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Abstract

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing of the State of California mandates that teacher preparation programs prepare effective and knowledgeable pre-service teachers to teach all students. Through the use of literature review, interviews and surveys with graduating Liberal Studies students, this senior capstone examines whether Liberal Studies graduating students are being prepared to work effectively with autistic students or not. The findings indicate that they take introductory education courses on autism spectrum disorder along with other forms of disabilities, but they do not receive sufficient breadth and depth coverage on how to work effectively with autistic students in regular classrooms.
Introduction and Background

Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) has been reported to be increasing in students in general education classrooms across the nation. With this growth of students who have ASD, mainstream educators are expected to create an inclusive educational environment that will adapt to all student’s needs. In 2016, Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) revealed in the study Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring (ADDM) that the rate of autism is commonly present in 1 in every 68 individuals in the United States population (Sanz-Cervera, Fernández-Andrés, Pastor-Cerezuela, & Tárraga-Mínguez, 2017). This prevalence of students with autism at the state and national level places educators in situations of teaching students with ASD with little to no educational background on how to teach these students.

ASD is defined as a development disorder that impacts both verbal and non-verbal communication and social interaction. With an individual’s ability to communicate and concentrate being affected, teachers are questioning if their educational knowledge from the credential program is sufficient to help students with autism. The United States Department of Education states that there has been an increase of 3.29% in the special education population in 2005 to 7.02% in 2011 (Park, Harwood, Yu, Kavanagh, & Lu, 2016). Around 560,000 individuals in the U.S. ranging anywhere from birth to age 21 are living with ASD (Ruef, M., Openden, D., Harris, K., Nefdt, N., Elmensdorp, S. & Robinson, S., 2009).

As an educator in the pre-service teaching program, one is mandated to learn about the best forms of class management in order to educate all types of students. The Teaching Performance Expectations (TEPs) states that all beginning teachers need to know and apply theories and principles in an inclusive learning environment to understand all student developmental levels in order to provide effective learning for all students, including students
with disabilities. With this specific written expectation that pre-service teachers are required to learn and understand how to teach all students, including students who have disabilities in a general education classroom, it poses the question if pre-service teachers are being educated to the required state mandate. When the category of “all students” falls under the multiple subject teachers’ responsibility, one must specifically focus on the California Standards for Teaching Profession (CSTP). The CSTP states all the learning outcomes and state requirements that are to be met by all pre-service teacher before they are assigned to their own classroom. The CSTP mandates that all California pre-service teachers reach six domains; however, none of the outcomes addresses pre-service educator’s knowledge on how to help students with autism. There is no list of educational outcomes that addresses any disabilities differing needs. However it does cover the idea of an educator being able to adapt the subject matter curriculum to meet the needs of the student with disabilities. Multiple pre-service teachers are mandated 600 hours in a general education classroom but no hours are being mandated to work with students with disabilities, like autism. How are these teachers expected to perform and “adapt their subject matter” to meet the need of the students with disabilities if they lack the knowledge on how to approach them from the beginning. The particular class pre-service teachers are mandated to take that goes into depth on students with disabilities is SPED introductory course. Besides this course, mainstream, multiple-subject teachers are not required to take any other formal classes that covers information on disabilities.

Educators have a large list of responsibilities that covers more than just helping students in mainstream classrooms. They must also adapt and address materials for all forms of students with disabilities to assure their learning outcomes are at grade level standards. Along with the standards required by the state for teachers to be held up to, The Individuals with Disabilities
Education Improvement Act of 2004 also requires that students in special education are provided with a free public education. Parents who have students with disabilities are allowed to enroll their child in general education classrooms to participate with students without disabilities to ensure social interaction.

This capstone study will analyze multiple-subject pre-service teachers on their educational outlook on the subject preparation and effectiveness of autism in the credential program. The rationale for this study aims to answer my primary research question, *Do teacher preparation programs prepare multiple-subject pre-service teachers to work effectively with students who have autism? If so, How?* With increasing levels of students with autism in mainstream classrooms, multiple-subject pre-service teachers are expected to be knowledgeable on how to alter their lesson plans and teach students through inclusion programs, yet the offered educational courses that are present in the credential program lack in-depth approaches to teaching students with disabilities as a whole.

In hopes of understanding how multiple-subject pre-service teachers are educated and prepared effectively to work with students who have autism, this senior capstone research will examine reviewed literature, analyze the credential program standards set by the State of California and collected qualitative and quantitative support from surveys and interview questions. This capstone research is of significant value to the California credential programs on the effectiveness it has towards educating pre-service teachers on students with autism.

In order to support my research on the multiple-subject pre-service teachers credential program, I have created a series of questions that intend to seek the answers to support the primary research question, *Do teacher preparation programs prepare multiple-subject pre-service teachers to work effectively with students who have autism? If so, How?* The secondary
questions are; What does literature say about how programs should prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively with autistic students? Do teacher preparation programs include autism as a major component in their curriculum? How do credential programs address autism in their curriculum? What are the typical course offerings that infuse autism for training pre-service teachers at the credential level? If there are, what are some of these courses? Do the course offerings have disparities in the various credential programs; if so what are they? What can be done to better prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively with students with autism? In order to answer these questions, I will start with a review of the current academic literature.

**Literature Review**

With the statistical continuation growth of students who have autism in mainstream classrooms, literary support is presented throughout this section in order to provide more concrete evidence on the overall topic of autism. Throughout this literature review, the subtopic that will be researched and discussed are on the brief history of autism, diagnoses of autism, issues on health and finical burdens, causation and genetics, the development of programs, laws and mandates for children with autisms, and state mandates of pre-service teachers. The extensive research gathered will provide support and background on autism and the regulations credentialing programs have to follow in the State of California.

**The History of Autism**

Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder that causes difficulty with one’s ability to properly immerse in a social interaction, communicate effectively, and creates repetitive behavioral actions (Serna, R., Lobo, H., Fleming, C., Fleming, R., Curtin, C., Foran, M. and Hamad, C., 2015). The beginning of research on ASD initially evolved from U.S. and European medical literature in the mid-1940. Interestingly enough, several centuries ago
documents covered individuals exhibiting clinical profiles that match someone that is typically
classified as someone with Autism. Research conducted by Eugen Bleuler (Kuhn, R. and Cahn,
C. 2004), a Swiss psychiatrist, developed the idea of what is now called autism. Bleuler
specialized in the areas of schizophrenia, ambivalence and autism. His research began on
schizophrenia examining the psychic fusion and symptoms that an individual exhibits in
relationship to mind, soul, and spirit. The Greek word ‘schizein’ means splitting. It wasn't until
the 1979 that the idea of early childhood schizophrenia was abandoned leading to the concept of
autism (Wolff, 2004). As discussed in the journal History of Psychiatry, Bleuler (Wolff, 2004),
the research on autism expands off the idea of ambivalence. The three most basic forms of
ambivalence are: for one to have a positive and negative response combined together. It makes it
difficult to separate o feelings one from another. Another form is when an individual wants
something and at the same times does not want it. An uncertainty of one’s personal needs and
desires is warped and blurred by the constant confusion. Lastly is intellectual ambivalence when
an individual says one word but the word to them has a opposite or different meaning. This
creates uncertainty regarding effective communication. Expansion of ambivalence traces to the
research gathered on autism. Bleuler’s clinical studies to report that "autism is withdrawal of the
patient to his fantasies, against which an influence from the outside becomes an intolerable
disturbance. This seems to be the most important factor” (Kuhn & Cahn, 2004, p.364). Eugen
Bleuler’s statement, emphasizes the idea of fantasies and constant simulation from the outside
world causing distractions and disturbances in some form for the individual (Bleuler, 2004).

Utilizing Bleuler’s research, Kanner and Asperger (Kuhn, R. and Cahn, C., 2004)
expanded the concept of autism by their description of certain developmental disturbances.
Kanner and Asperger (Kuhn, R. and Cahn, C., 2004), expanded on the idea of where and how
autism develops. Initially parental neglect was one of the first thoughts to be a key factor to developing autism. From this theory, Kanner and Asperger (Kuhn, R. and Cahn, C., 2004) researched the possibility of genetic causation; for a child to be born with this disability rather than to be raised to develop it. His research studied a family of 11 children with 4 having abnormal speech, pronominal reversal, literalness and inability to use language for communication, and monotonous repetitive behaviors with and "anxiously obsessive desire for the maintenance of sameness" (Wolff, 2004, p. 203). Kanner and Asperger (Kuhn, R. and Cahn, C., 2004) also re-defined autism to a narrowly constructed symptom based off of the brain functions that deter these children from being able to socialize correctly with the outside world.

In the 1950's, it was recognized that the U.S. was populated with a magnitude of students with various levels of autism. Directing our attention to Asperger's work, he examined the commonalities between high functioning autism and Asperger syndrome (Kuhn, R. and Cahn, C. 2004). He made the connection that these individuals each reacted positively to the same special educational needs that students with brain syndromes and individuals with learning disabilities need. Children with autism generally have difficulty verbally communicating effectively; repetitive behavioral actions and lack social interaction skills (Johnson, P., Porter, K. and McPherson, I., 2012). Asperger's (Kuhn, R. and Cahn, C. 2004) work defined and drew attention to the birth of the autism spectrum which has been useful clinically and a base for the genetics of autism. When looking at the root of the word "autism," it is derived from the Greek word "autos," meaning "self." The root defines the conditions in which a person is isolated from social interaction. In other words, he becomes an “isolated self” (WebMD, 2018).

**Diagnoses of Autism**
ASD has three diagnoses; autistic disorder, Asperger's (Kuhn, R. and Cahn, C. 2004) disorder and pervasive developmental disorder. The term autism refers to the group from which the diagnoses is rooting from. When the biological factors are taken into consideration, there is no such thing as a test for autism. The diagnostic criteria is based off of behavioral impairments in the three core domains. For example, Asperger's disorder differs from autism because the individual does not experience significantly inhibited language barriers and acquires average cognitive skills. Individuals that might have pervasive developmental disorder exemplify impairment socially but they do not exhibit lacking in the language or behavioral domain. The overall autism spectrum disorder "test" is diagnosed based on deficits in the ability to socially interact, and communicate effectively. Within the past two decades, the field has increasingly encompassed a broader range of impairments than once thought. For example, children of African American decent receive diagnoses three years later compared to white children. Autism diagnosis does not need to be re-diagnosed but pervasive developmental disorder can possible develop into autism disorder.

ASD symptoms present in a wide range of diagnostic categories that can influence the impact of the disorder. Stages in which diagnosis is applicable for the child begin as young as two years old. One skill which a young child will be lacking in is the acquired language and social skills. The percentile in which a child could be lacking is anywhere from a 25% to 50% regression rate (Newschaffer, Croen, Daniels, Giarelli, Grether, Levy…Windham, 2007). The symptoms that go along with the developmental of autism are, behavioral, psychiatric and medical conditions. Behavioral are related to persistence and obsessiveness; symptoms of aggressiveness, hyperactivity and or sensory inhibition; psychiatric symptoms are anxiety or depression. Medically children between the ages of two and three with autism are susceptible to
neurological or metabolic disorders. Medical symptoms reported in children with autism are; feeding difficulties, immune system dysregulation, seizures, gastrointestinal symptoms or sleep disruption (Newschaffer, 2007). Medications are often prescribed to address behavioral issues like short attention spans and hyperactivity. It has been documented that as high as 47% of the children are on some form of medication (Newschaffer, 2007).

**Health and Financial Burden**

Considering the public health impact of children with autism, the core impairment that is associated with health issues is morbidities and expenditures. It has been documented that children who have autism have nine times the amount of health expenditures than children who are intellectually disabled. On average, $4.7 million of public expenditures, goes towards helping individuals with ASD (Newschaffer, 2007). With the healthcare system by individuals with autism, we must turn our attention to the rate at which students with autism has grown over the years. Since the 1960’s, surveys and evaluations have tracked the growth of autism over time. Beginning in 1987, many surveys documented ASD as a categorized group with its own form of disability. Autism disorder per capita was estimated to be at 5 per every 10,000 in the 1960s and 1970s; 10 per 10,000 in the 1980s; 72 per 10,000 in 1990s. The statistical evaluation of students that have autism in 2018 is documented at 147 per 10,000 individuals (Newschaffer, 2007).

**Causation and Genetics**

Looking at the causation of autism in the United States falls under various categories but all support the concept that a child is born with autism. Examining gender differentiation that evaluates the 147 out every 10,000 individuals found it to be more male dominant than female. The lower rates found in females is perhaps due to dysmorphic features. Apart from gender, race and ethnic background has been documented and explored in hopes to expose a possible
relationship to autism. California studies have shown that black mothers are at higher risk of having children with autism than Mexican-born mothers (Newschaffer, 2007). In comparison, mothers that are white, Asian, and U.S. born Hispanic mothers are lower in risk all together. At a national level, autism parenteral reports exemplify that black and white children are at a much higher risk of being born with autism then children that have are from a Hispanic background. Variation between the national and state levels creates some discrepancies on the validation and connection that the statistical evidence has on the relationship to the causation of autism as a whole. Throughout research about autism, social and environmental interactions have also been examined as an evident role in the causation. Forms of causation were directed towards the idea of poor parenting, triple vaccination inducing bowel disorders, postmodernist climate, neuropsychiatric disorders, gender imbalance, genetic mechanism, abnormal sex hormones in pregnancy, decreased melatonin for sleeping and many more (Wolff, 2004). An ongoing amount of research has been conducted through the years exploring the core contributors to autism, but there is not one leading factor that heavily contributes to the disabilities and end outcome.

Genetic liability to autism was first documented in 1977 based on the biological construct of sets of twins. Both identical twins and fraternal twins were each evaluated showing how genes play a deciphering role in autism. In the research, the fraternal twins share only half of their DNA with each other, making it so that if one child had autism the likelihood of the other child was 50% or less. When looking at identical twins, each child shares the same genes therefore making it 90% more likely that both will have autism if one carries the gene. Autism disorder amongst siblings carries a 4% to 6% chance of having autism in both (Newschaffer, 2007). This genetic makeup that is the causation to ASD is a complex and dynamic formulation of hundreds of genes that contribute to the overall outcome of autism.
It is hard to examine just one aspect in the genetic makeup because each and every outcome of autism is not exactly alike. The main dominating chromosomes that link to autism are 1p, 2p, 5q, 15q, 16p, 17q, 19p, and Xq (Newschaffer, 2007). Each one of these identifying regions with more than one genome is supports the identification of chromosomal anomalies in the outcome of autism. In the past ten years alone over 100 genes have been studied to find a connection associated with ASD. Molecular biology presses challenges for the understanding of autism by identifying the core influences of the phenotype expression. Currently, at a biological level, scientists are narrowing down the regions of linkage disequilibrium to focus on the phenotypes that autism portrays within the disorder.

Focusing at the functional genomics of autism, the molecules which the genes interact with each other produce a biochemical pathway in which the genes become potential targets for candidates causing the disorder to occur (Turner, Barnby, & Bailey, 2000). Further research is being conducted on animals to find the complex behaviors between the chromosomes. These animal models are proving useful when referring to the single gene disorder, but being that autism is linked to multiple genes as the causation, there is limited clarity on the current state of the research.

**Development of Programs**

Educational development of students with autism spectrum disorder rely heavily on teacher preparation programs and hands on teaching skills in order to be educated effectively. Students with ASD are a heterogeneous group of individuals that have a unique educational need. Public health concerns about students with ASD in the United States are increasing therefore mandating collaborative efforts from the national, state, and community levels (Park, Harwood, Yu, Kavanagh, & Lu, 2016). Since 1995 the US Department of Health has created
more developmental programs that help understand autism at a more extensive level. Some of the well-known programs that are contributing to this research are Combating Autism Act of 2006 (CAA) and Health Resources and Service Administration (HRSA).

The CAA act has helped establish funding and more knowledge through research, intervention, screening and education on the topic of autism. In 2011, the act was reauthorized to promote the health and wellbeing of individuals with ASD and other disabilities through research and training systems. Another program Health Resources and Service Administration (HRSA) helps to: increase awareness of not only ASD but other disabilities that might develop alongside it; regulate screenings and diagnosis; provide and support research to advance the outlooks on interventions; promote development of practices; train professionals on how to produce valid screening for ASD (Park, Harwood, Yu, Kavanagh, & Lu, 2016). HRSA’s mission as a federal agency is to focus on improving health equity and improving access to healthcare for unserved ethnic backgrounds regarding populations who have autism and or other disabilities. In 2008, under the HRSA’s authority the Maternal and Child Health Bureau (MCHB) was created to; include new training programs in neurodevelopmental disabilities and pediatrics to insure qualified professionals that are able to diagnose ASD properly; a new autism intervention program to promote accurate readings; improve health care and services to children with ASD and their families, as well as increase awareness. A national evaluation was also mandated by the CAA to provide statistical evidence of developmental outcomes derived from the research on ASD. Under the CAA act, both HRSA and MCHB programs are helping our nation comprehend the growth of ASD and achieve partnership with communities to establish a better understanding for individuals and families alike.
Alongside the national programs for ASD research, educational programs for students with autism in mainstream classrooms has expanded as well. Educational development programs like LEAP (Learning Experiences and Alternative Programs for Preschoolers and their Parents) are found in the classroom. Another program implemented into the school systems is treatment and education of autistic and related communication handicapped children (TEACCH). TEACCH is based off of a conceptual learning theory that accommodates visual schedules and work systems that help the student learn individually through a certain environment. This program was created to educate children with ASD in a classroom that is separated from their typical peers. LEAP on the other hand is a treatment based approach that blends children with ASD into the mainstream educational setting. Students that have ASD are taught in an inclusive approach with their same aged peers. These two forms of teaching are considered natural occurring models compared to the former models used (Boyd, Hume, McBee, Alessandri, Gutierrez, Johnson, Sperry, & Odom, 2013). These treatment models represent two different categories that fall under intervention approaches. There is a focused intervention and or comprehensive treatment models (CTM). Focused intervention emphasizes treatments that are shorter but have targeted skills on communication or behaviors. Comprehensive treatment models are based off of intervention practices and or theoretical framework for children for long durations of time in order to hit multiple developmental skills.

Laws and Mandates for Children with Autism

There are laws and state mandates that help support and protect an individual’s right to an education. In 2004, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) law was set in place and later amended in 2006. The act was created in order to help children with disabilities to have equal opportunity for full participation, independent living, and economic
self-sufficiency (Yell, Katsiyannis, Ryan, McDuffie, & Mattocks, 2008). Before 1975, students that had disabilities were not given the proper educational services they needed. Students were excluded from public school, there were no diagnostic tools and lack of resources.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act was implemented into schools around the nation helping millions of students obtain a better educational outlook. Although the act was set into place in 1975, research and knowledge lacked in the area of disabilities which affected the ability to help these students. It wasn’t until thirty years later research showed that setting higher educational expectations for these students in general education classrooms helped to maximize developmental ability, independent preparation and parental involvement in and out of the classroom setting. With improvements needed to implement programs into the schools, congress enacted the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1975 and renamed it to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2006. This law was reauthorized to expand on the design to ensure that students in special education are provided with Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE). If a school is found to violate FAPE under the IDEA by; impeding the rights of the child; impede the parent's right to participate in the special education process or cause educational deprivation to the student, the school will be taken to court and ruled against.

The individualized education program (IEP) is another mandated program that holds the school districts accountable under the IDEA. The IEP legally insures that the educators must have regular meetings with the parents to insure that they are involved with their child’s education. Meetings are to be held at least annually and must include; parents, representative from the educational agency, special education teacher, one general education teacher and an interpreter of the assessment results. These meetings are to insure that there is continual goal setting and developmental growth being implemented into the student’s educational curriculum.
A crucial component of the IEP process is the assessment process. There are two major reasons for this assessment and that is to gather evidence that the child is eligible for special education and to establish the possible instructional programs that are needed to help the child succeed. The assessments are often standardized achievement tests based off of the curriculum and functional behavioral assessments as well as a basic medical assessment. According to the United State government information on title 20 Education, Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act places responsibility on the states and educational service districts to provide a well-rounded and equal education for students with disabilities.

The Federal Government also plays a role in supporting and assisting the state and local efforts to educate students with disabilities in order to improve the results for such children under the law. If a child with disabilities is to be implemented into a general education classroom the involvement from the parent must be present and annual goals must be set, including any extracurricular activities. Modifications are to be made and support provided from the school to allow these students to participate in a classroom setting with students without disabilities (Yell, Katsiyannis, Ryan, McDuffie, & Mattocks, 2008).

**State Mandates of Pre-service Teacher**

When it comes to multiple subject teaching programs, each state varies in the requirements needed to be a certified educator. According to California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, the programs create local career ladders that enable school paraprofessional to become certificated classroom teachers (Brown, E., 2011). Within the State of California, there are six standards that are to be met called the CSTP (California Standards for Teaching Profession); Standard 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning; Standard 2:
Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning; Standard 3:
Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning; Standard 4: Planning
Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students; Standard 5: Assessing
Students for Learning; Standard 6: Developing as a Professional Educator (Ctc.ca.gov, 2017).
The state standards for multiple subject pre-service teachers is taught within the curriculum of
the core courses mandated by the State of California.

The courses vary depending on the university but are approved by the state overall.
Example A, is a typical example of a special education class that is offered to multiple subject
pre-service teacher. This specific course covers all disabilities that might be commonly found
within a general education setting. In Example A, there is a small section in the course that
covers the topic of autism. One class is mandated by the state regarding special education
students, along with courses on classroom management and how to teach core subjects. A total
of 600 hours in a general education classroom is mandated in order for a pre-service teacher to
become a licensed educator in the State of California (Ctc.ca.gov, 2017).

(Example A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autism Spectrum Disorders &amp; Communication Disorders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prevalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distinguishing Unproven Interventions from Evidenced-Based Practices for Children with Autism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch. 7 &amp; 8</th>
<th>Quiz #7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic Presentation (ASD)</td>
<td>Parent Interview Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retrieved from: (Fresnostate.edu, 2018)
Education for pre-service teachers in the State of California expands more into the logistical content that is written within the Teaching Performance Expectations document itself. State mandates for pre-service teachers follows the outline addressing that all students are to be educated under the law.

California state mandates for multiple subject teachers has varying outlooks of what a educator is to know in order to teach "all students," including students with disabilities. The Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) is a document that comprises all the state mandates of knowledge, skills, and abilities that beginning general education teachers are to know before being approved by the state. The TPEs are research based and aligned with the national state standards along with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The CSTP is a document that helps California teachers prepare beginning educators by mentoring them in their first year of employment. Educators are to practice and educate in an all-inclusive learning environment to understand all students developmental levels to provide appropriate assessments (CTC.ca.gov, 2017).

The categorization of all students encompasses all students with disabilities in general education classrooms. The term "all students" is defined in depth within the TPE document addressing all students that are enrolled in general public education and/or exhibit learning and behavioral characteristics, dyslexia, intellectual or academic advancement, ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, first language in English, English learners, Standard English learners, and/or geographic origin.

Pre-service teachers are held accountable for all students' academic learning outcomes. Narrowing in on students with disabilities, the criteria for clinical sites on school grounds is
based off of ongoing practices and continuous program improvement in order to support teaching and learning for students that have disabilities. Students with autism have programs such as LEAP and TEACCH implemented into some schools to better facilitate the child's learning. However students with disabilities that are not enrolled within a clinical program provided through the school system are placed in a general education classroom and are supported by TEP 3 and 4.

In TEP 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Students Learning, it states that beginning teachers are to adapt subject curriculum to organize and support students with disabilities. Pre-service educators are mandated to create and design their own pedagogy that engages and supports all students’ learning curves that fit within the California State Standards (p.7). TEP 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students.

This TEP elaborates that beginning teachers are to learn how to design, plan, implement and monitor instruction for all students’ optimum learning. Alterations and/or modifications are to be made for students with disabilities in a general education classroom. A student’s success is to be promoted by opportunities provided by the teacher’s knowledge of learned strategies and/or specific needs in order for the student to participate in the lesson. Possible methods to help a child with disabilities is to extend help through other programs such as; Individualized Education Program (IEP), Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP), Individualized Transition Plan (ITP), and 504 plan (p. 8). The IEP and 504 plans are similar in that they were created to help students with disabilities within a curriculum but vary in the way they help the child. IEP is a made to help the student under a specially designed instruction by altering the curriculum that will result in achieving set goals over a period of time. A 504 plan does not change the curriculum that the student receives. The changes that are predominantly seen in a 504 plan are to have a child
sitting in front of the class or extended time on exams. Beginning teachers acquire the knowledge through TEP in order to effectively know how to target students with learning disabilities and make adjustments for their benefit along with the rest of the students in the class. The continuous repetition of incorporating the word “all student” depicts that multiple subject per-service teachers are to be prepared through TEP on how to teach all students no matter race, gender and or disability (CTC.ca.gov, 2017).

**Methods and Procedures**

In the beginning of the semester, I had a clear idea on my topic. To research students in the teacher preparation programs to determine if the multiple-subject pre-service teachers are adequately prepared to work effectively with students on the autism spectrum? If so, How? I wanted to explore the credential program that is in my near future, in order to determine the preparation I will be given to educate students who have autism. To explore this topic, I had to compile in depth questions as a component of the research to come to conclusions. The secondary questions I developed, help to support the primary question and are also implemented into the interviews I conducted throughout the project.

With the completion of my prospectus paper (See research prospectus section in Capstone Binder) and the meetings with Dr. Thao, I was able to narrow my focus even more and finalize the complete outline of my research. The primary and secondary questions were created from peer-reviewed scholarly articles and helped to expand more into depth the main topic. The conduction of the research was easy after finding viable evidence through online peer-review articles. The literature review research was quite extensive and many of the articles were recent in statistical evidence. All of the peer reviewed journals and books were found from in the university's library database and on google scholar. Along with researching, reading, and
obtaining new knowledge, I was able to expand my understanding and perspective by interviewing and communicating with individuals connected to the state credential program.

In order to gather viable information on how multiple-subject pre-service teachers are being educated in the credential programs, I had to communicate via email to a California state university on their particular credential program and their courses mandated by the state. With direct contact through the university, I obtained information from the Credential Analysis Coordinator who provided viable documentation on the state mandates, preconditions, common standards and program standards (Appendix F). The analysis provided insight on the funding going to the program across the state as well as the emphasis on standards that each program must meet. I also interviewed Josh H., professor from the Special Educations Program Department of Education and Leadership at a current California state university. The interview with Josh H. focused on the degree of knowledge multiple-subject pre-service teachers are receiving when it comes to teaching students with autism in a general education classroom (Appendix E).

With further understanding on the multiple-subject pre-service teacher courses and state mandates for the teaching program, I was able to expand my research by creating a survey specifically for pre-service teachers regarding their personal feelings on their learning outcomes when teaching students who have autism. Before sending out the survey it had to be approved by the Coordinator Chair of the Education and Leadership Department. After being approved, an email was sent out to a total of 45 students attending a specific California state university. The survey was presented through a google survey format, to multiple-subject pre-service teachers at varying levels in the program (Appendix A). The total participants that completed the survey were four. Being that I was in contact with Cathi R., the Chair of the Education and Leadership
Department, about the survey, I was also able to conduct a personal interview to grasp an understanding of the overall components that make up a credential program (Appendix C). In line with a Chair of the credential program, I was also able to contact a Program Manager III in the Department of SPED in the Fresno Unified School District. Her job is to improve student’s achievements in the special education program throughout the school district. With an interview via email, I was able to explore an inside perspective regarding general education teachers and their ability to work with students with autism/disabilities.

Following the research survey for pre-service teachers, I was able to contact several multiple-subject pre-service teachers and interviewed them via email to obtain a more personal outlook on their credential program. The questions in this interview (Appendix B) were similar to the questions in the survey, but allowed the pre-service teachers to describe their overall feelings with more description. Through researching the personal ideals and the structural mandates observed through my interviews, I created a final set of questions (Appendix G) for current teachers in general education classrooms that have completed a credential program. This extension of interviews outside pre-service teaching programs, provided the perspective of current general education teacher’s and if they felt prepared to teach students with autism in their classrooms. I obtained a total of two interviews with general education teachers.

Materials

I designed my set of questions to be directed toward an audience of pre-service teachers in a credential program within the State of California and or faculty that work within the guidelines of the program. Overall I was able to obtain; four survey answers from pre-service teachers in a teaching program (Appendix A); one interview online with a Credential Analysis Coordinator (Appendix F); one in person interview with Special Education Program Department
of Education and Leadership (Appendix E); one in person interview with the Chair of the Education and Leadership Department (Appendix C); two email interview with general education teachers (Appendix G); one email interview with pre-service teacher (Appendix B); one email interview with Program Manager III Department of SPED (Appendix D).

Results and Discussion

After spending weeks preparing my research, I was able to compile my collected interviews and survey in order to answer my secondary questions. By expanding my research from peer-reviewed journals to actual fieldwork, I was able to exhaust the secondary questions on all different spectrums of the teacher credential program. Through my interviews with the various participants, I was able to have my secondary research questions answered. As the secondary questions are listed, my documentation of the interviews will be noted and discussed.

(1) What does literature say about how programs presently prepare multiple-subject pre-service teachers to work effectively with students who have autism?

With increasing levels of autism being integrated into the general education classrooms, effective teacher training programs have become a necessity for the wellbeing of all students. Impending reauthorization of both Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) demonstrates the undoubtable presence of student with ASD being enrolled in inclusive classrooms.

According to the journal, Teachers Education in Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Potential Blueprint, teachers must be prepared to meet students with such needs. There has been statistical evidence collected through the National Research Council that a lack of expertise in the area of ASD has shown through the years (Shyman, E., 2012). Little research has been conducted to gauge pre-service teacher’s current standing on their education regarding autism. In order to
improve the process there must be standards and accountability set in place in order to measure teacher quality on the topic and to re-define, measure, and improve the preparation of education in the credential program.

The program for multiple subject teaching credential students is run by a multiple theory teaching approach. The program provides suggestive alternative teaching forms in order to individualize rather than fit all students in a classification. The problem with the multiple theory approach is that the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standards states that all children are to be educated and helped. However, the courses provided by the credential program require only one class focusing on all students with disabilities.

Some university programs do not offer a course they discuss topics about disabilities in a sporadic approach throughout their time in the program. There are not any required hours spent with students with disabilities in the classroom for pre-service teachers. Many pre-service teachers are given a basic comprehension of possible students that might be in their classrooms but have no hands on experience working with them. Some of the trends that teaching programs focus on are; the reactive strategies on behavioral problems for students with ASD; general certification and standards; general classroom management certification with a teaching credential does not necessarily mean that one is qualified to educate students with ASD in an infused classroom setting. Studies have shown that 5% of teachers receive training about autism even though the majority of them have a child with autism in their class (Lindsay, Proulx, Thomson, & Scott, 2013). Based off data gathered from an article, “Educators’ Challenges of Including Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder in Mainstream Classrooms”, Lindsey (2013) stated that teachers have a hard time understanding how to manage the student’s behavior and they felt that they lacked adequate information about ASD. Downs, A. and Downs, R., (2012)
states that it is difficult to engage students with ASD; it is hard to get through to them; as well as having to explain to other children why a student (with ASD) needs more time or care. The students with ASD often create distractions for the rest of the class. From the Evidence-Based Practices in The Public School journal it states, “Whaley (2002) found that some teachers did have good general knowledge about ASD, but lacked training related to research based methods that should be used in the classroom” (Lauderdale-Littin, S., 2018). Many components are involved when having a student with ASD in a classroom but teachers cannot teach a child if they do not understand the core problem with the child themself. The literature review on teaching students with autism finds that educators have a lack of preparation provided to them within the teaching credential program. The article, Teaching Children with Autism: Addressing Teacher Challenges and Preparation Needs, reveals a survey of statistical support proving general education teachers lack preparation in the credential program when working with students who have autism. In a survey sent out, 63% responded that they felt they needed more support (Busby, R., Ingram, R., Bowron, R., Oliver, J. & Lyons, B., 2012). The research conducted extended the understanding past the peer-reviewed articles to determine if the teaching programs include autism as a component in their curriculum.

(2) Do teacher preparation programs include autism as a component in their curriculum?

Teaching preparation programs are based off the state standards and each standard must be met within the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program. (Appendix H). According to the Credential Analysis Coordinator interview, the Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE) document states that all approved teaching credential programs in the State of California must be upheld to the state preconditions, common standards, and
program standards. The Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standards document expands on the purpose of the TPE’s:

“The TPEs are research-based and aligned to national teaching standards expectations. They link to expectations set forth in California's adopted content standards for students. They require beginning teachers to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments to meet the needs of each and every student and to model digital literacy and ethical digital citizenship” (CTC.ca.gov, 2017).

This particular piece of text presents that the TPE is a comprised body of knowledge that pre-service teachers are to know in order to provide an effective and positive learning experience for all students. Within this document there are strategies and specific pedagogical outlooks that are to be taught and executed for the benefit of all, including students with disabilities. Refer back to the literature review on the state mandates for pre-service teachers, in reference to the defining term of “all students” frequently used throughout this document. The interview with the Credential Analysis Coordinator discussed the mandated clinical practices across the credential program is a total of 600 hours, found in Standard 3 for Multiple and Single Subject programs in California. The hours are all performed in a general education classroom, while Special Education pre-service teachers are to do 600 hours in a general education classroom and special education (CTC.ca.gov, 2017).

Cathi R., the Chair of the Education and Leadership Department, explained that there is always room for improvement, but the time the students spend in the classroom gives them hands on time with all types of students. Mrs. R. also explained that Multiple Subject pre-service teachers are to learn how to create lesson modifications plans for students with disabilities. Within the lesson plan building and the hands on hours in the classroom, the credential program
mandates for general education teachers to be educated about all forms of disabilities the pre-service teachers might see in a classroom (CTC.ca.gov, 2017).

Based on the survey findings sent out to only multiple-subject pre-service teachers, 100% answered no to the question, Do you feel teacher preparation programs include autism as a major component in their curricula? Out of the four responses, three were 2nd year students and one was other? Aligned with the pre-service teacher’s responses to the survey, my interview with Josh H., the Special Educations Program Department of Education and Leadership, explained that students are not being prepared to work effectively with students with autism. Most university classes incorporate into the curriculum the subject of disabilities, but do not specifically go into depth on working with students with autism other than a few lessons to teach pre-service teachers what it is and how to modify a lesson plan if need be. There is a disconnect of learning about students with disabilities and then having to actually experience working with these students one on one. General education teachers that have completed the statewide credential program have a generalized knowledge on all disabilities but lack in understanding the specifics of how to teach them individually. Considering this deficit, general education teachers and special education teachers need to work hand in hand with each other when a child is in an infusion program, in order to meet with their specific needs. Since general education teachers are mandated to take a course on disabilities, perhaps to obtain a better understanding on what these teachers are learning we must look into depth at a typical syllabus within California state guidelines (Appendix I).

(3) How do credential programs address autism in their curriculum?
Courses are the main component for the expansion of knowledge for pre-service teachers regarding students with disabilities. The course that is taught within a California State University credential program provides a surface level information on the disabilities that one might find in a general education classroom (Appendix I). In Appendix I, there is a course description of a disabilities class offered through a California State University credential program. Within this syllabus, there is one section that discusses autism spectrum disorder and what the characteristics are and service providers that could help one as an educator. Pre-service teachers are being educated on the subject matter through tests and simulations rather than hands on experience.

Through my interview process, Josh H. the Special Educations Program Department of Education and Leadership offered his own personal insight; that it is hard to discuss all the different forms of disabilities that students can have in just one class. Josh H. personally believes that general education pre-service teachers should do more in-service training to learn how to adjust their curriculum for a child's benefit. He also stated that multiple-subject teachers are taught how to teach the masses and not one specific student compared to special education teachers that work one on one with students.

On the other hand, Cathi R. the Chair of the Education and Leadership Department claimed that there is not a major component about autism in the credential program because it is left for the special education pre-service teachers to go more into depth. Pre-service teachers are taught how to make certain modifications to help students with ASD in their general education classroom. Josh H. and Cathi R. each have individual ideas on the topic of autism being taught in the program itself. Cathi R. presents that general education pre-service teachers are to be doing hours in general education classrooms only because that is the student dynamic that they will be teaching in. However within our interview she did express that general education teachers will
have some experience with students with disabilities in their in-service hours. When I interviewed a current general education teacher, her response to the credential program addressing autism was that she took a generalized course on special needs children.

Overall, the credential program does address autism but only within one course, offering minimal expansion on the topic. The discussion on the topic of autism lasts over the course of a few chapters in the textbook readings and reflection on their knowledge is documented and graded by quizzes and essays. Exploring more in depth on the typical course offerings that incorporate autism training pre-service teachers could expand off of the special education course syllabus.

(4) What are the typical course offerings that incorporate autism training for pre-service teachers at the credential level? If there are, what are some of these courses?

Implemented into the teacher credential program is a standard conformed course that covers the overall defining factor of “all students”. Since the teaching program is directed towards general education teaching, pre-service teachers are to take classes on how to teach to the masses of general education students. Hours are also mandated by these students to take in only general education classrooms. In the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standards document (Appendix H) all students are to be taught by the educator if placed in their classroom. The definition of all students exemplified in this document is,

“This phrase is intended as a widely inclusive term that references all students attending public schools. Students may exhibit a wide range of learning and behavioral characteristics, as well as disabilities, dyslexia, intellectual or academic advancement, and differences based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status,
gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, and/or geographic origin” (Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standards document p. 3).

With a more in depth look at what the spectrum of all students means within this legal document, disabilities is listed but stands alone as a broad definition. Being that students with disabilities are immersed into a general education classroom, the standards still apply towards their learning.

The interview with Josh H. explained that there is only one class that multiple-subject pre-service students are required to take. For a better visual understanding on this course outline, refer to Appendix I. This particular course syllabus was taken from a California State University teaching credential program for multiple-subjects. The overall course is 16 weeks long and covers a total of one week about diagnoses for students with ASD, OHI and the visually impaired. In this one week it is listed that students learn about the characteristics and the atypical and typical developments of these listed disabilities. The coursework that pre-service teachers are to do for this week long lesson are to answer questions from the books readings, compete a quiz and correspond with their classmates through their online portal on the topic. There is one mandated case study, and one lesson plan modification that pre-service teachers are to complete throughout the 16 week course.

When referring to the survey questions form 100% of them feel that the teaching preparation program do not include autism as a major component in their curricula. Also documented that 75% of pre-service teachers do not feel educated on how to teach students with autism and 100% of the pre-service teachers felt that they needed to learn more on how to teach these students. When asked if any other courses in their program have provided knowledge on
the topic of autism, they responded with only the one special education basic course. A personal interview I conducted with a pre-service teacher expressed,

“I believe that teacher preparation programs are brushing over preparing teachers to work with students with autism. I am currently in the credential program and so far some of our professors tell us about students with special needs but not specifically students with autism. There has not been really anything to deal with those students with autism. I have gotten my experience working with students with autism by being out in the classroom and actually working with those students. But the program does not prepare you for the students with behavioral issues in class situations. Everything is done by a simulation of a lesson plan or a possible modification of a certain situation that could happen”(Pre-service Teacher, Personal Communication, 30th March, 2018).

An interview of a current general education teacher and her opinion on her educational background on autism was done. In the interview, she explained that she took one course in the credential program on special education students but it did not go into depth on the topic of autism. Being an educator for twenty plus years in the field, she expressed that there is a greater need for pre-service teachers to be more educated on the subject of autism, along with the idea that it would benefit them more if they spent some hours in an autistic special education classroom. The overall special education course that pre-service teachers are mandated to take reinforces the same standards, but is the course content the same across the state and or nation (CTC.ca.gov, 2017).

(5) Do the course offerings have disparities in the various credential programs; if so what are they?
The California State credential program document mandates that pre-service teachers are to be taught how to create lesson plans and are able to produce appropriate modifications for the student with disabilities in their classroom. When it comes to varying disparities found from one California State University to another, there are very little variances. The variation of the courses on how they are presented to the pre-service teachers may be taught in different formats but the content within the courses has the same state standards across the board. The format of the course on disabilities and/or SPED course introduces degrees of autism and other disabilities.

According to, Josh H. of Special Educations Program Department of Education and Leadership the teaching programs are shaped around the standard mandated by the state. In order for the credential program to be funded by the state, the university has to be reviewed and approved by the board of education. The courses can be modified by the state if they see fit. Many universities within the last five years have implemented a whole SPED course dedicated to learning about students with disabilities. Before a whole course was dedicated to learning about special education students, the class content would be infused sporadically throughout the whole program in various courses.

The interview with the Credential Analysis Coordinator stated that on February 7, 2018 there was discussion at the state level about requiring clinical practice hours in the Special Education setting for General Education teachers (Altmayer, C., Campbell, T., Correa, L. & White, J., 2016). With the possible implementation of field hours in a special education classroom for multiple subject pre-service teachers would create some disparities for a few years as the universities implement the new state standard into their programs.

Another disparity within the California state university is that students become co-teachers starting the first day of the credential program, while other universities slowly integrate
their pre-service students into a classroom. Changes within the credential program at the state level are occurring slowly, but when evaluating disparities currently between different credential programs, there are very few. At the foundation of the teaching credential program, according to Cathi R., Chair of the Education and Leadership Department, is in constant improvement in order to prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively with “all” students including those with autism.

(6) What can be done to better prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively with students with autism?

Improvements can always be made to the teaching credential program in order to prepare pre-service teachers for their future classrooms. The pre-service teachers personal feelings on the topic of autism being implemented into their curriculum was divided 50/50. Half of them felt that they should learn more about the topic in more than one course and the other half felt that they were prepared enough. In the survey pre-service teachers agreed 100% agreeance that as part of the credential program it would be helpful if there were in-service training to work with students with autism. At the end of the survey the pre-service teachers were questioned on what is the importance of learning about autism in a credential program and they responded:

“There is definitely a chance that we are going to have an autistic student, or someone who is “on the spectrum” in our class. Inclusion is so important to help mainstream these students and having teachers without this knowledge, how do they expect teachers to do that. These students are just as important and should get the opportunity and help they deserve and need to become successful”

(Pre-service Teacher, Survey, 2nd March, 2018).

“To best serve all students. Instead of learning theory in a class setting. It’s better to learn hands on in the child’s room.
Students will come into your class with a variety of different needs, and it is important to be educated on their needs (as much as possible)” (Pre-service Teacher, Survey, 2nd March, 2018).

“While I feel autism is important, I don't feel that there should be more classes to address it. Instead of adding more classes, it should be integrated within the classes we take. It could have a stronger presence in the SPED class I am currently taking right now (maybe it will, we still have a little less than three months)” (Pre-service Teacher, Survey, 2nd March, 2018).

The pre-service students appear to understand the possibility of having students in their future classrooms and express in Appendix A that they feel overall that they are not prepared enough on the subject. In the general education teacher interview, the participant expressed that teacher preparation programs are not teaching effectively on how to help students on the autism spectrum in general education classrooms. When it comes to finding a better form of preparing pre-service teachers to work effectively with students with autism she states,

“I think the autism diagnosis is such a huge umbrella of severe to moderate issues that it would be very challenging for any college program to address all those needs. Plus it’s been my experience that the students I’ve had with a diagnosis of “Autism” have had a few similarities in their needs and behaviors but as a general population have very different issues. In my opinion a pre-service teacher would benefit from spending their hours in an autistic special ed classroom”(General Education Teacher, Virtual Communication, 30 March, 2018).

With personal insight from a general education educator on how to improve pre-service teachers’ knowledge on students with disabilities, she also expressed that as a current teacher she
has not received training on how to help a child effectively if they do have some level of autism. Some assistance has been provided from the district office but hours spent in a classroom would better benefit teachers for the future. The Program Manager III Department of SPED suggested that based on the new teachers she works with, most of the multiple subject teachers feel they do not have the skill set to effectively teach students with Autism. Some of the multiple-subject teachers feel students with Autism are the special education teacher’s responsibility and often expect special education teachers to provide for the needs of the student because the training the multiple subject teachers receive is minimal. As a Program Manager III Department of SPED stated;

“Pre Service teachers need to understand Autism, how to deal with behaviors that may impede their learning or the learning of others. They need to understand how to provide visual schedules, work tasks, and social stories through evidence based practices. Mindset of pre service teachers is important as well, they need to believe that all students have equitable educational options to engage in high quality instruction in the least restrictive environment with high expectations, individualized for each student to be college, career and community ready” (Program Manager III Department of SPED, Virtual Communication, 11 March, 2018).

In agreeance with the Program Manager III Department of SPED, pre-service teachers and general education teachers, Josh H. of Special Educations Program Department of Education and Leadership believes that 600 hours for general education teachers should be expanded and mandated for students to working with students with disabilities to neutralize the notions created by society. Experience hours in a special education classroom should be mandated for general education teachers in the credential program. The special education students are required to do practical’s in which they are placed in a situation with a student with disabilities and are asked to
come up with ways for the student to reach their goal and improve their overall growth. Similar practicums should be done with general education students. There should be more supportive roles between both general educators and special educators to work together for the welfare of “all” students

In correlation with the interviews that have been conducted throughout the research, the overall end outcome that will better prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively with students with autism is hands on field work. Pre-service teachers should be mandated to have documented hours in a special education classroom that will provide exposure and application to what they are learning in their course work. With these mandated hours multiple-subject pre-service teachers will feel more prepared on how to work effectively with these types of students.

Problems and Limitations

The process of obtaining information to answer the research questions requires an extensive amount of interviews conducted with various individuals that were personally connected to the teaching credential program in some form. In the research I did find it difficult to rely on individuals to answer my interview questions within a strict amount of time.

As I was gathering the information from my interviewees, I was having to wait weeks for a response and some did not respond at all. In the interviews with Josh. H, the Special Educations Program Department of Education and Leadership and Cathi R., the Chair of the Education and Leadership Department, I had to make interview appointments a month in advance which prolonged my results and findings.

Another problem that I encountered was the survey I conducted for pre-service teachers had to be approved by the Chair of the Education and Leadership Department, which took two weeks to be approved and sent out to all multiple-subject pre-service teachers. The survey was
sent out to forty-five students and I received a total of four responses. The end response to the pre-service teacher survey had limitations because I felt that I did not obtain a large enough sample for reliability and to effectively determine how pre-service teachers felt about their program.

I also sent out interview questions to two pre-service teachers and received only one response. With the minor problems of time and reliance upon individuals in response to my research, I was still able to gather enough information from my literature review and other interviews to make a well-rounded observation in response to my primary question.

Now that I have completed this project, I feel there could have been other ways I could have reinforced and conducted my research to improve its reliability. Upon completion of this project, I feel that I have obtained a better understanding of what to expect in the teaching credential program. I am now aware of the role I will have to perform as a teacher in a regular education classroom, and the educational expectations that I have throughout the credential program as a multiple-subject pre-service teacher.

**Recommendation**

Through the research, it is essential for educators to be knowledgeable on how to teach students with autism. As stated from the interview with the Program Manager III Department of SPED, “There are not ‘requirements’ to be enrolled into a mainstream classroom. All students are GE students first” (Program Manager III Department of SPED, Virtual Communication, 11 March, 2018). With the statement, “all students are general education students first” (Program Manager III Department of SPED, Virtual Communication, 11 March, 2018) it exemplifies that general education teachers should be educated more in depth about students with disabilities because they fall under the definition of all students. The general education curriculum should
be expanded to incorporate more information specifically about ASD and its management in order to effectively infuse them into the mainstream classroom. Clinical classroom hours should be mandated and implemented into the standard curriculum for pre-service teachers in order to be educated on how to teach students with autism or any disability. Within the 600 hours required by the State of California for pre-service teachers to complete, there should be a minimum of 30 hours in the field spent in a special education classroom.

**Conclusion**

This senior capstone research project examines how teacher preparation programs prepare multiple subject pre-service teachers to work effectively with students on the autism spectrum. Through my research, in regards to answering my primarily question: Do teacher preparation programs prepare multiple-subject pre-service teachers to work effectively with students who have autism? If so, How? I found that multiple-subject pre-service teacher credential programs have upheld State standards that have included and incorporated introductory information on students with disabilities. The standards require lesson plan modifications and characteristic descriptions of students with disabilities but lack hands on fieldwork in a classroom setting. Documented in the California State mandates for credential teachers, all students are to be given equal opportunity to excel in their class with the help of their educators. With this equal opportunity directed towards all forms of students, I researched in depth on how teacher preparation programs prepared multiple-subject pre-service teachers to work effectively with students on the autism spectrum.

To this I found that the functionality of the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standards mandates that beginning teachers are to have the knowledge and ability to teach all students in a general education setting. When placing
emphasis on students with autism in particular, the end outcome of my research exemplified that
the teaching credential program did address ASD in one special education course or discussed
sporadically throughout the overall program. With the introduction of ASD students into the
classrooms, pre-service teachers are exposed to possible characteristics and behavioral
expectations. The interviews and survey that I conducted throughout the span of two months
revealed that pre-service teachers do not personally feel that they are being educated enough that
they feel comfortable with having a student with ASD this in their classroom. Likewise a current
teacher in a general education classroom explained that she did not feel that she was adequately
prepared to teach students with autism.

Not only does the research support how multiple-subject pre-service teachers are not
being prepared to work with students on the autism spectrum, but my literature review exposed
that the growth of autism is increasing in regular education classrooms because of the inclusive
approach to student learning. Program Manager III Department of SPED stated that students
with autism often have above average intelligence and can be successful in a regular education
classroom if the right support is provided. The more that students are being blended into a
general education setting the more likely multiple-subject teachers will have ASD students in
their classrooms in the future. In order to educate and better prepare multiple-subject pre-service
teachers to teach students with autism, there must be a mandated implementation of general
education pre-service teachers to spend hours in a special education setting. Hours in a special
education classroom will not only expose pre-service teachers on how to handle behavioral
situations but it will also dissipate the fear on how to teach an individual with autism and or any
disability. Fear derives from the lack of understanding, take that fear away and the opportunity
for optimum success is insurmountable.
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Appendix A
Survey to Multiple Subject Pre-Service Teachers

Instructions
Hi, My name is Makalah Vosmera and I am conducting a senior capstone research on multiple-subject credential students and their knowledge on working with students with autism in the mainstream classrooms. This is an anonymous survey that will strictly go to my research. If you have any questions feel free to email me at mvosmera@csumb.edu

1) What semester are you in your credential program?
   1. 1st
   2. 2nd
   3. other

2) Do you feel teacher preparation programs include autism as a major component in their curricula?
   1. Yes
   2. No

3) Do you feel you have been educated on how to teach students with autism in your future classrooms?
   1. Yes
   2. No

4) Do you feel you need to learn more on how to teach students with autism?
   1. Yes
   2. No

5) What courses have you taken that offer training and knowledge on teaching students with autism in the credential program?
   Long answer text

6) Should there be more courses that cover teaching students with autism for you as a future educator to feel more prepared?
   1. Yes
   2. No
7) As part of the credential program, would it help to work with students with autism in the classroom to be better prepared?

1. Yes
2. No

8) Should the teaching credential program expand more on autism?

1. Yes
2. No

9) Why is it important to learn about autism in a credential program?

Long answer text
Appendix B

Interview Questions to Multiple Subject Pre-Service Teachers

1. Do you believe that teacher preparation programs are preparing you as a multiple-subject pre-service teacher to work effectively with students on the autism spectrum?

2. Is learning about autism a major component in the curricula for the credential program?

3. Can you list the typical course or courses that you feel have taught you about autism and trained you as a pre-service teachers to be better prepared as a future educator?
   a. What does your course cover in class about autism?
   b. What things do you think should be emphasized on this topic to better prepare you as a future teacher?

4. What do you think can be done to better prepare you as a pre-service teachers to work effectively with students who have autism?

5. Do you think there is enough time being allotted to you as a pre-service teacher to learn about autism? What would be appropriate?
6. Do you think that you will teach students who have autism in your future classrooms? If so Why?

7. Is there anything else you would like to add?
Appendix C

Interview Questions to the Chair of the Education and Leadership Department

1. What is your job description?

2. Do you believe that teacher preparation programs prepare multiple-subject pre-service teachers to work effectively with students on the autism spectrum?

3. Is learning about autism a major component in the curricula for the credential program?

4. Does the credential program address autism in their curriculum? How is it covered?
   a. Do you believe that there should be more emphasis on this topic to better prepare teachers in their classrooms?

4. Can you list the typical course offerings that infuse autism for training pre-service teachers at the credential level?
a. Do you think the course offerings have varying disparities compared to other credential programs? What differences are there?

5. What do you think can be done to better prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively with students who have autism?

6. Do you think there is enough time being allotted for pre-service teachers to learn about autism?

7. Does every credential program for multiple-subject per-service teachers have the same courses mandated or can they vary?

8. If a student is in the credential/master program, do the pre-service teachers miss some courses that they would have taken if they were just doing their teaching credential? Are there any differences in regards to the subject of autism?
Appendix D

Interview Questions to the Program Manager III Department of SPED

1. What is your job description?

2. Do you think there is an increase of students who have autism being enrolled in mainstream classrooms?

3. What are the requirements for students who have autism to be enrolled into mainstream classrooms?

4. Do you think multiple-subject teachers are being well educated on how to help students with autism in mainstream classrooms? Why or why not?

5. Are there any in-service courses that are offered for current teachers that can better prepare them to work with students who have autism?

6. Do you believe there should be more emphasis on autism in the teacher credential programs to better prepare teachers in their classrooms?

7. What do you think can be done to better prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively
with students who have autism?

8. Is there any other information you would like to share regarding the subject of children on the autism spectrum?
Appendix E

Interview Questions to Professor & Coordinator of Special Education Program

1. What is your job description?

2. Do you believe that teacher preparation programs prepare multiple-subject pre-service teachers to work effectively with students on the autism spectrum?

3. Is learning about autism a major component in the curricula for the credential program?

4. Can you list the typical course offerings that infuse autism for training pre-service teachers at the credential level?
   a. Do you think the course offerings have varying disparities between credential programs?

2. Does the credential program address autism in their curriculum?
   a. What is covered in the class about the subject?
b. Do you believe that there should be more emphasis on this topic to better prepare teacher for their classrooms?

5. What do you think can be done to better prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively with students who have autism?

6. Do you think there is enough time being allotted for pre-service teachers to learn about autism?

7. Do you think there is an increase of students who have autism being enrolled in mainstream classrooms? If so why?
Appendix F

Interview Questions to Credential Analyst

1. Why do the multiple subject teachers not have any hands-on classroom training requirements when teaching students with special needs such as autism? However special education teachers are required to have time with general education students, inclusive students, and students in special education.

2. How many classroom hours are multiple subject teachers required to have total?

3. Have there been any recent changes made by the state to the credential program?

4. How are credential programs accommodating their curriculum in regards to students with autism disorder being mainstreamed into the general classroom?

5. What are the typical course offerings that infuse autism for training pre-service teachers at the credential level?
   a. If there are, what are some of these courses?
   b. Do the course offerings have disparities in the various credential programs?
Appendix G

Interview Questions to General Education Teacher

1. Do you feel that your teacher preparation program prepared you as a multiple-subject pre-service teacher to work effectively with students on the autism spectrum?

2. Was learning about autism a major component in the curricula for the credential program?

3. Can you list possible course offerings that infused autism at the credential level?

4. Do you feel that there should be more emphasis on the topic of autism to better prepare teachers for their classrooms?

5. Do you or have you had students in your classroom with autism?
   a. Were you trained on how to help the child effectively?

6. Have you taken any courses after obtaining your teaching credential that have helped you on the subject of autism?

7. What do you think can be done to better prepare pre-service teachers to work effectively with students who have autism?

8. In the California state teaching credential programs there is a 600 hours requirement for every pre-service teacher to fulfill in a general education classroom. Do you feel that
there should be hours allotted for pre-service teachers in special education classroom?

9. Do you think there is enough time being allotted for pre-service teachers to learn about autism?

10. Do you think there is an increase of students who have autism being enrolled in mainstream classrooms?
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SPED Course Syllabus

Department of Education and Leadership
Special Education Programs
SPED - Inclusionary Practices for Students with Special Needs
Spring 2018

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Mission
The College of Education is committed to the preparation and professional development of innovative scholar-practitioners who implement evidence-based practices that support and promote overcoming achievement gaps that result in success for all.

To accomplish this mission we strive to develop caring educators who demonstrate:

EXCELLENCE
- Professional knowledge base
- Pedagogical and leadership skills
- Professional dispositions

EQUITY
- Ethnic diversity
- Linguistic diversity
- Diversity of ability

ETHICAL ACTION
- Educators take ethical action in schools and in the world
- Ethical action is an outcome of effective education in order to effectively facilitate learning for all students so that they can fully participate in a dynamic society and world.

PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS EXPECTED OF CANDIDATES
Faculty model and encourage all candidates to reflect dispositions that represent the values and attitudes expected of professionals in the field of education. These dispositions are based on the Education Unit’s conceptual framework and encompass several behavioral indicators within the three program outcomes. As candidates move through their programs it is expected they demonstrate these dispositions.

COURSE DESCRIPTION
Provides participants with the required competencies to assist in teaching exceptional students, and information needed to meet federal and state mandates for serving children and youth with disabilities in schools. The course includes exploration of educational laws, IEPs, service delivery systems, modification of instructional methods, and assessment processes to support inclusion and mainstreaming of students with exceptionality in regular education environments.

COURSE GOALS AND RELATED OBJECTIVES
1. Examine historical and current issues related to inclusion and mainstreaming of children with special needs, including key litigation and societal perspectives that have framed the discussion.
2. Demonstrate understanding of key concepts central to professional bridge-building between special and general education, such as collaboration, differentiated instruction, behavior management, test & curriculum adaptations, and Least Restrictive Environment.
3. Know the services available under the Individual Education Plan and the Section 504 Plan, and the provisions included in IDEA, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and ADA laws.
4. Delineate the process of determining eligibility for special education, including pre-referral intervention, referral, assessment and the initial IEP meeting.
5. Understand the characteristics of students with different exceptionalities, typical and atypical development, including low and high incidence disorders, as well as other special needs categories (e.g., giftedness, “at-risk”, ADD/ADHD).
6. Adapt instruction and the learning environment for the purpose of providing access to the core curriculum for all students within a general education setting, including the use of technology.

**PROGRAM OBJECTIVES MET BY THIS COURSE**

**Program Learning Outcomes (Special Education):**
1. Candidates will understand the characteristics of students with mild to severe disabilities and advocate for their education.
2. Candidates will develop and implement positive behavior supports at both the classroom and individual student level.
3. Candidates will use informal and formal assessment tools to develop and implement effective individualized instructional plans and monitor student progress.
4. Candidates will select, create and adapt evidence-based instructional strategies and materials.
5. Candidates will effectively teach students with disabilities in inclusive environments through empirically supported models and methods of collaboration.
6. Candidates will understand the differing linguistic and cultural needs of English Language Learners and CLD students from referral to planning to implementation and evaluation of instruction.

**CTC STANDARDS ADDRESSED IN THIS COURSE**

**Education Specialist Program Standards:**
- Program Standard 2: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices
- Program Standard 3: Educating Diverse Learners
- Program Standard 4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships
- Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students
- Program Standard 7: Transition and Transition Planning
- Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary
- Program Standard 11: Typical and Atypical Development
- Program Standard 13: Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities

**Mild to Moderate Standards:**
- M/M Standard 1: Characteristics of Students with Mild-Moderate Disabilities
- M/M Standard 3: Planning and Implementing Mild-Moderate Curriculum and Instruction
- M/M Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild-Moderate Disabilities
M/M Standard 6: Case Management

**Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization Standards:**
ASDAA Standard 1: Characteristics of ASD
ASDAA Standard 3: Collaborating with Other Service Providers and Families

Moderate to Severe Standards
M/S Standard 1: Learning Characteristics of Individuals with Moderate-Severe Disabilities

SB 2042 CA State Standards for Single and Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials: No. 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom

California Standards for the Teaching Professions (CSTP):

- Standard 2 - Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning
- TPE 3: Interpretation and Use of Assessments
- Standard 3 - Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning
- TPE 4: Making Content Accessible
- Standard 4 - Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for all Students
- TPE 8: Learning About Students
- TPE 9: Instructional Planning
- Standard 5 - Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning
- TPE 11: Social Environment
- Standard 6 - Developing as a Professional Educator
- TPE 12: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations

**REQUIRED TEXTS**


**Other Required Materials:** The following articles will be posted in iLearn as a PDF or you can access them through the university Library.


**GRADING POLICY AND GRADING STANDARDS FOR THE COURSE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235-220</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>100-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219-211</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>93-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-203</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>89-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-194</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>86-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193-187</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>82-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186-180</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>79-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179-171</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>76-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-164</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>72-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-140</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>69-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 and below</td>
<td></td>
<td>59 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTIONS

1. **Local Resource Project (Due no later than February 25)**

   First, you must identify a local resource that provides services to individuals with disabilities or students who are English Learners. To learn about the resource, it may be helpful to interview someone who works at the facility. For this project, you must create a presentation with visual aids (PowerPoint, Prezi, or other of your choice). You must provide a commentary along with the visual presentation. The video must be between 4 – 6 minutes. Then you will upload the video as a YouTube link into iLearn to share with your classmates. The video must provide the necessary information your colleagues would need to know about this local resource (i.e., What population(s) are served? What services are provided? Is there a cost? How do you get referred or qualify for this local resource?)

   In addition, upload a brief summary of the resource. The one page summary should be clear and concise. It must have the name of the local resource, contact information, services provided and any other necessary information. This can be done in a flyer, bullet point or narrative format. Both the video and the 1-page summaries will be added to a multi-media portfolio and made available as a resource to all students in the department. (Standards addressed: CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA3 & MS1)

2. **Case Study Simulation (Due no later than April 1)**

   Read one of the case studies (i.e., Ben, Carlos or Yancy) posted in iLearn. Based on the selected case study please provide a write up addressing each of the points listed below. Please also refer to the rubric at the end of this syllabus for grading criteria. The written response should follow the outline provided and please label your response for each section as it is below (a, b, c, d, e).

   a. based on the knowledge you’ve gained in this course, describe the aspects of the case that you found appropriate and inappropriate for the student in question as it relates to (a) process, (b) content, (c) consideration for effective family participation, (d) effective consultation and collaboration, and (e) cultural and linguistic variables.
b. please develop and describe three modifications and/or adaptations that would be appropriate for the student in order to increase their success in the general education setting (be sure to cite evidence-based modifications/adaptations from the text, course readings or peer review journal articles).

(Standards addressed: CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA1, ASDAA3 & MS1)

3. Lesson Plan Modification (Due no later than May 6)

Using a previously developed lesson plan (from another course or in your daily practice), explain how you would adapt it to meet the different needs of 2 students with varying exceptionalities of your choice (you can choose an ELL student as one of your students you adapt for). First, describe two students with exceptionalities. Give some background information in your description as well as include specific information about the students’ strengths and challenges. How does this student present in a classroom setting? Explain what the modifications and adaptations to the lesson plan are and how these changes will support the student in the class setting. Explain how the modifications and adaptations result in a more inclusive placement for the selected students. Furthermore, the adaptations must fit with the description of the student and why the adaptations are appropriate regarding age, disability, and cultural and linguistic diversity. In addition, how the students will be assessed needs to be addressed, even if not present in the original lesson plan.

You may submit two lesson plans (one original and one with the modifications) or you can submit one lesson plan and highlight the adaptations you would make for your identified students. The modified lesson plan must be included and the modifications / adaptations for each student clearly identifiable.

(Standards Addressed: CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA3 & MS1; SB 2042 Standard 14d/e; TPE 4, 9)

Discussion activities and End of Module Questions:
Each week we will have a reading from the required text. In addition there will be online activities that you will need to complete each week. Each week we will complete a module. It is important that you post your response to the End of the Module Questions or probes in a timely manner so that others have an opportunity to respond. In this way, we are all learning from each other and able to discuss (asynchronously) this issues and questions for each module. Furthermore, the responses to your classmates need to be completed in a timely and professional manner. The responses that you post in the iLearn Forums will impact your participation grade and I expect your responses to be thoughtful, unique and engaging. (Standards Addressed: CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA1, ASDAA3 & MS1; SB 2042 Standard 14d/e; TPE 4, 9)

Quizzes:
Class quizzes will be posted in iLearn and will be available from Monday to the following Sunday night. If you miss the window of opportunity to take the quiz, the quiz grade is forfeited. You are only allowed one attempt and 30 minutes to take the quiz so please be sure you are
prepared before you begin. (Standards Addressed: CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA1, ASDAA3 & MS1

***If a week of work is missed, class participation points are forfeited and cannot be earned with extra work. Chapter quizzes will still be available during the assigned times.

ASSIGNMENT BREAKDOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>STANDARDS ADDRESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes: (4 points each)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA1, ASDAA3 &amp; MS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Activities Response to End of Module Question Response to Classmates (total of 45 points)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA1, ASDAA3 &amp; MS1; SB 2042 Standard 14d/e; TPE 4, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Simulation (see rubric below)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA1, ASDAA3 &amp; MS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Project (see rubric below)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA3 &amp; MS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plan Modification (see rubric below)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CCTC Program Standards 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, MM1, MM3, MM5, MM6, ASDAA3 &amp; MS1; SB 2042 Standard 14d/e; TPE 4, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 1: 1.22-1.28 | **INTRODUCTION, Overview of Syllabus and course expectations**  
• Introduction to Inclusive Teaching  
• Educational Rights of Individuals with Disabilities  
• The Least-Restrictive Environment  
• Legal Foundations  
• Models of Service Delivery | • Read Chapter 1  
• Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
• Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
• Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
• Take Quiz on Chapter 1 |
| Week 2: | Collaboration: Partnerships and Procedures | Read Chapter 2  
Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
Take Quiz on Chapter 2 |
|---|---|---|
| Collaboration to Meet Students’ Needs  
Effective Communication  
Collaboration for Referrals and Placements  
Collaboration as Partnerships  
Co-teaching |  
Week 2:  
1.29-2.4 |  
Read Chapter 3  
Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
Take Quiz on Chapter 3 |
| Week 3: | Teaching Students with Higher Incidence Disabilities | Read Chapter 3  
Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
Take Quiz on Chapter 3 |
| Diagnoses include: SLI, LD, IDD, ED, ADHD  
Characteristics  
Typical & Atypical Development |  
2.5-2.11 |  
Read Chapter 4  
Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
Take Quiz on Chapter 4 |
| Teaching Students with Lower Incidence Disabilities |  
Diagnoses include: ASD, OHI, Visual impairments, D/HOH  
Characteristics  
Typical & Atypical Development |  
Week 4:  
2.12-2.18 |  
Read Chapter 5  
Read the 3 articles posted under “Other Required Materials”  
Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
Take Quiz on Chapter 5 |
| Characteristics  
Typical & Atypical Development  
Gifted, Creative and Talented  
Students who are Culturally and Linguistically Diverse  
Students at Risk |  
Week 5:  
2.19-2.25 |  
Post Local Resource Project - Upload 1 page summary. Due February 25* |
### Week 6: 2.26-3.4
**Effective Differentiated Instruction for All Students**
- Promoting Effective Differentiated Instruction
- Prioritize Instruction
- Adapt Instruction, Materials or the Environment
- Systematically Teach
- Systematically Assess/Evaluate (formal & informal) the Outcomes of Your Instruction

- Read Chapter 6
- Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)
- IRIS Module: Differentiated Instruction
- Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum
- Respond to online activities posted in iLearn
- Take Quiz on Chapter 6

### Week 7: 3.5-3.11
**Improving Motivation and Social Behavior**
- Setting the stage for academic success
- Teaching Social Skills

- Read Chapter 8
- Educating Peter Video and Forum
- Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)
- Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum
- Respond to online activities posted in iLearn
- Take Quiz on Chapter 8

### Week 8: 3.12-3.18
**Promoting Inclusion with Classroom Peers**
- Peer-Supported Social Acceptance
- Peer Assistance
- Peer Tutoring
- Cooperative Learning

- Read Chapter 9
- Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)
- Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum
- Respond to online activities posted in iLearn
- Take Quiz on Chapter 9

### Spring Break: 3.19-3.25
**Improving Attention and Memory**
- Attention
- Memory

- Read Chapter 10
- Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)
- Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum
- Respond to online activities posted in iLearn
- Take Quiz on Chapter 10
- Turn in Case Study Simulation
  - Due April 1st
| Week 11: 4.2-4.8 | Teaching Study Skills | • Read Chapter 11  
• Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
• Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
• Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
• Take Quiz on Chapter 11 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Week 12: 4.9-4.15** | Assessment | • Read Chapter 12  
• Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
• Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
• Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
• Take Quiz on Chapter 12 |
| **Week 13: 4.16-4.22** | Literacy | • Read Chapter 13  
• Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
• Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
• Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
• Take Quiz on Chapter 13 |
| **Week 14: 4.23-4.29** | Mathematics | • Read Ch. 14  
• Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
• Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
• Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
• Take Quiz on Chapter 14 |
| **Week 15: 4.30-5.6** | Science, Social Studies & Transitions | • Read Ch. 15  
• Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s)  
• Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum  
• Respond to online activities posted in iLearn  
• Take Quiz on Chapter 15  
• Turn in Lesson Plan Modification Due May 6th |
| **Week 16: 4.30-5.6** | Response to Intervention | • Read Chapter 7  
• Answer / Discuss End of Module Question(s) |
5.7-5.13

- Respond / Communicate to Classmate(s) in Forum
- Respond to online activities posted in iLearn
- Take Quiz on Chapter 7

Important Policies:

Attendance Policy:
While credential candidates are expected to participate in 100% of all class sessions (face to face, online & hybrid), a credential candidate cannot earn a passing grade in a course in which they did not participate in a minimum of 80% of all class sessions. For online classes, simply logging into the class online is not considered to be participation.

Participation in online courses includes, but is not limited to:
* submitting an academic assignment;
* taking an exam, completing module activities;
* participating in required online discussions, quizzes, etc.

Withdrawal Policy:

Policy on the Appropriate Use of Technology in the Classroom:
In order to establish a climate of mutual respect for one another in our programs at this university cell phone use including text messaging during instruction is prohibited. Please turn your cell phone off or set to vibrate so as not to disturb other students or distract the instructor. Laptops are permitted, but shall only be used for note taking or research associated with an assignment for that particular class. Checking email or internet surfing is prohibited.

Students who receive a cell phone message deemed to be of an important nature should exit the class quietly and then return as soon as possible. If it is an urgent matter, alert the instructor that you will need to leave to take care of an emergency, gather your materials and exit the class.

For students who do not comply with the policy the following actions are in order:
- STEP 1: The instructor will speak with said student(s) after class or at a convenient time and remind them of the policy.
- STEP 2: The instructor will request a meeting with the program coordinator and the student to resolve any issue pertaining to this policy, and a dispositions action plan form will be completed.
- STEP 3: If unresolved after STEP 2, any party may request a meeting with the Education and Leadership Department Chair. The instructor must be included in this meeting.

Collection of Student Assignments:
Assignments completed for this course may be used as evidence of candidate learning in national, regional, and state accreditation reports of the Education Department. Names and other identifying elements of all assignments will be removed before being included in any report. Students who do not wish their work to be used for accreditation purposes must inform the instructor in writing. Your participation and cooperation in the review of this university programs is appreciated.

**Attendance Policy:**

While credential candidates are expected to participate in 100% of all class sessions (face to face, online & hybrid), a credential candidate cannot earn a passing grade in a course in which they did not participate in a minimum of 80% of all class sessions. For online classes, simply logging into the class online is not considered to be participation.

Participation in online courses includes, but is not limited to:
* submitting an academic assignment;
* taking an exam, completing module activities;
* participating in required online discussions

**Hybrid Courses:** Attendance in a hybrid course is calculated using both in class attendance and online activity.

**RUBRICS**

**SPED 560**

Local Resource

Grading Rubric

| Name: ________________________ | Date: ____________________ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Earned Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student has chosen an appropriate local resource that provides services to students with disabilities or English Learners.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. One page summary of the local resource.  
  * No typographical or grammatical errors  
  * Clear prose  
  * Concise prose | 10 |
| 3. The video should:  
  * Provide the necessary information your colleagues would need to know about this local resource (i.e. What population(s) are served? What services are provided? Is there a cost? How do you get referred or qualify for this local resource?)  
  * Be uploaded so it can be shared easily with colleagues as a part of a multi-media portfolio | 15 |

Additional Comments:
Simulation Case Study
Grading Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>23-25 points</th>
<th>20-22 points</th>
<th>17-19 points</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Based on the knowledge you’ve gained in this course, describe the aspects of the case that you found appropriate and inappropriate for the student in question as it relates to: (a) process, (b) content, (c) consideration for effective family participation, (d) effective consultation and collaboration, (e) cultural and linguistic variables. | • Includes all 5 criteria (A-E).  
• The criteria (A-E) are clearly outlined and easy to locate within your paper.  
• Each criteria includes supporting evidence from the case study.  
• Clear and concise prose.  
• No grammatical errors  
• No spelling errors | • Includes 3-4 criteria (A-E).  
• The criteria (A-E) are somewhat outlined.  
• Each criteria includes some supporting evidence from the case study.  
• Clear and concise prose.  
• One grammatical error  
• One spelling error | • Includes less than 3 criteria (A-E).  
• The criteria (A-E) are not outlined or are difficult to locate within your paper.  
• There is no or minimal supporting evidence from the case study provided.  
• Multiple grammatical errors  
• Multiple spelling errors | Points Earned |
| a. Please develop and describe three modifications and/or adaptations that would be appropriate for the student in order to increase their success in the general education setting (be sure to cite evidence-based modifications/adaptations from the text, course readings | • Includes 3 modifications / adaptations that are appropriate for the student.  
• At least 2 citations are used to support the | • Includes 2 modifications / adaptations that are appropriate for the student.  
• One citation is used to support the | • Includes 1 modification / adaptation that are appropriate for the student. Or the modifications are not appropriate to the students needs. | Points Earned |
or peer review journal articles).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Target 10</th>
<th>Acceptable 8</th>
<th>Needs Improvement 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Project includes a lesson plan for a typical group of students (can be previously developed) and a clearly modified lesson plan. One lesson plan can be turned in if the modifications are clearly highlighted. | • Project includes a lesson plan for a typical group of students and a clearly modified lesson plan  
• One lesson plan can be turned in if the modifications are clearly highlighted.  
• Lesson is appropriate and complete. | • Project includes a lesson plan for a typical group of students and a modified lesson plan  
• One lesson plan can be turned in if the modifications are clearly highlighted.  
• Lesson is appropriate and somewhat complete. | • Project includes a lesson plan for a group of students  
• Modifications are not clearly highlighted.  
• Lesson is not appropriate for the students or is not complete. |
| 2. Two students with different exceptionalities are clearly described including background information, strengths and challenges. | Two students with different exceptionalities are clearly described including background information, strengths and challenges. | Two students with different exceptionalities are somewhat described, but may be missing some pertinent information (e.g., background information, strengths and challenges). | Two students with different exceptionalities are not clearly described. There is limited information about the students’ background, strengths and challenges. |
| 3. Project includes a summary of how the lesson plan was modified and why the adaptations or modifications were chosen. | Project includes a summary of how the lesson plan was modified and why the adaptations or modifications were chosen. | Project includes a summary of how the lesson plan was modified and why the adaptations or modifications were chosen. | Project does not include a summary of how the lesson plan was modified and why the adaptations or modifications were chosen OR the adaptations do not match the students’ |
| 4. Project includes how and why the assessment | Lesson plan and description include | Lesson plan and description as to how | Lesson plan and description do not |
will vary (if necessary) for the additional students with exceptionalities and/or English Language Learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>will vary (if necessary) for the additional students with exceptionalities and/or English Language Learners.</th>
<th>how and why (or why not) the assessment will vary for the target students with exceptionalities.</th>
<th>and why (or why not) the assessment will vary for the target students with exceptionalities is limited.</th>
<th>include how and why (or why not) the assessment will vary for the target students with exceptionalities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Project quality includes</td>
<td>5. Project quality includes</td>
<td>5. Project quality includes</td>
<td>5. Project quality includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the listed components</td>
<td>No typographical or grammatical errors</td>
<td>Clear prose</td>
<td>Concise prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No typographical or grammatical errors</td>
<td>Clear prose</td>
<td>Concise prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plan Modification Grading Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name____________________ Date ____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>