Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Alliant International University

June 2, 2008

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at Alliant International University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the attached report, the accreditation recommendation is **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**.

Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution or Program Sponsor

Common Standards

	Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership	X		
Standard 2: Resources		X	
Standard 3: Faculty	X		
Standard 4: Evaluation			X
Standard 5: Admission	X		
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	X		
Standard 7: School Collaboration		X	
Standard 8: District Field Supervisors		X	

Program Standards

	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Internship	19	0	18	1
Single Subject, with Internship	19	0	18	1
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, with Internship	27	20	7	
Administrative Services- Preliminary	15	2	6	7

The following was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

The original team that was selected for the Alliant International University (AIU) accreditation visit was comprised of eight team members, a team lead and a CTC consultant. The AIU accreditation team suffered a loss when a selected team member's husband became seriously ill and the member had to withdraw from the visit. Additionally, a second member had made a commitment to CTC to serve on an advisory panel and the panel meeting conflicted with the accreditation visit. To accommodate the visit, the team member agreed to conduct constituent interviews on Monday, May 5, 2008 and a second CTC staff person was assigned to the visit to facilitate the review process. These events left the AIU team two members short of the original eight to conduct accreditation team activities during Tuesday and Wednesday, May 6 -7, 2008.

The Alliant International University (AIU) main campus is located in San Francisco, however, the university offers educator preparation programs in several locations: San Francisco, Los Angeles (Alhambra), San Diego, Irvine and Sacramento. The home base and location for the May 4–7, 2008 accreditation visit was in San Francisco. Candidate files, faculty vitae, syllabi and other evidence were housed on the San Francisco AIU campus during the visit.

Since the AIU San Francisco site serves the majority of AIU Multiple and Single Subject candidates (129) the university was asked prior to the visit to secure sufficient San Francisco MS/SS candidates for interview. AIU stated that they would try to schedule some additional interviews but due to the fact that there was STAR testing taking place, it would be difficult to do so. Additional requests for San Francisco candidate interviews were made during the AIU reception on Sunday, May 4, 2008 and during the Mid-Visit report on Tuesday May 6, 2008. The university indicated that they would try to schedule the additional interviews but again indicated that due to the late date and STAR testing, it would be difficult. According to the interview schedule, very few San Francisco candidates (7) were interviewed. All other sites produced a sufficient number of candidates for interview.

On Monday, May 5th, three team members and two CTC staff left San Francisco to travel to Los Angeles and San Diego to conduct constituent interviews. Team members and staff left at 6:00 am and spent a full day in each location. Team members and staff returned to the San Francisco site Monday evening. Team members who remained in San Francisco conducted constituent interviews and fact finding. Stakeholder group representatives from Irvine, Sacramento and San Francisco were interviewed in person and by telephone during the course of the accreditation visit. Team activities began on Tuesday morning with a breakfast meeting. The team member who had to return to Sacramento Monday evening joined the Tuesday morning team meeting via conference call and was able to provide input for the accreditation report.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report

Institution: **Alliant International University**

Dates of Visit: **May 4-7, 2008**

Accreditation Team Recommendation: **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; 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 team reviewed each of the eight Common Standards and decided as to whether or not the standard was met, met with concerns or not met. Standard 4: Evaluation is "Not Met". Standard 2: Resources, Standard 7: School Collaboration, and Standard 8: District Field Supervisors, are "Met with Concerns". All other Common Standards are 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. In the Multiple Subject program, Standard 7A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English is "Not Met". 18 standards are "Met with Concerns". In the Single Subject program, Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English is "Not Met." 18 standards are "Met with Concerns".

In the Pupil Personnel Services Program, 20 standards were met and seven were met with concerns: 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination; 10: Consultation, 11: Learning Theory and Educational Psychology, 15: Technological Literacy, 21: Wellness Promotion, Crisis Intervention and Counseling, 25: Practica and 26: Culminating Field Experience.

In the Administrative Services Program, 2 standards were met, 6 were met with concerns and 7 were not met: 1: Program Rationale and Design, 2: Program Coordination, 10: Vision of Learning, 11: Student Learning and Professional Growth, 12: Organizational Management for Student Learning, 14: Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity and 15: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding.

Overall Recommendation –
The team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) make the following accreditation decision for Alliant International University and all of its credential programs: **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations.**

Following are the recommended stipulations:

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.

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.

3. That the institution prepare for a full team revisit within one year of the COA action. All credential programs, including all alternative certification programs, are to be re-evaluated as well as the common standards at the time of the re-visit.

4. That the institution provide a written report to the Commission consultant every sixty (60) days describing progress made in addressing the stipulations.

5. That all credential candidates are to be informed of these findings within sixty 60 days of the COA action. A draft of the letter notifying candidates of the COA action must be submitted to the Commission consultant within thirty (30) days of this action.

6. That AIU must complete the initial program review process for their Preliminary Administrative Services Preparation program.

7. That AIU
   a. Must notify all candidates who began coursework in the Preliminary Administrative Services credential 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.
   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 credential. A list of those candidates and a copy of the letter must be received by the Commission by July 15, 2008.
   c. May not admit any new candidates to the Preliminary Administrative Services program until the revised program is approved by the COA.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject
- Multiple Subject
- Multiple Subject Internship
- BCLAD Emphasis: Hmong
  Spanish

Single Subject
- Single Subject
- Single Subject Internship

Advanced/Service Credentials

Pupil Personnel Services
- School Psychology
- School Psychology Internship

CTEL Certificate

Education Specialist (Special Education)

Preliminary Level I
- Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship

Professional Level II
- Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Alliant International University not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation for a period of one year.
- Alliant International University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:	**J. L. Fortson** Pepperdine University
Common Standards Cluster:	**Gary Sherwin** California State University, San Bernardino
Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster:	**Thomas Doyle** National University **Lois Abel** Sinclair Research Group
Advanced/Services Programs Cluster:	**Dan Elliott** Azusa Pacific University **Mark Fulmer** Kern County Superintendent of Schools **Carol Robinson-Zanartu** San Diego State University
Staff to the Visit	**Marilynn Fairgood**, Consultant **Catherine Creeggan**, Assistant Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog
Institutional Self Study
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae
College Annual Report
College Budget Plan
Faculty Handbook
Student Handbook

Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Basic/ Teaching Cluster	Advanced/ Services Cluster	**TOTAL**
Program Faculty	1	1	19	8	**29**
Institutional Administration	7	4	11	7	**29**
Candidates		3	49	20	**72**
Graduates		2	10	8	**20**
Employers of Graduates	1	1	12	4	**18**
Supervising Practitioners	1	1	24	3	**29**
Advisors		1	7	4	**12**
School Administrators	4	1	18	4	**27**
Credential Analysts and Staff	1	1	4	2	**8**
Field Supervisors			8		**8**
				TOTAL	**252**

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.

Background Information

Alliant International University (AIU) is a result of a 2001 merger of two universities: Alliant University (formerly California School of Professional Psychology or CSPP) and United States International University (USIU). CSPP, founded in 1969, was the nation's first free-standing professional school of clinical psychology. Over a span of 50 years USIU expanded its offerings to open multiple foreign campuses from its home base in San Diego. USIU had been approved by the Commission to offer educator preparation programs since the 1980s.

USIU offered educator preparation programs approved by the Commission for many years and had undergone CTC accreditation visits. The merger of USIU and Alliant/CSPP occurred during implementation of SB 2042 and just prior to a moratorium being placed on the accreditation process. AIU is WASC accredited and has been approved by the COA and the Commission to offer educator preparation programs. The May 4–7, 2008 visit is the first Commission accreditation visit for AIU.

AIU has five distinct schools: California School of Professional Psychology, Graduate School of Education, Marshall Goldsmith School of Management, Center for Undergraduate Education and Center for Forensic Studies. AIU has California campuses in Los Angeles (Alhambra), Fresno, San Francisco, San Diego, Irvine and Sacramento. The University also has international sites in Mexico City, Hong Kong and Tokyo. The institution serves a diverse group of students and has a total student enrollment of 4,025. Its extended professional community includes over 26,000 alumni.

Education Unit

At the time of the July 2001 merger, the Commission authorized AIU to offer all of the educator preparation programs that were previously offered by USIU. Programs offered by USIU included the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs and the preliminary Administrative Services Program. In 2004, AIU was approved to offer the Multiple and Single Subject Internship, Multiple Subject BCLAD options (Hmong and Spanish) and Pupil Personnel: School Psychology programs. In September 2007 and January 2008 AIU was approved to offer Level I and Level II Education Specialist programs. A Multiple Subject BCLAD (Mandarin) option was also authorized in January 2008. Due to the recent approval of the Education Specialist programs, and because there are no graduates of the program and few candidates in the program, the Education Specialist credential programs were not reviewed during the May 4-7, 2008 accreditation visit. The AIU BCLAD programs do not serve candidates at this time. Because there are currently no BCLAD candidates, review of the BCLAD program is not included in this report. Also, it should be noted that the AIU Preliminary Administrative Services Program is in the process of a Commission review for initial approval of the program. The review process under the 2003 Standards had not been completed at the time of the May 4-7, 2008 accreditation visit.

The AIU GSOE's mission is to prepare competent, confident, and conscientious educational leaders who will promote and empower personal growth, academic success and professional achievement for all in a global society. The AIU vision is to develop a continuum of certification and degree programs to support the professional development and advancement of teachers. All actions in the GSOE are based upon the SANKOFA initiatives. SANKOFA is derived from a proverb of the Akan people of Ghana. The words San (return), Ko (go), and Fa (look, seek, take) infer that an intelligent and patient quest for future knowledge and goals is informed by a critical examination of the wisdom of the past.

The university serves 275 GSOE candidates. Partner school districts include Oakland Unified, Alum Rock and a number of Charter schools. The Governance structure for the Alliant GSOE includes one Systemwide Dean, one Assistant Dean, four Systemwide Program Directors, and 12 Campus Program Directors. The Dean of the GSOE is the chief administrator for the GSOE and is responsible for articulating the mission and vision of the GSOE. The Dean is responsible for the integrity of its programs, quality of the faculty, staff, students and the effectiveness of its operation. The Dean is a member of the President's Cabinet and the University Academic Council and serves as an advocate for the GSOE and all if its programs in the broader university community.

Each campus includes a Systemwide Program Director and a Campus Program Director. In addition, the GSOE has four full-time faculty and 55 adjuncts. Authority and responsibility for planning, developing and implementing GSOE policies across all campuses in large part is delegated directly from the Dean to the four Systemwide Program Directors and then to Campus Program Directors and other program faculty.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers (2006-07)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	Initial	38	81	CTC
Single Subject	Initial	69	85	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	Advanced	35	100	CTC
Administrative Services	Advanced	10	9	CTC

The Visit

The Alliant International University (AIU) visit began on Sunday, May 4, 2007 at noon with seven team members. Team members met at the hotel for a team meeting to discuss the interview schedule and develop questions in preparation for constituent interviews. At 4:00 pm the team traveled from the hotel to the university where AIU staff provided an introduction to the university document room followed by a tour of the university building. A reception was held with university administration, faculty and staff with greetings and an overview of the university and the GSOE from the President, Provost and Dean. At 6:00 pm the team traveled back to the hotel and resumed its team meeting. On Monday morning three team members traveled to Los Angeles and San Diego to conduct constituent interviews. A CTC staff person traveled with team members to the Los Angeles and San Diego sites to facilitate the interview process. Team members remaining in San Francisco gathered evidence and conducted constituent interviews. One team member who remained in San Francisco traveled to school sites in San Jose and Oakland to conduct stakeholder interviews. On Monday evening, that team member had to leave for Sacramento.

On Tuesday morning, the team met during breakfast for a team meeting. The team member who left on Monday night joined the team by telephone. The remaining six team members continued their data collection and interviews throughout the day on Tuesday. On Tuesday morning the team lead presented the Mid-Visit report to the Dean and Associate Dean. On Tuesday evening the team met to discuss all standards to determine whether or not the standards were met. On Wednesday morning the team met to continue their deliberations and discussion as to whether or not all standards were met. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and an accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was held on Wednesday, May 7, 2008 at 1:30 pm.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership **Standard Met**

The institution (faculty, dean/director and institutional administration) articulates and supports a vision for the preparation of professional educators. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of credential program faculty. Institutional leadership fosters cohesiveness in management; delegates responsibility and authority appropriately; resolves each professional preparation program's administrative needs as promptly as feasible; and represents the interests of each program in the institution, the education profession, and the school community.

Alliant International University is a WASC accredited university made up of 6 campuses in California. Credential granting programs include Educational Administration, School Psychology, and Teacher Education. The vision for preparation of professional educators enforces the University's mission to "educate citizens of the world, ensuring the acquisition of knowledge and competencies that are essential to live, lead, and solve problems in a global society." The Conceptual Framework for the Graduate School of Education is made up of major theoretical and practical education constructs. Program coordination is achieved through the active involvement of program faculty and senior leadership including the University President, Provost, Graduate School of Education (GSOE) Dean, GSOE Assistant Dean, System-wide and Campus GSOE Program Directors. Program decisions are made with faculty, staff, and Program Director input.

Standard 2: Resources **Met with Concerns**

Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for the effective operation of credential preparation program, to enable it to be effective in coordination, advising, curriculum, instruction, and field experiences. Library and media computer facilities, and support personnel, among others, are adequate.

Faculty and staff report that there are insufficient resources for some programs. For example, faculty reported that resources to smaller programs such as Educational Administration appeared to be insufficient. In other instances, faculty and staff raised questions regarding how one faculty member can effectively coordinate a program with 44 candidates. Adequacy of office space for adjunct instructors, lack of access to technology or technological assistance, and a lack of awareness of Blackboard and on-line technologies were also cited by staff and faculty as inadequate allocation of resources in some locations. Concern for system-wide consistency in this area exists, not only in regards to location equality, but also for program equality in regards to resource allocation.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
Early completion intern candidates consistently reported excellent advisement into and within the program.

Common Standard 3: Faculty **Standard Met**

Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach all courses and supervise all field experiences in each credential preparation program. Faculty reflect and are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. The institution provides support for faculty development, and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching. The institution regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains in credential programs only those individuals who are consistently effective.

Core faculty members in the GSOE hold doctoral degrees in the area of program specialization. Faculty assignment is based on areas of expertise, credentials, and preparation. Evaluation is consistent and structured throughout the campus locations and presented to the applicable faculty member in a timely fashion. An opportunity for improvement is given to those faculty members not meeting the high expectations of Alliant Intentional University, after which appropriate action is taken. The university is committed to ensuring that faculty members possess a strong commitment to social justice through an understanding of cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. Faculty development is fundamental to the institution.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
There is strong evidence that faculty and instructors are rigorously and regularly evaluated. This evaluation information is then utilized by the faculty in restructuring their classes both in regards to content and in delivery methodology to meet the needs of the students.

Common Standard 4: Evaluation **Standard Not Met**

The institution regularly involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences, which leads to substantive improvements in each credential preparation program, as needed. Meaningful opportunities are provided for professional practitioners and diverse community members to become involved in program design, development and evaluation activities.

While the institution gathers considerable data using a variety of assessment instruments, further evidence is needed that these assessments are used to drive program changes. For example, evidence is needed that assessments measure student attainment of specific standards and that these data are used to inform program changes. Comprehensive data regarding the quality of courses, field experiences, and candidate performance must be used to make substantive improvements in each program system-wide.

Common Standard 5: Admission **Standard Met**

In each professional preparation program, candidates are admitted on the basis of well defined admission criteria and procedures (including all Commission-adopted admission requirements) that utilize multiple measures. The admission of students from a diverse population is encouraged. The institution determines that candidates meet high academic standards, as evidenced by appropriate measures of academic achievement, and demonstrate strong potential for professional success in schools, as evidenced by appropriate measures of personal characteristics and prior experience.

The goal of admissions is to achieve an academically strong, diverse group of candidates who are qualified and committed to education. Candidates must meet university and program criteria that are clearly delineated in multiple sources including the Web and University Catalogue. For all

programs, candidates are interviewed by the Program Director or designated faculty. Relevant experience is examined for all intern candidates. Attempts are made to attract a diverse student body.

Areas of Strength in Standard Implementation:
Early Completion Program candidates and faculty consistently reported that the interviews which are commonly one to two hours are particularly effective in screening candidates.

Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance **Standard Met**

Qualified members of the institution's staff are assigned and available to advise candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, as the need arises, and to assist in their professional placement. Adequate information is readily available to guide each candidate's attainment of all program and credential requirements. The institution assists candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Advisement and assistance is provided through multiple avenues ranging from faculty and staff interactions with students to web-based interactions. Workshops and group orientations for new students assist candidates to understand program requirements and scholarship opportunities. All students receive a Graduate Student Handbook with general information about university policies and program specific procedures. Staff apprises students about specific credential requirements and ensures necessary procedures are followed to obtain the credential. Students who may need assistance are commonly identified by program faculty who will collaborate to develop appropriate accommodations to meet the individual needs of the student. Students requiring special assistance may be recommended to the Student Evaluation Review Committee (SERC) which is made up of the Program Director, Site Coordinator, a faculty member, Field Service Coordinator, a staff member, and meets with the student to explore remedial instruction, special assistance, or to be counseled to exit the program.

Common Standard 7: School Collaboration **Met with Concerns**

For each credential preparation program, the institution collaborates with local school personnel in selecting suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel for guiding candidates through a planned sequence of fieldwork/clinical experiences that is based on a well developed rationale.

While evidence, such as MOU's and email contacts with some districts was provided, no corroboration that collaboration was taking place was found. Consistency of meetings with district/school partners over time is needed to fulfill this standard. Further evidence, such as regular meetings with partners that show collaboration in creating a learning community model, would provide additional documentation that selection of suitable school sites and effective experiences for all candidates is present system-wide and in all programs.

Common Standard 8: District Field Supervisors **Met with Concerns**

Each district-employed field experience supervisor is carefully selected, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, and certified and experienced in either teaching the subject(s) of the class or performing the services authorized by the credential. District supervisors and supervisory activities are appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the institution.

Some interns have District Mentors on site while others do not. Evidence from interns and faculty indicated that in some cases, an on-site district/school mentor was not identified or provided. Intern programs require collaboration that includes an on-site mentor for all interns in the subject area of the candidate's credential.

Strengths in Standard Implementation:
In some programs, field supervisors are consistently and rigorously evaluated by candidates.

Multiple Subject Credential Program
Multiple Subject Credential Program with Internship

Single Subject Credential Program
Single Subject Credential Program with Internship

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional self-study report, program documents, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with candidates, intern teachers, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that 18 program standards are met with concerns and one program standard is not met for the Multiple Subject Credential Program and the Single Subject Credential Program.

Standard 1: Program Design **Met with Concerns**
The team was presented a self-study document and supporting documentation which described traditional teacher preparation and internship programs and the Early Completion Option (ECO) intern program prior to the visit. When the team arrived at Alliant International University (AIU) the team found that a significant number of candidates (approximately 75% as described by the university) are affiliated with Teach for America (TFA).

Traditional teacher preparation and intern candidates interviewed provided positive information about their programs and think highly of AIU faculty. Candidates are confident about the professional preparation that they receive through the AIU program.

No course listing or other documentation describing how TFA candidates are prepared was provided prior to or during the visit. This made the program design unclear and the team does not understand what course of study TFA candidates are completing.

A review of candidate files found that a large number of AIU candidates are identified as ECO interns as well as TFA interns. Of the files checked by team members, each ECO intern had successfully passed the Teaching Foundations Examination (TFE). Although documentation submitted with the AIU self-study states that ECO interns complete a 9-month program through AIU, it was unknown what program ECO interns complete in affiliation with TFA.

Additionally, the team found that the number of traditional teacher preparation candidates, ECO and TFA candidates was unclear. These findings made the review challenging for team members.

Although the AIU self study document identifies a list of candidate experiences during what is called Phase 2 course work, it is unclear how the TPEs align with the experiences or how competency is measured. Candidates and supervisors interviewed were unclear as to how the TPEs relate to candidate experiences.

The team found little evidence regarding the presentation of a variety of pedagogical strategies, methods, or models for teaching. Evidence was inconsistent as to whether or not candidates are afforded multiple opportunities to practice the TPEs.

Through faculty, candidate and supervisor interviews and review of syllabi the team found that there is a misunderstanding about the TPEs and interviewees are confusing TPEs as teaching and learning strategies. Some interviewees also confused the TPEs with the Academic Content Standards.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program **Met with Concerns**

The institution has an arrangement with TFA but no evidence how the institution determines that the standards are met for candidates affiliated with TFA was provided. No document describing the TFA program or the support services that TFA candidates receive was presented to team members prior to or during the visit. TFA candidates who were interviewed were asked about the program they completed through TFA. Neither the TFA interns nor AIU supervisors could clearly describe what is completed by candidates affiliated with TFA.

The team found little evidence that partnership districts were engaged with the unit in program governance and planning. The institutional self study identifies educational advisory groups, but no documentation identifying a relationship with educational advisory groups was found and no advisory group members were interviewed.

The team had insufficient evidence to determine where candidates were placed with regard to their TFA practicum experiences. The team found little evidence of how program partners support the cost of cooperation by providing sufficient human and fiscal resources in support of the AIU programs.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 3: Relationship between Theory and Practice **Met with Concerns**

Candidates interviewed and documents presented were inconsistent regarding theories and research in education. It is unclear how the largest cohort of candidates (interns) is assessed on theories of learning and development. Relevant theories are not clearly described.

Candidates interviewed were not clear about their understanding of different methodologies and their impact on learning. University supervisors interviewed were equally unclear about instructional methodologies and their impact on student learning.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice Met with Concerns

Interviews with supervisors and mentors revealed a lack of evidence of consistent training in the TPEs and the TPA.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 5: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum for All Children Met with Concerns

The AIU self-study stated that there were supervisor workshops that covered gender issues and pedagogy to ensure equal access for all students. Although this content was covered in course syllabi, AIU supervisors interviewed said workshops related to gender issues and pedagogy are not offered.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn, Practice and Reflect on Teaching in All Subject Areas Met With Concerns

Through review of syllabi, each course includes a broad-based objective identifying 4 TPEs. The team could not identify a relationship between the exercises and the listed TPEs. Candidates interviewed indicated that the portfolio assessment is only required in San Diego. The TPA coordinator who was hired to support the San Francisco site transition to the TPA does not support the San Diego and Los Angeles sites. The syllabi reviewed by the team revealed that clear formative and summative assessments are not consistently included in the syllabi.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 7A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English Not Met

Traditional Multiple Subject candidates and interns reported that their reading preparation was excellent. Candidates found that they were well prepared to take RICA and many reported that they passed RICA on the first try.

The team had no information about the TFA intern program and how the teaching of reading is addressed. Documentation describing how TFA and ECO interns are prepared to pass RICA was not available.

The team found little evidence that the field experience included teaching comprehension, fluency, and assessment in the use of language.

During interviews, supervisors indicated that they received little or no training in reading. Interviews with candidates and faculty revealed discrepancies with the statement included in the self study that candidates are placed in 'diverse' settings for field experiences. One candidate

reported that she was employed in a school setting that is not diverse. When asked where her second reading fieldwork placement took place, the candidate stated that she was allowed to remain at the same school site.

The team found no evidence for orientation and training of master teachers, university supervisors, or site mentors with either interns or traditional student teachers. There is little interaction between university supervisors and master teachers (referred to as mentors by AIU).

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English Not Met

One Single Subject traditional candidate reported that he did not recall completing a course in the teaching of reading. The team was provided no information about the TFA intern program and how teaching of reading is addressed.

The team found little evidence that the field experience included teaching comprehension, fluency, and assessment in the use of language.

During interviews, supervisors indicated that they received little or no training in reading. Interviews with candidates and faculty revealed discrepancies with the statement included in the self study that candidates are placed in 'diverse' settings for field experiences.

The team found no evidence for orientation and training of master teachers, university supervisors, or site mentors with either interns or traditional student teachers. There is little interaction between university supervisors and master teachers (referred to as mentors by AIU).

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 8A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Multiple Subject Candidates Met with Concerns

The team found that traditional Multiple Subject Candidates and interns receive the preparation needed to provide content-specific instruction. However, candidates are unclear about the state-adopted Academic Content Standards, Curriculum Frameworks and the TPEs. Many confused the terms. Learning objectives for TPEs are included in course syllabi but course activities did not relate to the objectives and the TPEs.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction for Single Subject Candidates Met with Concerns

Mathematics: The response to this standard identifies the elements of the Mathematics program for Single Subject candidates and documents identify specific courses. Faculty, administrators, and the documents indicate that at times, small enrollment numbers forces AIU to combine single subject candidates from various disciplines into an integrated course. Detail concerning the

integrated course and the "field expert" who is to serve as subject matter expert and the outcomes for the field experts to address were not available.

Science: Faculty, administrators, and the documents indicate that at times, small enrollment numbers forces AIU to combine single subject candidates from various disciplines into an integrated course. Detail concerning the integrated course and the "field expert" who is to serve as subject matter expert and the outcomes for the field experts to address were not available.

History-Social Science: Faculty, administrators, and the documents indicate that at times, small enrollment numbers forces AIU to combine single subject candidates from various disciplines into an integrated course. Detail concerning the integrated course and the "field expert" who is to serve as subject matter expert and the outcomes for the field experts to address were not available.

English: The team found it unclear why ECO and Intern field experience was addressed for English Single Subject candidates only. Faculty, administrators, and the documents indicate that at times, small enrollment numbers forces AIU to combine single subject candidates from various disciplines into an integrated course. Detail concerning the integrated course and the "field expert" who is to serve as subject matter expert and the outcomes for the field experts to address were not available.

Languages Other than English: Faculty, administrators, and the documents indicate that at times, small enrollment numbers forces AIU to combine single subject candidates from various disciplines into an integrated course. Detail concerning the integrated course and the "field expert" who is to serve as subject matter expert and the outcomes for the field experts to address were not available.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 9: Technology **Met with Concerns**

Through review of course syllabi, interviews with traditional candidates, interns and the course instructor, the team found that integration of computer technology to facilitate teaching and learning is designed to occur in the coursework. Greater information is needed concerning the integration and research findings throughout the curriculum.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Program Standard 10: Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning **Met with Concerns**

Through review of syllabi and interviews with traditional candidates and interns the team determined that classroom management is covered.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research Met with Concerns
Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 12: Professional Perspectives toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession Met with Concerns
The team found that traditional coursework provides a theoretical foundation and a clear means for application to the classroom. Some traditional interns interviewed stated that they do not receive the State required pre-service hours while others reported that they received the required pre-service through TFA. Documentation regarding supervision provided for TFA interns was unavailable. TFA interns commented that Teach for America provides helpful practical information regarding best practices. One AIU supervisor indicated that at times, the University supervisors and TFA support providers "stumble over each other."

ECO interns reported that they complete a three day in-service workshop for classroom preparation. This three day workshop does not meet the 120 clock hour internship pre-service requirement. The team found little coordination with field experience supervisors and mentors evident. The team found little evidence of training for Master Teachers and Supervisors.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 13: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners Met with Concerns
Traditional candidates and interns interviewed receive training to meet the needs of English Learners. Information about how TFA interns are prepared to provide services to English language learners was not available.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom Met with Concerns
Through review of course syllabi and candidate interviews the team found that this content is covered in the traditional Multiple Subject, Single Subject and intern programs.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork Met with Concerns
Supervision and mentoring for all alternative certification programs is unknown (e.g., ECO, Traditional Interns, Teach for America Interns). Candidates interviewed indicate a variety of supervisory experiences. The team found little evidence of interaction and coordination with field experience supervisors and mentors. Placement of candidates in all alternative certification programs is unknown.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors
Met with Concerns

One traditional intern at the San Francisco campus described the professional preparation program as 1/2 of a school year. This timeline differs from the description given by San Diego interns, who identified their program as 1 year, and information included in the AIU admissions packet which indicates a 1-2 year traditional intern program.

Traditional supervisors acknowledge that there is an initial meeting and a monthly newsletter that is distributed by AIU. No additional training was indicated. Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not provided. The team does not know how AIU is involved in the assignment of TFA interns and the training of their supervisors. It is unknown how the University is involved in the development of TFA mentors and training of those mentors for supervision.

Sponsorship of professional training between AIU and cooperating school administrators was inconsistent. Interviews with supervisors indicated that some worked with administrators and some did not. Some supervisors indicate some professional development while others indicate none. Interviews with a variety of supervisors indicated limited knowledge of TPEs and TPAs. Some supervisors admit that they evaluate candidates based upon TPEs while others are unaware of the TPE listing that is included on the student teaching evaluation form.

The team found little evidence for orientation and training of master teachers, university supervisors, or site mentors with either interns or traditional student teachers. There is little interaction between university supervisors and master teachers (referred to as mentors by AIU)

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence about TFA interns to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in Fieldwork Sequence **Met with Concerns**

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not available. The team was provided insufficient evidence to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments During the Program
Met with Concerns

AIU states that it is an early adopter of the TPA. Although the TPA will be required of all candidates beginning July 1, 2008, indication of the training of supervisors in the TPA seems to be limited. The San Francisco site has a TPA Coordinator but the Coordinator provides no training for the San Diego and Los Angeles AIU sites. Faculty interviews indicate a variety of understandings of the TPEs and the TPA. Supervisors interviewed indicate limited preparation with the TPEs.

Documentation describing how TFA interns are prepared was not provided. The team was provided insufficient evidence to determine if the standard is fully met.

Standard 19: Assessment of Candidate Performance **Met with Concerns**

Syllabi mention the integration of TPEs but syllabi do not demonstrate how outcomes in the syllabi, the TPEs, and assignments are related. Adjunct faculty interviewed has limited

knowledge of the TPEs and TPA. Supervisor interviews indicate limited preparation in the TPEs. Some candidates interviewed knew about TPEs while others did not.

Documentation describing the selection of supervisors for TFA interns was not provided. The team had insufficient evidence to determine if the Standard is met.

Strengths in Program Implementation:
The traditional Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs provide a clear and developmental plan to the credential program. Courses have been developed by content experts. Traditional interns and traditional candidate interviews frequently indicated a great appreciation for the level of support and encouragement they receive from AIU faculty and staff. Candidates felt that they were cared for and were being coached to become good teachers. The attempt for the institution to provide methods courses for each of the single subject content areas provides opportunities for Single Subject candidates to grow in content area understanding and appropriate methodology.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential Program
School Psychology Credential Program with Internship

Findings on the Standards
After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, faculty, employers, mentors and field supervisors, the team determined that 20 program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential and 7 standards are met with concerns:

Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination Met with Concerns
The design of the program is cogent; foundations precede practice. However, the rationale is unclear, and coordination across curricular areas and program sites is inconsistent. For instance, students and adjunct faculty members on one site report that adjunct faculty members do not communicate with one another, and as a result there are areas of overlapping instruction and missed opportunities for pedagogical congruence.

Standard 10: Consultation Met with Concerns
Although the program does provide discussions on processes of collaboration and problem solving, which students appear to apply well in their fieldwork/internships, the program does not appear to require students to learn or demonstrate competence using specific models of consultation (e.g, behavioral, mental health). From examining syllabi, it appears that different campuses do not have consistent requirements for the course in consultation. Candidates interviewed did not demonstrate knowledge of consultation models. The emphasis is on strong collaborative relationship building.

Standard 11: Learning Theory and Educational Psychology Met with Concerns
Although the program does provide training in perceptual-sensory processes, emotional state, motivation, organizational skills, gender, cultural differences, and linguistic differences, adjunct faculty at one site report that students do not receive grounding in learning theory and cognition. Syllabi that address academic assessment and intervention were inconsistent across campuses; for instance, employers of graduates from one campus found academic interventions an area of strength.

Standard 15: Technological Literacy **Met with Concerns**

Although some students use PowerPoint presentations and some appear to use some technology associated with Blackboard and Yahoo groups, no clear evidence was found that the program provides candidates with systematic opportunities to understand and demonstrate skills in current technology for communication and collecting, organizing, distributing and analyzing data and resources in order to facilitate effective and appropriate outcomes in program management and individual student achievement.

Standard 21: Wellness Promotion, Crisis Intervention and Counseling Met with Concerns

Candidates are introduced to issues in crisis intervention, and some appear well prepared to help design, implement and evaluate wellness, prevention, intervention and other mental health programs at the individual, group and systems level. However, at one campus, one internship supervisor raised concerns that students were not sufficiently prepared in this area. The program has an option of a mental health certification that provides candidates skills to recognize the behaviors and context that are precursors to the development of internalizing disorders, externalizing disorders, and dropping out of school. Although many candidates are signing up for this option, it is not a required portion of the program. No evidence was found that candidates consistently demonstrate the ability to design programs and implement prevention, intervention, and treatment services across the hierarchy of pupils' development needs.

Standard 25: Practica **Met with Concerns**

The program provides students the opportunity to participate in 450 hours of experience related to a variety of areas of practice. The content of these opportunities appears to vary significantly across sites. At one site, the majority of these are observational in nature, and do not involve supervision. However, the LA campus has an office that helps students coordinate with Alhambra school district to obtain these experiences; San Francisco's office takes an active role in providing appropriate school-based opportunities. At least one campus requires that students find their own experiences, in a school or other setting. Some do them in home settings or in the community; others in schools. Candidates frame this as a character building experience so that they can become assertive in the workplace; however, programmatic coordination and supervision would enhance the overall experience. Lack of supervision of mastery of specific skills creates a concern.

Standard 26: Culminating Field Experience **Met with Concerns**

Many of the interns interviewed have excellent experiences where the field supervisor has designed a comprehensive program, provided close supervision and mentoring, and built on the individual's strengths.

During the culminating field experience, candidates should demonstrate a full range of skills in a comprehensive service delivery model. Although some candidates appear to do this well, it seems to be very dependent on the design and supervision that individual districts develop. Not all district supervisors seem to be given specific direction at the beginning of the internship for designing this experience, nor do the expectations appear in the contract with the university. University liaisons/supervisors visit twice a year – at one campus, the first time occurs three months into the internship. Supervisors at one site report that the evaluation form has changed in the last two years, with the current evaluation being far less comprehensive.

Areas of Strength in Program Implementation
Faculty, students, and many of its constituents are enthusiastic about the program across campuses. Candidates uniformly cite their professors and campus directors as strengths and assets in the programs. Many advanced students and alumni demonstrate excellent skills in the field, and are positively affecting the experiences of students, teachers and parents. The program document lists a tremendous number of strong textual resources. The program should be commended for its resource in that area. Attention to issues of diversity is a strength across campuses in this program.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation
Alliant International University's School Psychology Program is fairly "young" and clearly interested in reflection on and strengthening its program. In many cases, current plans or newly integrated experiences reflect awareness that shifts in the program need to occur or are occurring. While some coordination occurs between directors of those programs, far more in-depth collaboration would ensure more consistency in curriculum delivery, and in enhancing compliance with standards. Further, greater collaboration between sites and within programs (e.g., adjunct and core faculty; university and school partners) would provide consistency across sites and strengthen the programs' processes and delivery of content.

Administrative Services Credential - Preliminary

Findings on Standards
After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, faculty, employers, mentors and field supervisors, the team determined that two program standards are fully met for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. The remaining standards are 'Met with Concerns' or 'Not Met'.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program self-study document presented to the team, as well as supporting documents, were responding to the new standards. The course descriptions, candidate matriculation processes and candidate assessment processes were all designed to be implemented later and are not now in place because the program has not completed the Commission review process and has not been recommended for approval.

Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design **Not Met**
The design (for the old program) was limited to a list of courses taken. No rationale or purpose descriptions were found that support or explain a program design. Faculty interviewed were able to describe the design of the new program and the list of some of the old courses but not all. Adjunct faculty interviewed were unaware of the published institutional conceptual framework statement (the Ghana statement) or mission and purpose statements provided in the self study document and could not link it to the content they have taught or would teach in the future.

The team found no evidence of a 'cohesive set of learning experiences informed by adult learning. Two graduates interviewed explicitly recommended that the program faculty be more aware of adult learners' needs. Adjunct faculty interviewed were unaware of the overall program design and could not explain how the course they had taught or would teach fit into the program's rationale. While technology was mentioned in the self-study (relevant to the proposed new program), none of the graduates or students interviewed could identify any ways in the

programs they had experienced wherein they were prepared regarding the implementation of technology in K-12 schools. No mention was found of 'strategies for professional instruction' to be used in this program nor was there mention of 'observation in diverse settings,' other than in the field experience handbook.

Standard 2: Program Coordination **Not Met**

The team found no evidence of partnerships with schools for fieldwork. No process for selecting site supervisors was discovered. Candidates reported that their site supervisor was their principal or vice principal, by default.

Standard 3: Development of Professional Perspectives **Met with Concerns**

The team found only one candidate portfolio (from 2004-05) demonstrating understanding of content standards and monitoring or assessment of students, or evaluation of staff. Five out of the seven current course syllabi were eventually presented to the team. One demonstrated review of teacher evaluation approaches for use by administrators. Generally there was insufficient data presented to assess this element.

The team found a list of courses, syllabi for current program courses, and a field experience handbook, as well as a 2002 petition for initial approval of the PASC program. It was not clear how there might be a 'recurring review of foundational issues' for instructional leadership. The team found one candidate document (from 2004-05) reporting candidate reflections about leadership.

Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership **Met with Concerns**

Three syllabi for the existing educational leadership courses were found and examined. Two of the syllabi included alignment to Standard 6 elements. Little other evidence was found regarding alignment of all of the elements making up Standard 6 could be located. Candidates and graduates interviewed were inconsistent in responding as to which course they learned various elements that were asked about.

Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences **Met with Concerns**

The field experience handbook indicated that field experiences were assigned according to the ten domains of administrative practice and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). However, candidates and graduates interviewed, when asked about each of the ten domains of CPSEL were inconsistent in recognizing the types of experiences they had done in fieldwork for each of the ten domains. Candidates whose regular job was in the classroom reported that they were less able to engage all ten domains. Only one candidate portfolio was provided that reported reflections about all ten administrator-domains.

Evidence of linkages in the old program was evident, however, the team found no evidence of links between current courses and candidates' field experiences.

Interviews with faculty and candidates indicated that candidates' site supervisors always ended up being their site administrator, by default. One principal interviewed reported that there was no training or orientation for the role of site supervisor provided by the university. Faculty interviewed reported inconsistent evidence about contact with site supervisors during the field experiences of candidates.

All candidates interviewed reported that they planned their experiences with the site supervisor and reported them to the university supervisor at the end of the semester. There was no evidence that these experiences were negotiated to ensure coverage of a wide range of administrator duties.

No evidence was found to determine whether or not the candidates' field experiences represented 'diverse settings' or that they were at different levels. All candidates interviewed reported that they did their field experience at the site where they were employed.

Candidates interviewed reported inconsistent opportunities to deal with long-term policy issues for their school or district. Those tied to classroom jobs were least likely to have such experiences.

Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback **Met with Concerns**
The team found field experience evaluations for 9 former candidates revealing the degree to which each candidate received a mid-point or end-point assessment from the school site supervisor. No evaluations for the current program were available.

The team found inconsistent evidence regarding coordination among university supervisor, site supervisor and candidate.

Field experience response forms indicated that both supervisors signed the field experience completion forms in the old course descriptions. However, no evidence was found regarding this for current program candidates.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance **Met with Concerns**
The team found little evidence about methods for assessing candidate competence other than the field experience mid-term and end assessment by the site supervisor and completing courses wherein objectives were identified as linked to specific outcomes from the CPSELs and the domains of administration. No data were available aggregating candidate competencies across the board.

Standard 10: Vision of Learning **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to a vision of learning.

Standard 11: Student Learning and Professional Growth **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to the elements of student learning and professional growth.

Standard 12: Organizational Management for Student Learning **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to organizational management and student learning.

Standard 13: Working with Diverse Families and Communities **Met with Concerns**
There was much evidence across the existing (old) course descriptions, as well as those contained within the proposed program, illustrating the elements of standard 13—working with diverse families and communities. However no evidence was found regarding this standard for the

current program candidates. Candidates interviewed could not report specific content in this domain.

Standard 14: Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to personal ethics and leadership capacity.

Standard 15: Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Understanding **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to political, social, economic, legal, and cultural understanding.

Areas of Strength in Program Implementation
The program should be noted for an excellent instrument to be used in assessing candidate competence in field experience and across courses at multiple intervals.

Candidates in Orange and San Diego Counties talked about how important it was to them that their classes were small and intimate and that faculty members were attentive to their needs.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:
The new program proposal has not completed the Commission review process. This proposed program was presented without any design rationale or data-based evidence indicating why the faculty have chosen to modify their program in this way. Such data, if used by the faculty at large in evaluating their program could ensure that new proposals and modifications are undertaken for the best reasons.

Evidence of candidate competence is not collected and analyzed for program maintenance or revision. The proposed program includes a very good instrument relating to candidate competence. This instrument has an excellent potential for becoming a data-collection system used in assessing program and candidate quality. Teaching with, and about technology for use in the K-12 school system should be more seamlessly integrated into this program.