

# Report of the Accreditation Revisit to Alliant International University

December, 2010

## Overview

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visits to Alliant International University that were conducted in May and November 2008, November 2009, and November 2010.

## November 2010 Revisit Team Recommendations

1. That the one remaining stipulation be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

## Background

Alliant University had its initial accreditation review in May of 2008 which resulted in a COA decision of **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**. At that time, it was stipulated that the institution would respond to the stipulations and prepare for an interim revisit within six months of the initial 2008 accreditation action. The COA required that a full revisit would take place within one year of the interim revisit.

The interim revisit took place in November of 2008 and a full revisit took place in November 2009. In January 2010, the COA retained the status of **Accreditation with Probationary stipulations** for Alliant International University and removed all but one of the stipulations. Another revisit was required by the COA's January 2010 decision.

The second full revisit was held November 15-17, 2010 and the report is presented here, beginning on page 5, for the COA's review and action.

Presented on the next three pages is a table of the COA's decisions for the May 2008, November 2008, and November 2009. The right hand column presents the November 2010 site visit team's recommendations for the COA's consideration and action.

<b>Prior Committee on Accreditation Decisions and November 2010 Team Recommendation</b>			
<b>June 2008</b> (After May 2008 visit)	<b>January 2009</b> (After November 2008 Interim Revisit)	<b>January 2010</b> (After November 2009 Full-Team Revisit)	<b>January 2011 Recommendations</b> (Nov. 2010 Revisit)
<p><b>Action:</b> The COA accepted the team's recommendation of <i>Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations</i></p> <p>Following are the Stipulations:</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> The COA removed one Stipulation (6) and amended two additional Stipulations (3 and 7). The accreditation decision continues as <i>Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations</i></p> <p>Following are the remaining and amended Stipulations:</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> The COA removed 5 of the remaining Stipulations (2, 3, 4, 5, 7) and continued the accreditation decision of <i>Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations</i>. The COA further stipulated that a second revisit be conducted within nine months of the COA action and that the institution is not permitted to submit new programs for approval until the revisit has been completed.</p> <p>Following is the remaining Stipulation:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The remaining Stipulation be removed</li> <li>• The accreditation decision be changed from <i>Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations</i> to <i>Accreditation</i></li> </ul>
<p>1. That the institution provide evidence that all standards less than fully met are appropriately addressed and met within one year of the date of this action.</p>			<p>Team recommends removal of the stipulation</p>
<p>2. That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The University must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in all credential program areas, including the alternative certification program.</p>		<p>Stipulation removed, January 2010</p>	
<p>3. That the institution provide a written plan to the Commission within 30 days which addresses how the institution will address the stipulations. The institution will provide quarterly progress reports thereafter.</p>	<p>3. AMENDED: That the institution provide a written report to the Commission consultant every sixty (60) days describing progress made in addressing the stipulations.</p>	<p>Stipulation removed, January 2010</p>	

<b>Prior Committee on Accreditation Decisions and November 2010 Team Recommendation</b>			
<b>June 2008</b> (After May 2008 visit)	<b>January 2009</b> (After November 2008 Interim Revisit)	<b>January 2010</b> (After November 2009 Full-Team Revisit)	<b>January 2011 Recommendations</b> (Nov. 2010 Revisit)
4. That the institution receive an interim visit by the Commission consultant and team chair within six months of the receipt of the action plan as well as a full team revisit within twelve months of the interim visit. All credential programs, including all alternative certification programs, with attention to the Education Specialist and CTEL programs, are to be re-evaluated as well as the common standards at the time of the revisit.	4. AMENDED: That the institution prepare for a full team revisit within twelve months of the interim visit. All credential programs, including all alternative certification programs, with attention to the Education Specialist and CTEL programs, are to be re-evaluated as well as the common standards at the time of the revisit.	Stipulation removed, January 2010	
5. That all credential candidates be informed of these findings within sixty days of the COA action. A draft of the letter notifying candidates of the COA action must be submitted to the Commission within thirty days of this action. All applicants are to be informed of the accreditation status until such time it is changed.		Stipulation removed, January 2010	
6. That Alliant International University complete the initial program review process for their Preliminary Administrative Services preparation program.	Stipulation removed, January 2009		
7. That Alliant International University a. Must notify all candidates who began coursework in the Preliminary Administrative Services credential	7. AMENDED: That Alliant International University must notify all candidates who began coursework in the	Stipulation removed, January 2010	

<b>Prior Committee on Accreditation Decisions and November 2010 Team Recommendation</b>			
<b>June 2008</b> (After May 2008 visit)	<b>January 2009</b> (After November 2008 Interim Revisit)	<b>January 2010</b> (After November 2009 Full-Team Revisit)	<b>January 2011 Recommendations</b> (Nov. 2010 Revisit)
<p>program prior to September 1, 2006, by letter, that they must complete the program by August 31, 2008 in order to be recommended by the institution. A list of those candidates and a copy of the letter must be received by the Commission by July 15, 2008.</p> <p>b. Must notify all candidates who began coursework in the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program after August 31, 2006, by letter, that the program is not currently approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and they may not be recommended for the credential. A list of those candidates and a copy of the letter must be received by the Commission by July 15, 2008.</p> <p>c. May not admit any new candidates to the Preliminary Administrative Services program until the revised program is approved by the COA.</p>	<p>Preliminary Administrative Services credential program after August 31, 2006, by letter, that the program is not currently approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and they may not be recommended for the credential. A list of those candidates and a copy of the letter must be received by the Commission by July 15, 2008.</p>		

**Report of the Accreditation Visit to  
Alliant University  
November 17, 2010**

**Institution:** Alliant International University

**Dates of  
Follow-up Revisit:** November 15-17, 2010

**Accreditation Team  
Recommendations:** *Accreditation*

The team recommends that:

1. The remaining Stipulation from the 2009 accreditation revisit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* to *Accreditation*.

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based upon the institutional response to the Stipulations and thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with institutional administrators, faculty, candidates, intern teachers and local school administrators; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The review of the Common Standards was conducted under the 1998 Standards. The team reviewed the two Common Standards that were less than fully met and found that Common Standards 7, School Collaboration and 8, District Field Supervisors, are now **Met**.

Program Standards

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for each of the programs. Following these discussions the team considered whether the Standards were met, met with concerns or not met. The following programs were reviewed during the follow-up revisit: Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Level I Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities programs. In the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs, all Standards are now **Met**. In the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Level I program, all Standards are now **Met**.

**Follow-up Revisit Team Findings on the Stipulations (2010)**

**Stipulation #1**

*That the institution be required to provide evidence that all standards less than fully met are appropriately addressed and met within one year of the date of this action.*

**Follow-up Revisit Team Findings**

Based upon constituent interviews and review of documentary evidence the follow-up revisit team found that AIU has provided evidence that all Common and Program Standards are now Met.

**Common Standards**

	<b>November 2008</b>	<b>November 2009</b>	<b>November 2010</b>
Standard 7: School Collaboration	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 8: District Field Supervisors	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns	Met

**Program Standards (2010)**

	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Internship	19	19	0	0
Single Subject, with Internship	19	19	0	0
Ed Sp: Mild/Moderate Level I, with Internship	18	18	0	0

**Follow-up Revisit Team Recommendation**

The one outstanding stipulation be removed.

On the basis of these recommendations, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

**Initial/Teaching Credentials**

Multiple Subject  
 Multiple Subject  
 Multiple Subject Internship

Single Subject  
 Single Subject  
 Single Subject Internship

CTEL Certificate Program

Education Specialist Credentials, Level I Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Internship

**Advanced/Service Credentials**

Education Specialist Credentials  
 Professional Level II  
 Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Administrative Services  
 Preliminary

Pupil Personnel Services  
 School Psychology, with Internship

### Accreditation Team

**Team Leader:** Mel Hunt  
St. Mary's College

**Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster:** John Erratt  
Orange Unified School District

**Staff to the Visit** Marilyn Fairgood, Consultant

### Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	University Supervisor Training
Institutional Self Study	Schedule of Classes
Course Syllabi	Advisement Documents
Communication Logs	Electronic Database by Standard
e-Journal samples	Information Booklets
Fieldwork Handbook	Fieldwork Evaluations
Memoranda of Understanding	Field Supervisor Handbook
Field Experience Notebook	Candidate Work

### Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader/ Common Standards	Basic/ Teaching Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	4	6	<b>10</b>
Institutional Administration	8		<b>8</b>
Candidates	16	3	<b>19</b>
Supervising Practitioners	7	2	<b>9</b>
School Administrators	1		<b>1</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>47</b>

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

**Table 1**  
**Program Review Status**

Program Name	Number of program completers (2008-2009)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject, with Internship	42	44	CTC
Single Subject, with Internship	56	78	CTC
Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Level I, with Internship	4	6	CTC

### **The Follow-Up Revisit (2010)**

The Alliant International University (AIU) follow-up revisit began on Monday, November 15, 2010 at 11:00 with the team lead and one team member. The team met at the hotel for lunch and a team meeting to discuss the interview schedule and develop questions in preparation for constituent interviews. At 12:30 pm the team traveled from the hotel to the university where the team was welcomed by the AIU Provost via conference call. AIU staff provided an introduction to the electronic document room and the paper copies that were included for team review. Faculty and constituent interviews and data review and collection activities began at 1:30 pm and continued through the remainder of Day 1. The team traveled back to the hotel at 5:00 pm to have dinner. Following dinner, team members resumed its team meeting during which they met to discuss their findings and develop focused interview questions in preparation for Day 2 accreditation activities.

At 8:30 am on Tuesday morning, the team traveled to AIU and continued their data collection and constituent interviews. At 8:45 am, the Team Lead and Commission staff presented the Mid-Visit Status Report to the AIU Dean and the Associate Dean. The team traveled back to the hotel at 5:00 pm. On Tuesday evening, the team met to discuss all standards to determine whether the standards were met. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and an accreditation recommendation. On Tuesday evening a report draft was prepared and reviewed. On Wednesday morning, the team finalized the report. The AIU accreditation visit Exit Report was held on Wednesday, November 17, 2010 at 10:30 am.

## Common Standards

### Findings on the Common Standards (2009 and 2010)

During the November 9-11, 2009 accreditation revisit, the accreditation team made findings related to two Common Standards that were met with concerns. A summary of the 2009 revisit findings is presented in the left hand column below. The 2010 Follow-up Revisit Team findings are presented in the right hand column

2009 Revisit Findings	2010 Revisit Findings
<b>Common Standard 7: School Collaboration</b>	
<p>Given the wide geographic scope of AIU's internship programs the institution faces great challenges in maintaining effective collaboration with all its K-12 partners. The team finds that the evidence provided for the MOU process with districts with a small number of AIU student placement is not always fully completed. The bulk of AIU's interns are placed in districts with which the institution has completed the MOU process and AIU participates actively in county office of education sponsored intern collaborations when available. This Standard remains <b>Met with Concerns</b>.</p>	<p>AIU provided clear and consistent documentation that every intern is placed only in districts with which AIU has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Program directors reported that the MOU's now form the foundation of their placement system and that the MOU's serve to actively link the institution with the districts. AIU directors and the district representative commented that AIU program staff participates more actively in district meetings and activities, in part because the MOU's have increased the level of AIU recognition within district leadership. In addition, AIU created the position of Accountability Officer with the responsibility of ensuring the proper procedures, such as obtaining MOU's, are uniformly followed on at all campuses throughout the state. This Standard is <b>Met</b>.</p>
<b>Common Standard 8: District Field Supervisors</b>	
<p>The team found documentary evidence that Alliant's broad geographic service range has also complicated their efforts to provide effective on-site supervisors for all interns. While some indications exist that the institution may be preparing to focus increased attention on this issue, gaps still exist in recent placements. Individual placements at school sites that are relatively remote from an Alliant campus only increase the importance of local support for those individuals. This Standard remains <b>Met with Concerns</b>.</p>	<p>By providing a list of all current district field placements, AIU established that the institution has limited its geographic reach to areas each center can support. Each intern also had a clearly identified district support provider. District support providers are provided by the institution with clear expectations for their support of the candidate. Program leadership remarked that recent applicants have been denied admission not only because the district was too remote, but also because the district philosophy towards interns did not match that of the institution. This Standard is <b>Met</b>.</p>

**Multiple Subject, with Internship**  
**Single Subject, with Internship**

**Revisit Team Findings on the Standards (2009 and 2010)**

During the November 2009 revisit the team reviewed five Program Standards that were Met with Concerns or Not Met. After review of the institutional self-study, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, intern teachers, faculty, school administrators, supervising practitioners and AIU Hufstedler School of Education administrative representatives the team determined that all of the Multiple Subject and Single Subject program standards are **Met**. The summary of the 2009 and 2010 revisit findings is included below.

2009 Revisit Findings	2010 Revisit Findings
<b>Standard 1: Program Design</b>	
<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b> The revisit team found evidence that the TPEs have been instilled throughout the program in coursework and fieldwork. The team continued to find little evidence of a variety of methods and models of teaching. There is insufficient evidence of linkages between the learning of theory in coursework and application of theory in fieldwork.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> AIU has developed a multi-level electronic communication system that links candidates, field supervisors and field seminar faculty together on an on-going basis. Candidates, supervisors and faculty commented on the ability of the system to link the weekly topics in the seminar to the daily practice of the candidate in the field. Copies of the C-Logs and interviews the team conducted clearly demonstrated that candidates were exposed to and used a variety of methods and models of teaching in their placements. The Field Supervisors reported that the E-journals, through the candidate's own reflective writing, revealed important aspects of candidates' classroom experience that the supervisors had been unaware of prior to the use of the journals.</p>
<b>Standard 7A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English</b>	
<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b> The revisit team continued to find insufficient evidence that the field experience was structured to include the implementation of the teaching of comprehension, fluency, and assessment in the use of language though those areas are covered in the coursework. There is insufficient evidence that candidates are systematically asked to demonstrate the skills learned in the coursework.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> Evidence from interviews with faculty and candidates as well as from C-Logs and other additional documentation verified that the candidate's field experience included clear demonstration of the candidate's ability to teach reading using a range of techniques and assessment. Several of the Advanced (Second Year) Interns were focusing specifically on the teaching of reading as part of their professional development plan, having had difficulty with reading in their initial year.</p>

2009 Revisit Findings	2010 Revisit Findings
<b>Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English</b>	
<p><b>Not Met:</b> The revisit team continued to find inadequate evidence that the field experience was structured to include the implementation of the teaching of comprehension, fluency, and assessment in the use of language though those areas are covered in the coursework. There is no evidence the candidates are systematically asked to demonstrate the skills learned in the coursework. Review of documentation and interviews with candidates and faculty indicate that content specific reading comprehension strategies are not being adequately addressed.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> The revisit team found convincing evidence from interviews and documents that the field experiences were structured to include the implementation of the teaching of comprehension, fluency, and assessment in the use of language, as presented in the coursework. One P.E. intern secured space in the school cafeteria for his students to do journal writing and other language exercises, since the district did not provide P.E. instructors with classroom space. Another P.E. intern convinced her principal to provide a white board to facilitate her language instruction and several math interns reported using language techniques to assist students in interpreting word problems.</p>
<b>Standard 8A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction for Multiple Subject Candidates</b>	
<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b> The revisit team found that candidates continue to be unclear as to the application of the State curriculum frameworks. The institution has resolved the issues related to the TPEs and the Academic Content Standards.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> The revisit team found strong evidence from interviews with faculty, field supervisors and candidates that the state frameworks are fully integrated into both coursework and field placements. Candidates are taught to begin lesson planning with the state curriculum standards followed by the use of the frameworks to provide grade level specifics. Candidate interviews and documents also indicate that interns are encouraged to use the frameworks to determine what these students learned in their prior grade and what the framework expects the students to be ready to do in their next year in school.</p>
<b>Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction for Single Subject Candidates</b>	
<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b> The revisit team remains concerned that small enrollment numbers commonly force AIU to combine candidates from various disciplines into generic pedagogy course.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> The revisit team found evidence that candidates were supported in subject-specific content instruction in a number of settings. Faculty in the reading and pedagogy courses reported breaking up the candidates into subject specific groups and candidates also reported working together in content-specific cohorts. During their field placements, candidates are supported by a content specialist as part of the C-log and E-Journal process, in</p>

2009 Revisit Findings	2010 Revisit Findings
	<p>addition to their field supervisor. Candidates are also provided with access to current and retired teachers in their content areas for additional support.</p>
<p><b>Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork</b></p>	
<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b> The revisit team found evidence that there continues to be a variety of supervisory experiences for fieldwork. For traditional intern candidates university support during the second year of the internship experience is only being provided in cases where deficient skills have been documented.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> The revisit team found evidence that AIU has implemented new courses (EDU 6099 Advanced Mentoring for Multiple Subject and EDU 6199 Advanced Mentoring for Single Subject) for students participating in a second year of student teaching. All second year interns are required to enroll in the appropriate course which not only provides additional faculty support for the placement, but also ensures regular support by a field supervisor. The second year candidates also continue to participate in the electronic C-Log and E-Journal process.</p>

## Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level I, with Internship

In Fall 2007 the Shirley M. Hufstедler School of Education was approved to offer a Level I Education Specialist Credential program in the area of Mild/Moderate Disabilities. AIU enrolled 22 candidates in their 2007 cohort and 29 candidates in their 2008 cohort. In 2009, due to insufficient admissions, AIU did not enroll candidates in a Level I credential cohort. During the November 2009 revisit the team reviewed five Program Standards that were *Met with Concerns* or *Not Met*.

By Spring 2010, all 2007 and 2008 candidates had either completed their matriculation in the program or withdrawn from the program, with the exception of one candidate who is completing an “incomplete”. No candidates were enrolled in the Level I program in Spring 2010. In Summer 2010, the Commission approved the AIU Education Specialist transition plan and in Fall 2010 AIU enrolled five candidates into their preliminary Education Specialist Credential program.

After review of the institutional self-study, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, intern teachers, faculty, supervising practitioners and AIU Hufstедler School of Education administrative representatives the team determined that all Education Specialist Mild/Moderate program standards are now *Met*. The summary of the 2009 and 2010 revisit findings is provided below:

2009 Revisit Findings	2010 Revisit Findings
<b>Standard 11: Educational Policy and Perspectives</b>	
<p><b>Met With Concerns:</b> A review of syllabi indicates that there is an absence of assignments giving candidates the opportunity to demonstrate competence in this Standard. For example, candidates need to show expertise in the philosophy of education, legal requirements and the status of special education within society.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> A review of the syllabi and student work revealed assignments designed to demonstrate student competence and knowledge in education philosophy, policy, and legal expectations. Assignments outlined in syllabi and supported by examples of student work included online short answer essay assignments, class presentations, and papers reflecting student competence. Workshop leaders, course instructors, and students indicated the value of these assignments in developing their philosophies of disability, education, and special education as well as instructional and behavior management strategies. Students commented on the importance of these assignments and course content in developing legally defensible IEPs.</p>
<b>Standard 12: Educating Diverse Learners with Disabilities</b>	
<p><b>Met With Concerns:</b> A review of syllabi indicates that there is an absence of assignments giving candidates the opportunity to demonstrate competence</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> A specific course on teaching English language learners will be offered in the spring of 2011 for the first time. A review of the syllabus indicated that this course will address multiple cultural and linguistic differences and strategies to support CLD students. Strategies for supporting diverse student populations are presented in multiple courses beginning with the initial overview</p>

<b>2009 Revisit Findings</b>	<b>2010 Revisit Findings</b>
<p>in this Standard; for example, candidates need to demonstrate an understanding and acceptance of differences in culture, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, socio-economic status and understanding communication development and communication differences.</p>	<p>course in the sequence. These concepts are woven into other courses and workshops as evidenced by syllabi, agenda, and interviews with students and faculty. Interviews with students and field supervisors indicated that interns are engaged in teaching diverse populations in their classrooms; document review of class profiles supported teacher statements. Student interviews indicated that Saturday workshops provided important foundational information and strategies that they could immediately apply in the classroom. eJournal entries, initiated by field supervisors and shared with university faculty and district support providers, reflected candidate knowledge of diversity-sensitive practices related to supporting CLD and other diverse student populations such as students with same-sex parents, students from low SES families, gender differences, and twice-exceptional students.</p>
<b>Standard 13: Special Education Special Field Experiences</b>	
<p><b>Met With Concerns:</b> Evidence is needed to show that interns' field experiences include interactions with diverse populations. While 15 hours in another special education setting and 15 hours in a general education setting are discussed, evidence that the experience includes a different age group or that the population is diverse is needed; for example, evidence that the candidate has teaching interactions with EL students.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> The credentialing program is in a transition period to the new preliminary credential and standards. Under the Level I program Standard 13 stipulated 15 hours of field experience in a different special education setting and 15 hours in a general education setting. AIU has no students in the Level I program. The new Preliminary Education Specialist Program Standard 15 does not require the candidates to leave their assignments to engage in a broad range of service delivery options. Opportunities for experiences with diverse populations are provided through a combination of coursework, workshops, and classroom field experiences. Interviews with field supervisors indicated that interns have a diversity of special education experiences through site-level interactions and, when necessary, off-site visits and observations.</p> <p>Current assignment procedures and class profiles assure that the candidates have diverse experiences and work with diverse populations. MOUs between the university and school districts as well as Communication Logs provide evidence of candidate interactions with diverse populations. Communication Logs are a tool to share intern experiences, successes, and challenges between the interns, field supervisors, district supervisors, and university faculty; they provide a means for extra support at all levels if needed. Traditional coursework and workshops support candidates in working with diverse populations. Examination of student responses to short answer essay assignments and eJournal entries confirmed exposure to strategies for working with diverse</p>

2009 Revisit Findings	2010 Revisit Findings
	populations. Candidates consistently commented on the value and applicability of workshop content. A specific course on teaching English language learners with disabilities will be offered in the spring semester.
<b>Standard 15: Managing Learning Environments</b>	
<b>Met With Concerns:</b> The course syllabus does not include opportunities for each candidate to demonstrate knowledge regarding laws and regulations for promoting behavior that is positive and self-regulatory.	<b>Met:</b> A review of syllabi for multiple courses and workshops, including the introductory special education course, assessment course, and the curriculum course, revealed assignments directly related to the management of learning environments. A specific course on positive behavioral supports will be taught in the spring semester with a culminating activity of producing a positive behavior support plan. The assessment course instructor also indicated course content related to behavior assessment, management, and development of behavior support plans. The instructor for the workshop on supporting students with emotional disturbance indicated specific content related to behavior management through relationship building, self-regulation, and positive reinforcement. Candidate written assignments, journals, reflections, and field Communication Logs with supervisors verified classroom application of course content.
<b>Standard 20: Curricular and Instructional Skills in General Education</b>	
<b>Met With Concerns:</b> A review of syllabi indicates that there is an absence of assignments giving candidates the opportunity to demonstrate competence in this Standard; for example, demonstration of the ability to develop, implement and evaluate a variety of pedagogical approaches to teaching basic academic skills and content areas.	<b>Met:</b> Curriculum design and instruction skills are introduced in the overview course on special education with eJournals and written responses demonstrating candidate learning of foundational concepts. A specific course on curriculum and instruction provides students with an opportunity to demonstrate competence in curriculum design and implementation, accommodations, modifications, and differentiation. Students in this year-long course develop a unit of study incorporating all components of a basic literacy block in the fall, and a math unit will be developed in the spring semester. Additional coursework in curriculum design and instruction is offered in the Saturday workshop series as part of a menu of options. Students select workshops in consultation with university field supervisors and advisors to meet needs and interests. Candidate work samples, seminar agendas, and course syllabi supported information shared by faculty and candidates in interviews.
<b>Standard 21: General Education Field Experiences</b>	
<b>Met With Concerns:</b> Evidence, such as candidate logs, is needed to	<b>Met:</b> Previous credential standards required interns to leave their assignments to participate in supervised experiences in general education; candidates are no longer required to leave their

<b>2009 Revisit Findings</b>	<b>2010 Revisit Findings</b>
<p>show that interns have supervised field experiences in general education. It is not clear how much of the time in general education for all candidates is spent in observation versus supervised field experience.</p>	<p>primary assignments to gain this experience. Candidates obtain this experience in a variety of ways. Candidates stated in interviews that they regularly interact with their general education colleagues at their school sites, working collaboratively to support students in general education settings and to provide access to core content in special education settings. One candidate reported that she is part of a grade-level planning team that meets weekly. Other candidates reported that, in addition to site interactions, they have meaningful and collaborative interaction with general education teachers in the Saturday workshops, particularly during breakout sessions. Communication Logs between supervisors and candidates provided additional evidence of collaborative experience between special educators and general education teachers.</p>
<b>Standard 24: Positive Behavior Support</b>	
<p><b>Met With Concerns:</b> Evidence, such as student work, is needed to show that candidates' demonstrate the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on functional analysis assessments.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> Candidates are exposed to Positive Behavior Support (PBS) strategies in several courses and workshops. A specific course on PBS will be offered in the spring semester for the first time as part of the Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Program. The special education overview course introduces candidates to PBS and other behavior management strategies and aligns them to legal requirements as evidenced in the syllabus and student work samples. The course instructor for the assessment course and course syllabus review indicated that PBS and behavior management are addressed in two sessions in this course. The instructor for the behavior management and legal requirements workshop confirmed that principles of positive behavior support are addressed in the workshop setting; students provided positive feedback about the workshop and the applicability of content.</p>
<b>Standard 7A: Preparation to Teaching Reading/Language Arts</b>	
<p><b>Met With Concerns</b> <b>7A(c)</b> While reading aloud is addressed, further evidence of training regarding oral language is needed.  <b>7A(i)</b> Further evidence that the general education settings are linguistically and/or culturally diverse</p>	<p><b>Met</b> <b>7A(c)</b> A semester-long 8-week course focuses on teaching literacy to students with mild/moderate disabilities. A syllabus indicated that oral language and its relationship to literacy are taught throughout the course with two course sessions specifically focusing on oral language. An assignment to create a unit of study incorporates all aspects of literacy including oral language. Students confirmed that they submitted this assignment within the past week. A review of online assignment responses, reflective journaling, and Communication Logs between field supervisors and candidates confirmed the inclusion of oral</p>

<b>2009 Revisit Findings</b>	<b>2010 Revisit Findings</b>
classrooms where reading is taught is needed.	<p>language training and implementation in university coursework and in applied settings in intern classrooms.</p> <p><i>7A(i)</i> Student placements meet the standard for linguistically and/or culturally diverse classrooms as verified by MOUs, class profiles, field supervisor reports, and candidate interviews. Placements meet new Standard 15 requirements for experiences in a broad range of service delivery options.</p>