

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Preliminary Report of Findings and Addendum**

<b>Institution</b>	California State University, Fresno	<b>Program</b>	<b>PRELIMINARY EDUCATION SPECIALIST: Deaf/Hard of Hearing</b>
<b>Date of Review</b>	January 2021		

Please complete the table below for all programs that were deemed to require “more information needed” by reviewers during Program Review (PR). Brief narrative (less than 150 words) is allowable but response must include links to evidence that address the issue identified by the reviewers.

*Posting the Addendum*

Information from the addendum must be posted on the institution’s accreditation website at least 60 days before the site visit, along with the original program review document and feedback from the program reviewers. Please do not resubmit your response the items below; responses need only be added to your institution’s accreditation website.

<b>Standards Found to be Preliminarily Aligned</b>	Preliminary teaching standard: 10
--	-----------------------------------

<b>Standards Requiring More Information</b>	<b>Comment from Program Reviewers</b>	<b>Response from Program</b>
<b>Standard 1:</b> Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	Reviewers did not have enough evidence to fully understand the entire design and scope of the program. The rationale for the program and program coordination activities are evident; however, the coordination between the standards and coursework is less evident. Provide further evidence.	
<b>Standard 2:</b> Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices	There is evidence that assessment is introduced at the school-age level but Provide evidence.	

Standards Requiring More Information	Comment from Program Reviewers	Response from Program
	<p>There is no evidence of the IFSP process, legal and ethical practices, or any component of IEP development. Provide evidence.</p> <p>There is no evidence of the demonstration of the implementation of evidence-based practices in discussions or assignments. Provide evidence.</p>	
<p><b>Standard 3:</b> Educating Diverse Learners</p>	<p>There is no indication if and how specifically how diversity is addressed. Provide clarification/evidence.</p> <p>There is no evidence of research regarding literacy or ways in which students would address teaching literacy to students who are DHH. Provide evidence.</p> <p>There is no evidence of ways in which multi-faceted methodologies and strategies are to be used. Provide evidence.</p>	
<p><b>Standard 4:</b> Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships</p>	<p>Evidence of communication and collaboration with stakeholders is not evident. Please provide.</p> <p>There is no evidence of multi-tiered strategies, and no evidence of practice or assessment of 504, IFSPs or IEPs. Provide evidence.</p>	
<p><b>Standard 5:</b> Assessment of Students</p>	<p>Evidence of assessment information is introduced but not practiced or assessed. Provide evidence.</p>	

Standards Requiring More Information	Comment from Program Reviewers	Response from Program
	Assessing students with diverse needs is not evident. Provide evidence.	
<b>Standard 6:</b> Using Educational and Assistive Technology	Reviewers could not find evidence of the linkage between technology and the learning process. Please provide.	
<b>Standard 7:</b> Transition and Transitional Planning	Reviewers could not find evidence of transition and transitional planning within courses offered. Please provide.	
<b>Standard 8:</b> Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning	Evidence was found that IEP attendance is a component of the program but planning and implementation were absent. Provide evidence.	
<b>Standard 9:</b> Preparation to Teach Reading/Language Arts	No evidence found of how reading/language arts instruction is linked to state adopted English Language Arts Content Standards and the Reading/Language Arts Framework. Provide evidence.	
<b>Standard 11:</b> Typical and Atypical Development	No evidence of content specific to typical and atypical development found. Provide evidence.	
<b>Standard 12:</b> Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning	Introductory content found specific to positive behavior support but no evidence found on how this content is practiced and assessed. Provide evidence.	
<b>Standard 13:</b> Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities	Reviewers could not find evidence for strategies for developing general program units, sequencing, and working as collaborative members of teams. Provide evidence.	

Standards Requiring More Information	Comment from Program Reviewers	Response from Program
<b>Standard 14:</b> Creating Healthy Learning Environments	Reviewers could not find evidence that the following areas are addressed: community and environmental factors; student health and safety; and universal precautions. Provide evidence.	
<b>Standard 15:</b> Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options	There is no evidence that a broad range of service delivery options is addressed. Provide evidence.	
<b>Program Standard 16:</b> Assessment of Candidate Performance	An assessment rubric was not provided for practicum and student teaching. Please provide.	
<b>Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH)</b>		
<b>DHH Standard 1:</b> Characteristics of Learners	Reviewers were unable to find etiologies and characteristics of students across the spectrum of people who are Deaf/hard of hearing, deaf-blind, specifically regarding how to access language. Please provide.	
<b>DHH Standard 2:</b> Development of Professional Perspectives	Reviewers were unable to find historical and legal foundations for DHH or deaf-blind, no evidence of demonstrations of sensitivity and respects for varied beliefs, languages, etc. Please provide.	
<b>DHH Standard 3:</b> Candidate Communication Skills	Hearing technology is introduced but reviewers were unable to find components regarding the contributions of innovations that benefit DHH students. Please provide.	
<b>DHH Standard 4:</b> Language and Cognitive Development Strategies	No evidence found for demonstrating knowledge of and ability to develop language and cognitive skills of students who are deaf-blind and/or those with additional disabilities. Please provide.	

Standards Requiring More Information	Comment from Program Reviewers	Response from Program
<b>DHH Standard 5:</b> Specialized Assessment	Reviewers found evidence that assessment is introduced in coursework but could not find evidence of how assessment content is practiced or assessed in coursework, clinical practicum, or student teaching.	
<b>DHH Standard 6:</b> Instructional Techniques	Reviewers found evidence that content related to individually-designed instruction is introduced for Deaf students but specific evidence could not be found for how this is practiced and assessed, and no evidence of any kind could be found for students who are deaf-blind and/or those with additional disabilities.	
<b>DHH Standard 7:</b> Early Childhood Intervention and Education	Early childhood education is introduced, and this content is practiced only as it relates to audiology. Reviewers could find no other evidence that this content is practiced or assessed for young children, only for the school-age population in practicum and student teaching activities.	
<b>DHH Standard 8:</b> Hearing Loss and Additional Disabilities	Reviewers could not find any evidence that content specific to specific learning disability, visual impairment, emotional disturbance, and autism spectrum disorder is included in coursework.	
<b>DHH Standard 9:</b> Managing Student Behavior and Social Interaction Skills	Reviewers found evidence of a course that introduces behavior and social skill content, but could not find evidence of how this content is practiced and assessed. No	

Standards Requiring More Information	Comment from Program Reviewers	Response from Program
	evidence was found on how the program addresses self-advocacy.	
<b>DHH Standard 10:</b> Transition and Transitional Planning	Reviewers found no evidence that content specific to transition is included at any point in the program.	
<b>DHH Standard 11:</b> Collaborative Partnerships	Reviewers found evidence of this content introduced, practiced and assessed but only as it relates to collaborative partnerships with families. No evidence was found for collaboration with other special and general education professionals, and community agencies.	