Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report

California State University, Fresno
Kremen School of Education and Human Development
Academic Years 2008-09 and 2009-10

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report

Academic Years 2008-09 and 2009-10

Institution	**California State University, Fresno**
Date report is submitted	**October 15, 2010**
Program documented in this report	**Special Education**
Name of Program	**Special Education**
Credential awarded	**Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II Education Specialist**

Is this program offered at more than one site?

If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	**No**

Program Contact	**Dana Powell**
Phone #	**559.278.0228**
E-Mail	**danac@csufresno.edu**

If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:

Name:	
Phone #	
E-mail	

Special Education

Contextual Information
California State University, Fresno is one of twenty-three universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of education professionals. The Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development is the Unit Head that oversees 16 programs. Our last joint accreditation (NCATE/CCTC) visit was in March 2006.

The Special Education Credential Program at Fresno State has two levels: Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Credential Program and Professional Level II Education Specialist Credential Program. The level I credential program consists of 33 units in teacher education courses and 12 units of fieldwork completed in three phases/semesters. The Special Education Credential Program is based on a clearly stated rationale that requires candidates to complete foundational classes and content-specific pedagogy coursework while concurrently practicing the application of these concepts and teaching skills in a field placement setting. The Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Credential has two areas of specialization: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities. These areas of professional emphasis distinguish the student population with which the candidate seeks to pursue a special education career. Teacher candidates may pursue their credential goals through a Basic Program, an Internship Program or an Early Childhood Program and a Dual Certification Program at California State University, Fresno.

The Professional Level II credential program offers specialization in mild/moderate and moderate/severe disabilities after the candidates have completed the Preliminary Level I Specialist Credential Program. The selected level of disability will be consistent with the work setting in which the candidate is employed.

Candidates are expected to apply the theoretical and scholarly concepts, knowledge, and teaching skills in planning and implementing effective and appropriate lesson and units of study. The program provides extensive opportunities for candidates to learn to teach using the state adopted K-12 academic content standards to all candidates. All content-specific courses are based on the CCTC Standards and the state-adopted content standards and frameworks. Fieldwork placements are made in diverse settings. Table 1, Program Decision Points, provides an overview of the number of candidates admitted and completed for Fall 2008-Spring 2010.

Table 1: Fall 2008-Spring 2010 Program Decision Points

Program Name	No. of Applicants to Level I Program	No. Completing Level I Program	No. of Applicants to Level II Program	% Admitted to Level II Program	% Completing Level II Program

Special Education	136	101	91	97%	75

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document **Date**

- CTC EL Authorization Approval — Fall 07
- Student evaluation of lesson plans, behavior support plans, and IEP development were added to Preliminary Level I evaluations. — Fall 07
- A Master's Project evaluation & Candidate Writing Proficiency Assessment were added to the Master's Degree and Level II program evaluations. — Fall 07
- The Summer Achievement Center, a collaborative teacher training program with Fresno Unified School District, in the areas of Autism and Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, was developed and implemented for three consecutive summers. — Su 06 – Su 09
- Three new faculty were hired; two in Mild/Moderate and one in Moderate/Severe Disabilities. — Fall 07, 08
- Dual Student teaching, Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe and Multiple Subjects) was changed from a one-semester experience to two semester — Fall 07
- Student evaluation of Applied Behavior Analysis Project and Classroom Management Plan was added to the Preliminary Level I evaluations — Spring 10
- Special Education Program faculty won the first Provost Award for Outcomes Assessment — Spring 10
- Lost two faculty members; one in Mild/Moderate and one in Moderate/Severe Disabilities — Spring 09
- Hired one new faculty member in Moderate/Severe Disabilities; New search for position in Mild/Moderate Disabilities — Fall 09
- Program orientation materials and graduate handbook were revised to clarify program requirements. — Spring 09/Fall 10
- Math content and specific assignments related to teaching math were integrated into SPED 135 (Curriculum in Mild/Moderate) — Spring 09
- Communication and conflict resolutions strategies were integrated into SPED 155 and taught through role-play and simulation activities. — Spring 09

Special Education

A. Candidate Assessments the program used to and through recommending credential
List of Key Assessments

1. Level I Candidate Portfolio
2. Level II Candidate Portfolio
3. Class Management Plan
4. Behavior Support Plan
5. Applied Behavior Analysis Project
6. Curriculum-based Assessment Report

Summary of Candidate Assessment Data

Level I Portfolio : This assessment requires candidates to include some the following in a file box or binder; vitae; letters of recommendation; philosophy statement; assessment reports; classroom management plan; IEPs; curriculum unit/ lesson plans; resource binder; formal and informal supervisor evaluations; student work samples; videos and reflection of their teaching. Table 2 illustrates the numbers and percentages of Level candidates meeting CCTC standards.

Table 2: Level I Student Portfolio Evaluation of CCTC Standards

Spring 09 – N = 21 MM = 17 MS = 4	Fall 09 – N = 31 MM = 22 MS = 9	Spring 10 – N = 29 MM = 19 MS = 9
Lower Areas include: (Below 80%): Standard 15 – Managing Learning Environments Standard 20 – Curricular & Instructional Skills in General Education Standard 26 (MS) - Curriculum High Areas: (90% or above): Standard 10 - Professional, Legal And Ethical Practice Standard 12 – Educating Diverse Learners with Disabilities Standard 16 - Effective	Lower Areas include (Below 80%): None Noted High Areas (90% or above): Standard 10 - Professional, Legal And Ethical Practice Standard 15 – Managing Learning Environments Standard 16 - Effective Communication And Collaborative Partnerships Standard 22 – Assessment & Evaluation of Candidates (MM) Standard 24 – Positive Behavior Supports	Lower Areas include (Below 80%): Standard 20 – Curricular & Instructional Skills in General Education High Areas (90% or above): Standard 10 - Professional, Legal And Ethical Practice Standard 15 – Managing Learning Environments Standard 16 - Effective Communication And Collaborative Partnerships Standard 22 – Assessment & Evaluation of Candidates (MM)

Communication And Collaborative Partnerships Standard 17 – Assessment, Curriculum and Instruction Standard 24 – Positive Behavior Support Standard 25 – Characteristics & Needs of Candidates with MM Disabilities Standard 25 (MS) - Communication And Social Networks Standard 27 (MS) – Movement, Mobility, Sensory and Specialized Health Care.	Standard 25 (MM): Characteristics And Needs Of Individuals With Mild - Moderate Disabilities Standard 25 – Characteristics & Needs of Candidates with MM Disabilities Standard 25 (MS) - Communication And Social Networks	Standard 24 – Positive Behavior Supports Standard 25 (MM): Characteristics And Needs Of Individuals With Mild - Moderate Disabilities Standard 25 (MS) - Communication And Social Networks Standard 27 (MS) – Movement, Mobility, Sensory and Specialized Health Care.

Data Summary
Level I Portfolio…The Portfolio contains documentation of the candidate's ability to perform the duties expected of a special education teacher and is used to evaluate candidate competence prior to recommendation for a Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Credential. The data collected indicates that overall our candidates are functioning at a level commensurate with that of a developing teacher

Level II Portfolio This portfolio is divided into three sections. The first section includes the Professional Level II Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) and related forms. The second section includes materials or artifacts demonstrating student competency and ability to perform as a special education teacher. The third section contains the Program Completion Forms. This portfolio is designed to examine the products of candidates' learning throughout the Level II Special Education Program. Preparing a portfolio is a formative evaluation method requiring on-going data collection and reflection. During the process of preparing their portfolio, candidates are required to reflect on and evaluate their own learning. In addition, a scoring rubric is included for evaluation by program faculty. Table 3 presents the candidate professional portfolio results from Fall 2008 through Spring 2010.

Table 3: Special Education Professional Development Portfolio
Rubric Results From (Level II)

No.	Evaluation Item	Fall 2008 N= 5	Sp 2009 N =13	Fall, 2009 N = 6	Sp 2010 N=14	Mean N = 38
1	Overall Presentation	3.80	3.78	4.0	3.93	3.88
2	Evidence of Standards	3.60	3.83	3.92	3.86	3.80
3	Section of Narratives	3.40	3.78	3.83	3.79	3.70
4	Mean	3.60	3.80	3.92	3.86	3.79

Data Summary

Level II Portfolio: The mean scores are depicted in Table 3. Results show that portfolios were well organized. Candidates provided adequate to excellent narrative reflections showing a clear understanding and competence in standard. A thoughtful discussion of each goal for future professional development was related to each standard. All the means in the table are at or above 3.7 on a 1.0 -- 4.0 rating scale indicating that the candidates have a high level of competency in each area evaluated when they graduate from Level II program.

Classroom Management Plan Evaluation—Each semester candidates are required to write a classroom management plan. The assignment is designed to assist candidates in the development of a management system with the goal of creating a meaningful, active instructional environment where rules and expectations are clear, where more attention is given to desired behavior than to inappropriate behavior, and where inappropriate behavior is dealt with systematically, consistently, and equitable. Specific items evaluated by a stated criteria include: philosophy statement, personal commitment statement, classroom rules, expectations, relationship building, responding to minor and major disruptions, crisis management plan, and general strategies for generalization and maintenance. Data are collected in SPED 125.

Data Summary

Classroom Management Plan: Data were collected on 11 candidates in the Spring 10 class. The mean score was 57.68 out of 60. Results indicated that candidates are able to develop a management plan conducive to creating a positive classroom environment with clear expectations and consequences. Candidates were allowed to submit each part of the plan for feedback and most of the re-writes involved writing positive rules and step-by-step classroom procedures.

Applied Behavior Analysis Project Evaluation: Each student will conduct a behavior analysis on a student with special needs who exhibits a challenging behavior. A thorough, thoughtful examination of the student's behavior, data collection, implementation of intervention, and evaluation is expected. A rubric is used to evaluate the following areas: background information, environmental factors, ABC chart, ABC analysis, functional factors, functionally equivalent replacement behavior, behavioral objective, intervention, reactive strategies, data collection, results, and discussion. Information gained from the ABA project is used to write a Behavior Support Plan, which is also used as a program assessment measure. Candidates are required to present the project in class. Presentation includes brief background, behavior objective, baseline data, intervention choice and data, and a discussion of results. Presentation must include visuals behavioral objective, graphics, etc. Data are collected in SPED 125.

Data Summary

Applied Behavior Analysis Project: Data were collected on 11 candidates in the Spring 10 class. Results indicated that candidates have a basic understanding of the process involved in conducting a functional behavior assessment, implementing an intervention, graphing results, and discussing the process. Still needing improvement are the following:
Conducting an ABC analysis and analyzing the results to determine function of behavior

Writing behavioral objectives (increase positive behavior, decrease inappropriate behavior, and functionally equivalent replacement behavior)

1. **Reporting graphed results**

Curriculum-Based Assessment Report: The instrument is used to measure candidates' ability to design, administer and use results of assessment data to develop IEPs, and evaluate their instruction by using a certain curriculum (i.e., content taught to students at school. A rubric is used to evaluate the following areas: student description, instructional objective, probes design; probe administration, data analysis, and IEP goals/benchmarks. Data are collected in SPED 130.

Data Summary
Curriculum-based Assessment Report: the 26 candidates took the assessment course (SPED 130) in the first semester after being admitted into the Level I program. Results show the candidates have learned some basic skills of curriculum-based assessment scoring 80/100, however more practice is need to improve skills of designing, analyzing data, developing IEP and modifying IEP goals in other SPED core courses and student teaching later in the program.

D. Addition Information Collected on Completer Performance and Program Effectiveness
List of Assessments

1. Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I and II)
2. Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level I and II)
3. CSU Systemwide Survey
4. CSU Systemwide Exit Evaluation of Professional Teacher Preparation

Summary of Data
Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I and II)--This survey is designed to assess whether program graduates believe that goals and objectives of the program are met. The instrument contains (1) a statement of purpose, (2) demographic information, (3) questionnaire examining the level of competency achieved by the Special Education Program graduates and (4) additional comments made by the graduates. This survey is given to each candidate twice: when the candidate exits the Special Education Program at Level I and again when candidate exits Special Education Program at Level II. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3, with 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 being no knowledge. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I)

Fall 2008 – Spring 2010 (Mean)

	Competency Statements	Level I		Level II	
		Candidate	Administrator	Candidate	Administrator
1	Collaborates and communicates effectively with family members,	2.68	2.78	2.76	2.77

	school administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and other related service providers.				
2	Knowledgeable of and able to conduct formal and informal assessments of pupils.	2.56	2.65	2.58	2.81
3	Communicates assessment information to parents and appropriate service providers, and makes instructional decisions that reflect both student needs and core curricula.	2.50	2.63	2.77	2.72
4	Collaboratively develops IEPs with parents and other service providers to include yearly goals and benchmark objectives that target the student's needs (transition for students age 16 and up).	2.33	2.62	2.77	2.88
5	Selects appropriate instructional goals, strategies, and techniques based on individual student needs identified in the IEP.	2.58	2.65	2.74	2.88
6	Plans, adapts, and provides effective instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners across a variety of settings.	2.70	2.75	2.70	2.76
7	Maintains appropriate classroom management with positive behavioral support plans, proactive and respectful.	2.70	2.74	2.74	2.81
8	Demonstrates the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.	2.54	2.51	2.44	2.80
9	Utilized technology for instruction, communication, and/or assessment	2.51	2.66	2.64	2.80
10	Professional conduct is exhibited through open discussions of ideas, reflections on own practices, utilization of research based information and consideration of professional advice.	2.74	2.78	2.78	2.82
	Means of Competencies Listed Above	2.57	2.68	2.69	2.80

Data Summary
Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level I): A total of 74 candidates completed the survey between Fall 08 and Spring 10. Level I candidates scored highest in the areas related to adapting and providing effective instruction to diverse learners across settings, and in their ability to maintain positive, proactive, and respectful methods of managing student behavior. Candidate scores falling below 2.50 included collaborating to develop IEPs or transition plans with parents and other support providers. We note that it is difficult for candidates who are not yet teaching and are working with master teachers to have full control to write IEPs and collaborate with family members and service providers.

Data Summary
Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Candidate (Level II): A total of 35 candidates completed the survey between Fall 08 and Spring 10. Overall, candidates rated themselves higher on most competencies at Level II. Candidates rated themselves quite high in all areas requiring collaboration skills and professionalism. The one area in which Level II candidates scored themselves below 2.50 was specific to their ability to design and implement positive behavior support plans and interventions based on assessment data.

Evaluation and Needs of Assessment Survey- Administrators (Level I and II)--This survey intended to examine the quality of the Special Education Program perceived by the administrators or supervisors who hire our graduates or provide sites for the candidates of our program to complete their final student teaching. This measure consists of 4 sections: (1) a cover letter explaining purposes of survey (2) demographic information (3) questionnaire and (4) additional comments. Practicum Administrator are surveyed twice: When the candidates have completed their final student teaching at their practicum sites at Level I and the clear program at Level II, university supervisors are responsible for distributing this survey to district employers. Candidate performance is rated on a scale of 0-3, with 3 representing well prepared, 2 indicating moderately prepared, 1 being poorly prepared and 0 having no knowledge. Data are used to identify program strengths and areas for improvement. Necessary changes are made and subsequent assessment data analyzed.

Data Summary
Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level I): Eighty employers completed the Level I survey between Fall 09 and Spring 10. Employers rated our Level I candidates above 2.5 on each competency. The lowest score (2.51) was consistent with candidate ratings and involved their ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data.

Data Summary
Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator (Level II): A total of 31 employers completed the Level II survey between Fall 2008 and Spring 10. Employers rated our Level II candidates above 2.70 on each competency. No specific deficiencies were noted.

CSU Systemwide survey- In this survey employers and first-year graduates are asked to rate the quality of their program in 13 areas. Table 4 summarizes the results in two parts with Part I

including supervisors' rating and Part II first-year graduates' rating. For comparison purposes, two sets of means (%) are provided for each part.

Table 4: CSU Systemwide Survey (2007-2008)

	Evaluation Area	Part I		Part II	
		Employers N=16		First -Year Graduates N=385	
		% Well Prepared & Adequately Prepared		% Well Prepared & Adequately Prepared	
		CSU Fresno	CSU Wide	CSU Fresno	CSU Wide
1	Overall Effectiveness	85.00	83.00	68.00	69.00
2	Understand Subject & Curriculum	94.00	88.00	71.00	64.00
3	Prepare Lessons	94.00	86.00	71.00	76.00
4	Maintain Positive Support & Foster Student's Motivation	94.00	90.00	79.00	82.00
5	Understand Child Development and Human Learning	94.00	87.00	85.00	78.00
6	Monitor Candidates Progress by Using formal & Informal Assessments	94.00	85.00	86.00	77.00
7	Assist Student's Needs in Reading/Math	79.50	83.25	71.00	72.00
8	Teach Math according to California Content Standard in Math	76.00	82.00	57.00	58.00
9	Understand Personal, Family & Community Conditions	67.00	85.00	79.00	80.00
10	Get Candidates Involved in Activities to Sustain On-Task Behavior	72.00	84.00	71.00	71.00
11	Use Computer –Based Technology Help Candidates Learn Curriculum Subjects	76.00	77.00	36..00	54.00

12	Learn about Candidates' Interests and Motivations	78.00	87.00		64.00	76.00
13	Collaborate With Para-Educators in Meeting Candidates' Needs	72.50	78.00		64.00	67.00

Data Summary
CSU Systemwide Survey (2007-2008): Overall, employers rated our First-Year graduates (on each of the 13 competencies) much higher than our graduates rated themselves. We note that we have not meet the 85% level from employers with assisting in teaching reading and math, understanding family conditions, on-task behavior, technology, student motivation and collaboration with para-professionals.

CSU Systemwide Exit Survey--The purpose of the survey is to provide information that the Deans, other CSU leaders, and faculty can use in making improvements in teacher education programs. Graduates surveyed are asked to rate the quality and effectiveness of their CSU preparation. In Table 5 areas of perceived strength for our graduates are compared to CSU system-wide graduates. In Table 6 areas of perceived weakness for our graduates are compared to CSU system-wide graduates. In Tables 7 and 8 comparisons are made between employer ratings of the effectiveness of our program in preparing candidates to CSU system-wide ratings; areas of strength are compared in Table 7 and areas of weakness compared in Table 8.

Table 5: First-Year Graduates Rating of the effectiveness of CSU Education Specialist Teaching Credential Program
Areas of Strength (2007-2008) N=14

No.	Evaluation Area	CSU Fresno	CSU Systemwide
1	Understand Subject & Curriculum	94.00	88.00
2	Prepare Lessons	94.00	86.00
3.	Maintain Positive Support & Foster Student's Motivation	94.00	90.00

Table 6: First-Year Graduates Rating of the effectiveness of CSU Education Specialist Teaching Credential Program
Areas of Weakness (2007-2008) N=14

No.	Evaluation Area	CSU Fresno	CSU Systemwide
1	To teach mathematics according to California Content Standards	57.00	5.00
2	Plan Instructional Activities in Integrated Settings for Pupils with Disabilities	57.00	74.00
3.	To use computer-based technology for instruction, research and record keeping	36.00	54.00

Table 7: Employer Ratings of the effectiveness of CSU Education Specialist Teaching Credential Program
Areas of Strength (2007-2008)   N=14

No.	Evaluation Area	CSU Fresno	CSU Systemwide
1	Monitor Candidates Progress by Using formal & Informal Assessments	86.00	77.00
2	Develop and Implement IEPs With Parents, Teachers, and Administrators	100	76.00
3.	Use Positive Behavior Support Techniques	86.00	82.00

Table 8: Employer Ratings of the effectiveness of CSU Education Specialist Teaching Credential Program
Areas of Weakness (2007-2008)   N=14

No.	Evaluation Area	CSU Fresno	CSU Systemwide
1	Understand Personal, Family & Community Conditions	67.00	85.00
2	Get Candidates Involved in Activities to Sustain On-Task Behavior	72.00	84.00
3.	Collaborate With Para-Educators in Meeting Candidates' Needs	72.50	78.00

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The candidate assessment data presented in the previous section of this report indicate that the program is meeting its goal of adequately preparing candidates to teach candidates with special needs in a variety of school settings. The data reveal a number of program strengths as well as some areas for improvement within the Special Education credential program. Areas of strength and areas for improvement derived from the data are outlined below:

Program Strengths
- Level I candidates demonstrated proficiency in all required CCTC standards at the "applying" or "developing" level in final student teaching.
- Level II candidates demonstrated proficiency through portfolio evaluation and observation of required CCTC standards at program completion.
- University Supervisors' Evaluations of Candidate Portfolio and Performance at Level I and Level II indicate that candidates have a high level of competency in all CCTC standards.
- University instructors' evaluation of candidates' knowledge and skills involved in classroom management, functional assessment, design and implementation of positive behavior support plans indicate that our candidates score at the achieving or developing skill level in required competencies.
- Program Evaluation Surveys completed by our candidates at the end of Level I and again at Level II indicate a perceived increase in competency in all areas evaluated.
- Program Evaluation Surveys completed by Administrators/Employers of our candidates rank our Level I and Level II candidates high in required competencies.
- The CSU Systemwide Exit Survey rates our candidates higher than candidates Systemwide in the areas: organizing and managing student behavior and discipline; evaluating and reflecting on their own teaching and seeking assistance that leads to professional growth, and in conducting assessments as defined in candidates' IEPs.

Areas for Improvement
- CSUF Practicum supervisors' evaluations of Level I candidates and the Curriculum-based Measure indicates a need for additional training in curriculum and instructions skills in general education settings.
- The CSU Systemwide Exit Survey completed by First-year graduates indicate weakness in their ability to :
  - teach mathematics according to California Content Standards;
  - plan instructional activities in integrated settings for pupils with disabilities, and
  - use of computer-based technology for instruction, research, and record keeping
  - The CSU Systemwide Exit Survey completed by Employers of our first-year graduates indicate a weakness in our candidates ability to:
  - collaborate with para-educators to meet student needs

Section A-4
Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate & Program Performance

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Data Source	Data Focus	Action(s)	Contact Person	Timeline
CSUF Supervisor Evaluations of Candidates Level I Portfolio& Performance in Practicum	Improve curricular and instructional skills in General Education.	In response to the newly revised CCTC standards for Ed Specialists, we will require candidates seeking only the ED Specialist Credential to take all GE coursework.	SPED Faculty	Beginning Spring 11 for candidates entering the new program
CSUF Evaluation and Needs Assessment Survey-Administrator & Candidate (Level I	Improve ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on observation and assessment data	The program began requiring candidates to design and implement a positive behavior support plan in Spring 10. We will continue to require candidates to design and implement a PBS plan during Final Practicum.	SPED Faculty	Beginning Spring 10
CSU Systemwide Exit Survey Completed by First-Year Graduates	Teach mathematics according to California Content Standards	In response to the newly revised CCTC standards for Ed Specialists, we will required all candidates to take CI 176 Mathematics Instruction and Applied Assessment.	SPED Faculty	Beginning Spring 11 for candidates entering the new program
CSU Systemwide Exit Survey Completed by First-Year Graduates	Plan instructional activities in integrated settings for pupils with disabilities	In response to the newly revised CCTC standards for Ed Specialists, we will require all candidates to complete the Teaching Sample Project (currently a performance assessment required of Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates) The Teaching Sample Project (modified according to adaptations for ED Specialists) will be completed twice: in an initial	SPED Faculty	Beginning Spring 11 for candidates entering the new program

		student teaching experience and at final practicum for those seeking the Education Specialist Credential, and twice (during Final Student Teaching in Multiple Subjects and during Final Practicum in Special Education) for those seeking both the Multiple Subjects and Ed Specialist Credential.		
CSU Systemwide Exit Survey Completed by First-Year Graduates	Use computer-based technology for instruction, research, and record keeping	A technology matrix will be developed to ensure that technology standards have been integrated across program courses. This will be developed with full-time and part-time faculty.	SPED Faculty	Beginning Spring 11 for candidates entering the new program
CSU Systemwide Exit Survey Completed by Employers of First-Year Graduates	Collaborate with para-educators to meet student needs	Content and activities involving work with para-educators will be integrated across coursework. Candidates will be required to develop and implement a plan to work collaboratively with para-educators during Final Practicum.	SPED Faculty	Beginning Spring 11