade level beyond third grade.

### **Development of the Standards Crosswalk**

#### ***Crosswalk Workgroup and Leadership Team***

A crosswalk/alignment process that has been employed three previous times was followed to complete this crosswalk (Chandler et al., 2012; Mickelson et al., 2023). A 10-member workgroup, facilitated by a leadership team with representation from CEC and DEC, completed the crosswalk. Table 1 lists the workgroup members and the leadership team along with their affiliations and qualifications.

#### **Table 1**

*Standards Crosswalk Workgroup Members and Leadership Team*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Professional Affiliation</b>	<b>Expertise with Standards</b>
Serra Acar	Workgroup Member	Assistant Professor University of Massachusetts, Boston	<p>Member, ECE and EI/ECSE Standards Crosswalk Workgroup</p> <p>Member, PK-12 Educator Preparation Program Reviews for Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)</p> <p>Member, Certification for Early Intervention Specialists (CEIS) Pilot Evaluation Program, Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH)</p>

Rachelle Bruno	Workgroup Member	Professor Emeritus Northern Kentucky University	Member, CEC SDWG CEC Auditor CAEP Program Reviews NCATE State Partnership Board (2012) Member/Chair NCATE Specialty Area Studies Board (2004-2010, 2010-2012) Member/Chair CEC Professional Standards and Practices Committee (1995-2004, 2005-2008) NCATE Standards Task Force (2007)
Shannon Budin	Workgroup Member	Professor and Assistant Dean for Assessment and Accreditation Buffalo State University	Member, CEC SDWG Assistant Dean for Assessment and Accreditation
Kharon Grimmet	Workgroup Member	Clinical Associate Professor Purdue University	Coordinator, Online MEd in Special Education and Licensure Program Chair, CEC Knowledge and Skills Committee (KSSC)
Jennifer Kilgo	Workgroup Member	Professor University of Alabama, Birmingham	Coordinator, Graduate Program in EI/ECSE Member, EI/ECSE SDTF

Stephanie Morano	Workgroup Member	Assistant Professor University of Virginia	TED, Member-at-Large for Knowledge and Skills and Professional Development (2022-2024)
Megan Purcell	Workgroup Member	Clinical Associate Professor Purdue University	Member, DEC Program Review Committee CEC, NAEYC, and State program reviewer ECEEN Program Coordinator Member, EI/ECSE SDTF
Marcia Rock	Workgroup Member	Professor University of North Carolina, Greensboro	Program Director, Ph. D. in Special Education, Department of Specialized Education Services (SES) Graduate Studies Director, Department of SES Member, CEC Standards Framing Workgroup
Cynthia Vail	Workgroup Member	Professor University of Georgia	Member, EI/ECSE SDTF
Hasan Zaghlawan	Workgroup Member	Associate Professor University of Northern Colorado	Program Coordinator, ECSE program Member, EI/ECSE SDTF

Dee Berlinghoff	Leadership Team	Professor Emeritus Mount Saint Mary College	Chair, CEC Professional Standards and Practices Committee  <i>Co-editor, Practice-based standards for the preparation of special educators (2022)</i>  Co-chair, CEC SDWG
Margie Crutchfield	Leadership Team	Consultant for Program Review  Division for Early Childhood	Consultant, CEC SDWG  Consultant, EI/ECSE SDTF
Peggy Kemp	Leadership Team	Executive Director  Division for Early Childhood	DEC liaison to EI/ECSE SDTF
Vicki Stayton	Leadership Team	Professor Emeritus Western Kentucky University  Consultant for Professional Standards  Division for Early Childhood	Early Childhood Personnel Center liaison to EI/ECSE SDTF  Member, CEC SDWG  Member, CEC Standards Framing Workgroup  Member, CEC KSSC

*Note.* CEC SDWG = CEC Standards Development Workgroup

*Note.* EI/ECSE SDTF = EI/ECSE Standards Development Task Force

### ***Decision Guidelines***

A leadership team member developed a set of decision guidelines to describe the salient features of the K-12 and EI/ECSE Standards and components based on one created by a

previous standards crosswalk workgroup (Mickelson et al., under review). Those guidelines were developed to facilitate workgroup members' ability to focus on the same critical features of the components to complete an independent review. The leadership team members reviewed the guidelines with no additional edits made. Workgroup members also reviewed the document and provided no additional suggestions or edits.

### ***Procedures for Conducting the Crosswalk***

The process for conducting the crosswalk included a series of zoom meetings followed by independent review and crosswalking of the Standards at the component level by workgroup members. Zoom meetings were recorded and available for review of the meeting discussion, as needed, by workgroup members. The organizational zoom meeting introduced the crosswalk matrix, draft decision guidelines, procedures for completing independent crosswalks, and timelines.

Using the guidelines and the two sets of Standards, components, and supporting explanations, workgroup members completed two separate reviews of the components for similarity of content based on this definition: components can be crosswalked when the knowledge and/or skills represented in a K-12 component and an EI/ECSE component are comparable enough to say that they are addressing similar but not necessarily equivalent content. Using a matrix with all K-12 components (n=23) represented on the horizontal axis and all EI/ECSE components (n=27) on the vertical axis, workgroup members reviewed all components for the possibility of being crosswalked in the first independent review (i.e., 621 cells). The workgroup held a second zoom meeting to discuss results of the independent crosswalks and identify any additional guidelines/clarifications needed. The workgroup considered those

components with 80-100% agreement as crosswalked for a total of six pairs of components crosswalked.

For only those K-12 and EI/ECSE components that fell in the 50-70% agreement range, a second independent review was completed (i.e., 21 cells). Four additional pairs of components reached the 80-100% agreement range for a total of 10 pairs of components crosswalked. The workgroup held a final zoom meeting in which the results of the second independent crosswalk were confirmed and next steps for development and dissemination of a crosswalk product were discussed.

**Using the Standards Crosswalk**

While IHE programs must consider both sets of standards in their entirety, this crosswalk is designed to assist IHE faculty, when designing curriculum and preparing documentation for accreditation, to understand when and how these sets of Standards intersect. This crosswalk is designed as a resource to accompany the full sets of Standards for the following types of IHE degree programs (see Table 2) in the design, implementation, and evaluation of preservice curricula:

**Table 2**

*Type of IHE Program and Associated Standards*

<b>IHE or PD Program</b>	<b>Standards</b>
K-12	K-12 Standards
Pre-K through 12 (or some grade beyond grade 3)	EI/ECSE Standards for 3–8-year-olds (preschool through grade 3), K-12 Standards “for the remaining grade levels” (Berlinghoff & McLaughlin, 2022)
Birth through 12 (or some grade beyond grade 3)	EI/ECSE Standards for birth-8-year-olds (birth through grade 3), K-12 Standards “for the remaining grade levels” (Berlinghoff & McLaughlin, 2022, p. 3)

For programs that must use both sets of Standards, the crosswalk can be used to determine what assignments, activities, and field experiences meet or meet with some modification components for both sets of Standards and when age/grade specific experiences are needed. It is important to understand that components that have been crosswalked are not considered equivalent. An assessment that adequately addresses a K-12 component may need to be modified or adapted to also adequately address the relevant EI/ECSE component. Examples are provided in Table 3 below. The assignment description and/or scoring guides for these assignments could be designed to differentially reflect the components as they need to be demonstrated by the candidates.

**Table 3**

*Sample CAEP Assessments with Crosswalked Components*

<p><b>Example 1:</b> Reflecting on Adherence to Legislation and Policy, Professional Ethics, and Evidence-Based Practices During IFSP/IEP Development</p>
<p><b>Crosswalked Components:</b></p> <p>K-12 Standard 1: Components 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3</p> <p>EI/ECSE Standard 7: Components 7.4, 7.3, and 7.2 respectively</p>



**Performance Assessment:**

Observe an IFSP and/or IEP meeting and participate as a team member in a simulated IFSP or IEP meeting. To prepare for the observation and simulation review the legal guidelines for preparation for, implementation of, and follow-up to such meetings. In addition, review the relevant professional codes of ethics DEC Recommended Practices (RPs) and/or CEC High Leverage Practices (HLPs) as they might apply to such meetings After the observation and simulation, reflect on the degree to which the legal guidelines were followed, adherence to the professional codes of ethics, and the degree to which the IFSP and/or IEP addressed evidence-based practices. Based on this reflection, provide recommendations for what should be implemented differently in the next IFSP and/or IEP meeting.

**Modifications Based on Age/Grade Range:**

Infant/Toddler (Birth – 3 years) – Observe an IFSP meeting and an initial IEP meeting for a child transitioning into preschool, participate in an IFSP simulation, review legal guidelines and policies for developing IFSPs and IEPs, review the DEC and NAEYC codes of ethics, and the DEC RPs

Preschool (3-5 years) – Observe both an IFSP meeting focused on transition and an IEP meeting, participate in an IEP simulation, review legal guidelines and policies for developing transition IFSPs and IEPs, review the DEC and NAEYC codes of ethics, and the DEC RPs

Primary (Grades K-3) – Observe and participate in a simulated IEP meeting, review legal guidelines and policies for developing IEPs, review the DEC and NAEYC codes of ethics, and the CEC HLPs

Upper Elementary, Middle School, High School (Grades 4-12) - Observe and participate in a simulated IEP meeting, review legal guidelines and policies for developing IEPs, review the CEC code of ethics, and the CEC HLPs

**Example 2:** Collaborating with Team Members to Make Data-Based Decisions**Crosswalked Components:**

K-12 Standard 4: Components 4.1, 4.3; Standard 5: Component 5.1; and K-12 Standard 7: Component 7.2.

EI/ECSE Standard 4: Components 4.2, 4.4; Standard 6: 6.7; and EI/ECSE Standard 3: Component 3.3

**Performance Assessment:**

During a field placement, the candidate collects informal assessment data and analyzes and interprets it to make decisions about instruction/intervention and progress on outcomes. The candidate takes the lead in sharing the assessment data with the family and other professionals in a team meeting. The candidate along with other team members use the data to modify individualized plans as needed.

**Modifications Based on Age/Grade Range:**

Infant/Toddler (Birth – 3 years) – (a) Informal assessment measures/data - Anecdotal notes, some frequency counts; (b) Individualized plans – plans for home-based coaching session with family as primary provider; (c) Team members – family member(s), siblings if in setting, primary service provider, possibly a related service professional

Preschool (3-5 years) – (a) Informal assessment measures/data - Anecdotal notes, frequency counts, work samples (e.g., drawings, dictated stories, artwork involving cutting), some time samples; (b) Individualized plans – Lesson plans with components similar to elementary and with variations to include state early learning standards; procedures with open middle, close; peer mediation; facilitator which could be paraprofessional or related service professional; (c) Team members – lead teacher, paraprofessional(s), related service professionals, family

Primary (Grades K-3) – (a) Informal assessment data - Anecdotal notes, frequency counts, work samples (e.g., drawings, dictated stories, photos representing math concepts such as sequencing), some time samples; (b) Individualized plans – Lesson plans with components similar to elementary and with variations to include with open middle, close; peer mediation; facilitator which could be paraprofessional or related service professional; (c) Team members – lead teacher, paraprofessional(s), related service professionals, family

Upper Elementary, Middle School, High School (Grades 4-12) -(a) Informal assessment measures/data – Frequency counts, time samples, duration recording, teacher made tests; (b) Individualized plans – Lesson plans; (c) Team members – lead teacher, possibly a co-teacher, paraprofessional, and/or a related services provider

This crosswalk does not entirely capture the complexity and depth of the full sets of Standards and components, nor do the relationships identified mean these components are equivalent. The relationships, however, do indicate similarities in the knowledge and skills represented by these Components.

## References

Berlinghoff, D., & McLaughlin, V. (Eds.) (2022). *Practice-based standards for the preparation of special educators*. Council for Exceptional Children.

Chandler, L. K., Cochran, D. C., Christensen, K. A., Dinnebeil, L. A., Gallagher, P. A., Lifter, K., Stayton, V. D., & Spino, M. (2012). The alignment of CEC/DEC and NAEYC personnel preparation standards. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 32*(1), 52-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0271121412437047>

Mickelson, A.M., Stayton, V. D., Chandler, L. K., Green, K. B., Danner, N., Vail, C. O. Swett, J., Jones, H., & Robbins, S. H. (2023). The tradition of early childhood personnel preparation standards alignment: Collaboration for inclusion. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 44*(2), 199-215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2023.2166433>

**Table 4**

*Crosswalk of the Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Special Educators(K-12) (2020) and Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Early Interventionists /Early Childhood Special Educators (EI/ECSE) (2020)*

This table ***only identifies the 10 K-12 Standard components and the EI/ECSE Standard components that were similar enough to be crosswalked.*** The left column of the table specifies only the K-12 components that were crosswalked. The right column identifies only the EI/ECSE components that were determined to be cross-walked with the adjacent K-12 component.

<b>Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Special Educators (K-12) Standards and Components</b>	<b>Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Early Interventionists/Early Childhood Special Educators (EI/ECSE) Standards and Components</b>
<b>Standard 1: Engaging in Professional Learning and Practice within Ethical Guidelines</b>  Candidates practice within ethical and legal guidelines; advocate for improved outcomes for individuals with exceptionalities and their families while considering their social, cultural, and linguistic diversity; and engage in ongoing self-reflection to design and implement professional learning activities.	<b>Standard 7: Professionalism and Ethical Practice</b>  Candidates identify and engage with the profession of early intervention and early childhood special education (EI/ECSE) by exhibiting skills in reflective practice, advocacy, and leadership while adhering to ethical and legal guidelines. Evidence-based and recommended practices are promoted and used by candidates.
1.1 Candidates practice within ethical guidelines and legal policies and procedures.	7.4 Candidates practice within ethical and legal policies and procedures.
1.2 Candidates advocate for improved outcomes for individuals with exceptionalities and their families while addressing the unique needs of those with	7.3 Candidates exhibit leadership skills in advocating for improved outcomes for young children, families, and the profession including

<p>diverse social, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>the promotion of and use of evidenced-based practices and decision-making.</p>
<p>1.3 Candidates design and implement professional learning activities based on ongoing analysis of student learning; self-reflection; and professional standards, research, and contemporary practices.</p>	<p>7.2 Candidates engage in ongoing reflective practice and access evidence-based information to improve their own practices.</p>
<p><b>Standard 2: Understanding and Addressing Each Individual’s Developmental and Learning Needs</b></p> <p>Candidates use their understanding of human growth and development, the multiple influences on development, individual differences, diversity, including exceptionalities, and families and communities to plan and implement inclusive learning environments and experiences that provide individuals with exceptionalities high quality learning experiences reflective of each individual’s strengths and needs.</p>	<p><b>Standard 1: Child Development and Early Learning</b></p> <p>Candidates understand the impact of different theories and philosophies of early learning and development on assessment, curriculum, instruction, and intervention decisions. Candidates apply knowledge of normative developmental sequences and variations, individual differences within and across the range of abilities, including developmental delays and disabilities, and other direct and indirect contextual features that support or constrain children’s development and learning. These contextual factors as well as social, cultural, and linguistic diversity are considered when facilitating meaningful learning experiences and individualizing intervention and instruction across contexts.</p>

<p>2.1 Candidates apply understanding of human growth and development to create developmentally appropriate and meaningful learning experiences that address individualized strengths and needs of students with exceptionalities.</p> <p>2.2 Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of diverse factors that influence development and learning, including differences related to families, languages, cultures, and communities, and individual differences, including exceptionalities, to plan and implement learning experiences and environments.</p>	<p>1.2 Candidates apply knowledge of normative sequences of early development, individual differences, and families’ social, cultural and linguistic diversity to support each child’s development and learning across contexts.</p>
<p><b>Standard 4: Using Assessment to Understand the Learner and the Learning Environment for Data-Based Decision Making</b></p> <p>Candidates assess students’ learning, behavior, and the classroom environment in order to evaluate and support classroom and school-based problem-solving systems of intervention and instruction. Candidates evaluate students to determine their strengths and needs, contribute to students’ eligibility determination, communicate students’ progress, inform short and long-term instructional planning, and make ongoing adjustments to instruction using technology as appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Standard 4: Assessment Processes</b></p> <p>Candidates know and understand the purposes of assessment in relation to ethical and legal considerations. Candidates choose developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate tools and methods that are responsive to the characteristics of the young child, family, and program. Using evidence-based practices, candidates develop or select as well as administer informal measures, and select and administer formal measures in partnership with families and other professionals. They analyze, interpret, document, and share assessment information using a strength-based approach with families and other professionals for eligibility determination, outcome/goal development, planning instruction and intervention, monitoring progress, and reporting.</p>

<p>4.1 Candidates collaboratively develop, select, administer, analyze, and interpret multiple measures of student learning, behavior, and the classroom environment to evaluate and support classroom and school-based systems of intervention for students with and without exceptionalities.</p>	<p>4.2 Candidates develop and administer informal assessments and/or select and use valid, reliable formal assessments using evidence-based practices, including technology, in partnership with families, and other professionals.</p>
<p>4.3 Candidates assess, collaboratively analyze, interpret, and communicate students' progress toward measurable outcomes using technology as appropriate, to inform both short- and long-term planning, and make ongoing adjustments to instruction.</p>	<p>4.4 Candidates, in collaboration with families and other team members, use assessment data to determine eligibility, develop child and family-based outcomes/goals, plan for interventions and instruction, and monitor progress to determine efficacy of programming.</p>
<p><b>Standard 5: Supporting Learning Using Effective Instruction</b></p> <p>Candidates use knowledge of individuals' development, learning needs, and assessment data to inform decisions about effective instruction. Candidates use explicit instructional strategies and employ strategies to promote active engagement and increased motivation to individualize instruction to support each individual. Candidates use whole group instruction, flexible grouping, small group instruction, and individual instruction. Candidates teach individuals to use meta-/cognitive strategies to support and self-regulate learning.</p>	<p><b>Standard 6: Using Responsive and Reciprocal Interactions, Interventions, and Instruction</b></p> <p>Candidates plan and implement intentional, systematic, evidence-based, responsive interactions, interventions, and instruction to support all children's learning and development across all developmental and content domains in partnership with families and other professionals. Candidates facilitate equitable access and participation for all children and families within natural and inclusive environments through culturally responsive and affirming practices and relationships. Candidates use data-based decision making to plan for, adapt, and improve interactions, interventions, and instruction to ensure fidelity of implementation.</p>

5.1 Candidates use findings from multiple assessments, including student self-assessment, that are responsive to cultural and linguistic diversity and specialized as needed, to identify what students know and are able to do. They then interpret the assessment data to appropriately plan and guide instruction to meet rigorous academic and non-academic content and goals for each individual.

6.7 Candidates plan for, adapt and improve approaches to interaction, intervention, and instruction based on multiple sources of data across a range of natural environments and inclusive settings.

**Standard 7: Collaborating with Team Members**

Candidates apply team processes and communication strategies to collaborate in a culturally responsive manner with families, paraprofessionals, and other professionals within the school, other educational settings, and the community to plan programs and access services for individuals with exceptionalities and their families.

**Standard 3: Collaboration and Teaming**

Candidates apply models, skills, and processes of teaming when collaborating and communicating with families and professionals, using culturally and linguistically responsive and affirming practices. In partnership with families and other professionals, candidates develop and implement individualized plans and successful transitions that occur across the age span. Candidates use a variety of collaborative strategies while working with and supporting other adults.

7.2 Candidates collaborate, communicate, and coordinate with families, paraprofessionals, and other professionals within the educational setting to assess, plan, and implement effective programs and services that promote progress toward measurable outcomes for individuals with and without exceptionalities and their families.

3.3 Candidates partner with families and other professionals to develop individualized plans and support the various transitions that occur for the young child and their family throughout the birth through 8 age span.

7.4 Candidates work with and mentor paraprofessionals in the paraprofessionals' role of supporting the education of

3.2 Candidates use a variety of collaborative strategies when working with other adults that are evidence-based, appropriate to the task, culturally and linguistically responsive and take



individuals with exceptionalities and their families.

into consideration the environment and service delivery approach.