



DEVELOPING A FOUNDATION FOR CUED PRACTICE ENDORSEMENT

A Cued Language Lab Proposal | Invitation to Collaborate | Version 2

Prepared by Cue Cognatio, LLC | Working Collaboration Draft

PROPOSAL: Collaboratively develop an affordable endorsement foundation combining minimum word-level expressive cueing skill, assessed understanding of cued language theory, and professional scope awareness. Invite review before defining final standards or issuing endorsements.

Executive Summary

Cued Language Lab invites researchers, practitioners, Deaf cuers, families, assessment organizations, and educational partners to explore a shared foundation for the Cued Practice Endorsement (CPE). The intended benefit is a clear, usable way to distinguish introductory exposure from demonstrated foundational knowledge and skill.

The group's working understanding is that word-level expressive skill is a minimum requirement. This revised proposal adds a separately assessed cued language foundation and applied explanations of its meaning and limits. Existing professional authority and continuing learning remain part of the proposed pathway. Requirements, measures, and maintenance rules would be agreed through collaboration and tested before deployment.

The first endorsement would make a bounded claim about foundational knowledge and word-level performance. Conversational fluency, receptive proficiency, family coaching, clinical effectiveness, and specialty expertise require additional evidence. A proposed 16-month development horizon accommodates a small working group; particular phases may move faster when decisions, expertise, and resources are ready.

1. Invitation and Shared Purpose

The shared question is: What should an already-qualified professional understand and demonstrate before claiming a foundational qualification in cueing and cued language? We invite contributors to help define the answer, review existing measures, and test whether an endorsement would improve professional and family decisions.

PROPOSED FOUNDATION: Qualifying professional standing + approved word-level expressive

evidence + assessed cued language understanding + applied scope judgment + continuing professional learning. Final thresholds and renewal requirements remain for collaborative review.

The AG Bell Academy offers an organizational comparison: a defined body of professional knowledge and practice can be made recognizable through standards, assessment, and public verification. CPE's initial claim would be narrower than advanced specialist certification. The comparison informs development; it does not establish equivalent expertise or justify copying another credential's requirements.

2. Why Explore a Shared Foundation?

Course participation, expressive performance, receptive understanding, and effective professional practice answer different questions. A useful endorsement would state which of these it measures and help families, employers, and practitioners interpret the evidence. The group should test that practical value with a pilot partner rather than assume that a gap in credentials alone warrants a new program.

The inquiry in progress, Revisiting Cued Language Structure, provides a discussion foundation. It distinguishes visible feature presence, contrastive relevance, production timing, perception, and developmental outcomes. It treats Fleetwood and Metzger's bipartite account as foundational and a broader tripartite coordination account as a proposal to investigate. CPE can assess established concepts and evidence literacy while that inquiry continues.

Four facts the proposed endorsement would make visible

- The holder has an active qualifying professional license, certificate or employment credential.
- The holder has demonstrated an approved minimum of word-level expressive cueing skill.
- The holder has demonstrated foundational cued language understanding and judgment about the limits of the qualification.
- The holder maintains the endorsement through modest continuing professional development related to cueing.

3. Proposed Credential and Terminology

Working name: Cued Practice Endorsement (CPE)

Cued Practice Endorsement remains the working name while collaborators review terminology and public comprehension. The standard should define Cued Speech, cueing, cuem, and cued language and explain their relationships. Recognizability and linguistic accuracy should be considered together, with source definitions represented faithfully in designating a final name - whether it is Cued Speech Practice Endorsement, Cued Language Practice Endorsement, or an alternate name.

Initial professional populations

- Speech-language pathologists with qualifying professional standing.
- Teachers of the deaf with qualifying professional standing.
- Other educators or related professionals, subject to an agreed eligibility policy.

Begin with one common foundation. List the holder's existing profession in the verification record. Introduce specialty suffixes only after defining and assessing additional competencies; an existing professional title alone would not establish a cueing specialty.

Questions for collaborative terminology review

- How can the public name connect people to familiar resources while accurately describing the linguistic function of cueing?
- Which meanings of Cued Speech, cuem, cueing, and cued language should applicants explain, and which differences in the literature should remain explicitly documented?
- How should the initial designation distinguish assessed foundational knowledge and skill from conversational, receptive, instructional, and clinical competence?
- How should language-specific adaptations, pronunciation, dialect, and tonal features be represented? Begin with a clearly identified adaptation and avoid extending its feature inventory to all cued languages.

WORKING DESIGNATION: CPE as a shared foundational endorsement. Professional role information would accompany the record; specialty endorsements would follow only after additional standards and measures are approved.

4. Eligibility and Requirements

Requirement 1 — Existing professional authority

Applicants must hold an active credential appropriate to their role. For an SLP, this means an applicable state license or equivalent jurisdictional authority. For a teacher of the deaf, it means an applicable state teaching license, endorsement, certification or verified employment in an eligible educational role. The CPE supplements that professional authority; it never replaces it.

Requirement 2 — Minimum word-level expressive evidence

Applicants would demonstrate an approved minimum of word-level expressive cueing skill. The working group would review available measures with assessment providers, including relevant NCSA and TECUnit expertise, and agree on the construct, threshold, dialect treatment, and acceptable evidence. The original proposal's one-time assessment and no routine repeat examination remain options for review, not settled policy. Define evidence currency, equivalency, remediation, and maintenance before

acceptance. Word-level performance must not be interpreted as conversational or receptive competence.

Requirement 3 — Assessed cued language foundation

Applicants would explain the relationship among Cued Speech, cueing, cuem, and cued language; identify relevant manual–mouth pairings; distinguish linguistic contrasts from acoustic speech articulation; distinguish production from reception; and recognize the difference between a system’s capability and a learner’s actual access.

A draft assessment could combine 20–25 knowledge and interpretation questions with two brief applied explanations: explaining visual language access to a family or colleague, and responding to a professional scope scenario. Allow equivalent written, signed, cued, or spoken responses. Score conceptual accuracy, application, and recognition of limits rather than conformity to memorized wording.

Requirement 4 — Maintenance through professional development

A provisional maintenance option is six hours of approved professional development per three-year cycle. Collaborators would review whether this is sufficient and how knowledge, skill, and underlying professional standing remain current. Renewal rules must match the final endorsement claim.

Learning could address language access, cueing accuracy, pronunciation and dialect, production and reception, connected interaction, evidence interpretation, ethics, referral, family perspectives, and language development. Relevant clinical or literacy applications should distinguish established evidence from proposed uses.

Preparation may be offered through Cue College and other providers. Course completion alone would not establish endorsement eligibility. Publish the competency blueprint, expected responses, scoring rules, and feedback pathway; pilot independent review of applied explanations before operationalizing routine decisions.

5. What the Endorsement Does—and Does Not—Mean

PROPOSED CLAIM: “This professional has demonstrated an approved minimum of word-level expressive cueing skill, foundational cued language understanding, and judgment about the limits of this qualification within their existing professional role.”

Evidence the foundation would verify

- A qualifying underlying professional credential.
- Approved minimum word-level expressive performance, with its assessment scope and currency stated.

- Assessed foundational cued language understanding and applied scope judgment.
- Ongoing engagement with approved cueing-related professional development.

The CPE does not verify

- Conversational or discourse-level expressive fluency.
- Receptive cueing proficiency unless separately assessed.
- Expertise comparable to an advanced specialist credential.
- Effectiveness with every population, diagnosis or educational need.
- Authority to diagnose, treat, teach or bill outside the holder's existing scope.
- Qualification to provide cued language transliteration or other language-access services governed by a separate competency standard.

6. Collaboration and Stewardship

A small working group can coordinate the foundation while inviting focused external review. Suggested functions are coordination, cued language theory, assessment liaison, professional practice, and assessment design. Some roles may overlap; contested scoring and appeals need independent review. Participation and organizational responsibilities must be agreed, not presumed.

Assessment partners — NCSA and TECUnit

Invite relevant assessment expertise to review constructs, thresholds, rater preparation, currency, and equivalency. Existing measures may supply expressive evidence while CPE adds an independently defined knowledge component. Providers retain control of their assessments; participation would be negotiated.

Learning partners — Cue College, Language Matters Academy, and others

Invite preparation and continuing-learning providers to develop accessible modules aligned with the approved competency map. Training should support multiple learning pathways. Final assessment decisions should include review independent of a candidate's own instructor.

Research and professional advisory contributors

We would welcome dialogue with researchers alongside Deaf native and early cuers, families, SLPs, and educators. This invitation recognizes complementary expertise in linguistic structure, perception, development, and lived practice. No participation or endorsement by named individuals is implied.

[CUED LANGUAGE LAB] Private Research and Development

Serve as Cue Cognatio's private research and development arm, coordinating literature review, theoretical inquiry, expert consultation, and development of proposed CPE competencies and assessment materials. Facilitate focused collaboration among researchers, practitioners, Deaf cuers, and families; document evidence, unresolved questions, reviewer feedback, and revisions for consideration by the CPE working group.

Revisiting Cued Language Structure remains an inquiry in progress. Distinguish established findings from proposed models, and assess practitioners' understanding of evidence and its limits. Prepare reviewed findings for public communication through Cue Cognatio, with contributor input and appropriate permissions.

[CUE COGNATIO] Media and Public Communications

Translate approved CPE standards and research findings into accessible public explanations, media narratives, professional profiles, and outreach materials. Help practitioners, families, and potential partners understand the proposed endorsement, its requirements, and its limits. Coordinate public invitations to collaborate and communicate progress with contributor review and appropriate attribution.

[HUMANS AND ROBOTS] Lightweight Infrastructure

Subject to agreed roles, support application records, reminders, verification, and accessible assessment workflows. Automate administrative steps after standards are approved; designated reviewers remain accountable for assessment and appeals decisions.

[EMPLOYERS AND PROFESSIONAL PARTNERS] Recognition

Invite one school, clinic, or training partner to test how the qualification would inform supervision, professional development, referral, or hiring. Document intended use and actual usefulness. Expressions of interest should be distinguished from commitments to recognize the endorsement.

7. Sustainable Operation and Decisions Needed

Affordable participation is a design objective. A cost operating model must cover assessment review, administration, accessibility, records, appeals, and maintenance. Technology savings do not remove the need for qualified oversight.

- Credential claim and terminology: agree the bounded public statement, glossary, eligible professions, and initial language adaptation.
- Assessment evidence: approve expressive measures, minimum results, evidence currency, and an equivalency policy.
- Knowledge standard: approve competencies, source materials, tasks, rubrics, reviewer qualifications, and a justified passing standard.
- Stewardship: identify who approves standards, issues endorsements, maintains records, and resolves complaints or appeals.
- Recognition: secure a pilot partner and specify the decisions the proposed credential is intended to improve.
- Funding: estimate assessment and operating costs, identify sustained support, and set participant fees only after review.

These are the key decisions blocking deployment. Assign one lead and a review point to each. Earlier fee targets and maintenance hours are discussion inputs, not commitments; seek scholarships or partner support where needed.

8. Proposed Development Trajectory

Phase 1 — Shared scope | Months 1–2

Convene the small working group and invite focused reviewers. Produce CPE Foundation Standard v0.1: credential claim, eligibility, competency map, glossary, and explicit exclusions. Identify the initial adaptation and pilot partner. Milestone: approve a bounded standard and decision owners.

Phase 2 — Foundation and assessment design | Months 3–8

Months 3–5: prepare the source-based foundation guide and assessment blueprint; settle expressive evidence. Months 6–8: draft questions, scenarios, and rubrics; test sample responses with independent reviewers. Milestone: approve materials and a reasoned provisional passing standard for the pilot.

Phase 3 — Pilot and revision | Months 9–14

Months 9–12: pilot with approximately 8–12 practitioners, subject to feasibility. Collect completion time, costs, scoring agreement, misunderstandings, and partner feedback. This small pilot tests usability and obvious scoring problems, not full validity or clinical efficacy. Months 13–14: revise standards, remediation, appeals, renewal, and operating responsibilities. Milestone: approve the revised foundation and costed process.

Phase 4 — Deployment decision | Months 15–16

Review whether the bounded claim is supported, reviewers can apply criteria consistently, and ownership, funding, and partner use are ready. Decide on a limited first cohort, further piloting, or a pause. These month ranges are a planning horizon, not mandatory waiting periods: accelerate specific phases when decisions and resources are ready while retaining review milestones.

9. Quality Safeguards

- Publish the competency map, claim, assessment boundaries, and the limits of pilot evidence.
- Provide independent review of final assessment decisions and manage training-provider conflicts.
- Use documented rubrics, a justified passing standard, remediation, and an appeal or second-review process.
- Recognize dialect and valid pronunciation variants consistently.
- Keep current licensure or professional status visible in the registry.
- Suspend the active designation when the underlying professional credential expires or maintenance is not completed.

- Preserve access to learning and cueing for families and unendorsed people; participation is voluntary.
- Develop specialty or advanced pathways only after their additional competencies, measures, and practical value are established.

10. Invitation to Collaborate

We invite researchers, practitioners, Deaf cuers, families, NCSA, TECUnit, Cue College, Language Matters Academy, and potential pilot partners to help shape a useful foundation. Contributors may review a defined section, advise on an assessment construct, share professional needs, or join the working group. Participation can be bound to available time and expertise.

The first shared deliverable is a concise **Foundation Standard v0.1**. It should define what applicants must know and demonstrate, accepted expressive evidence, the assessment approach, permitted claims, responsibilities, and unresolved questions. The group can then decide whether and how to proceed.

Collaboration does not require agreement with every hypothesis in the research inquiry or a change to an organization's mission. Record differing interpretations, distinguish consensus from open questions, and give contributors an opportunity to correct how their work is represented.

The proposed foundation connects research-informed understanding with demonstrable minimum skill. Its success would be judged by clear assessment, trustworthy claims, sustainable operation, and practical usefulness to professionals and families.

Proposed Next Step

Invite a small working group and focused external reviewers to develop Foundation Standard v0.1 during Months 1–2, with earlier completion possible. Confirm decision ownership and the assessment blueprint before building the public application or issuing endorsements.

If you are interested in contributing to this project - please contact info@cuecognatio.com with a brief description of the area you would like to work in and your availability/commitment level.

Foundational References and Models

Cued Language Lab: Research Inquiry — Revisiting Cued Language Structure. Working discussion draft in progress; supplied as the conceptual reference for this proposal. Its coordination model remains a hypothesis for investigation.

Fleetwood and Metzger: Cued Language Structure (1998); What's the Difference Between Cued Speech, Cuem, Cued English, and Cued Language? (1999); Metzger and Fleetwood, Cued language: What deaf native cuers perceive of Cued Speech (2010). Leybaert and colleagues' perception,

memory, and literacy research is discussed in the inquiry and merits specialist review when selecting assessment content.

Organizational models and potential resources: AG Bell Academy for Listening and Spoken Language; NCSA instructor and expressive assessments; TECUnit assessments; Cue College preparation; relevant professional scope standards. These references do not imply participation or approval.

This proposal invites collaborative development rather than announcing an adopted standard. Final terminology, assessment claims, eligibility, fees, renewal, and stewardship remain subject to review. Public deployment follows the agreed milestones and a documented decision.