

## **Inclusive Preparation Program Redesign Guide**

### **Background**

For more than 10 years, the Ohio Deans Compact on Exceptional Children, also known as the Compact, has used a competitive grant process to incentivize blended educator preparation programs (EPPS). These programs prepare candidates to work with diverse students, including those with disabilities and those from marginalized and minoritized groups.

Recipients of incentive grants meet together throughout the year in a Community of Practice (CoP) that supports their work through focused discussions, institution-by-institution coaching, and cross-project sharing. Over the years, the CoP has accumulated a wealth of knowledge about how to design and implement blended programs.

This guide draws on the accumulated wisdom of the CoP by providing guidance to newly funded teams that are beginning work to redesign educator preparation programs. The document discusses the aims and features of inclusive educator preparation as well as the processes that teams use to set the stage for the work, redesign curricula and clinical experiences, obtain state approval, and initiate and sustain their new (or redesigned) programs.

### **What Are Blended Preparation Programs?**

Blended (also called, “merged”) programs prepare candidates to teach all students by giving them sufficient knowledge of and practice with a broad set of evidence-based teaching practices that have traditionally been seen as relevant to general education, on the one hand and special education, on the other. Other related terms are defined in the Glossary (see Appendix A).

### **How Do Educator Preparation Programs Blend or Merge Their Content?**

Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) blend or merge their content through a process that involves substantial change in course work, curriculum structure, and clinical experiences. This process also requires shifts in philosophical views and pedagogical approaches in order to prioritize equity, inclusion, and social justice.

The program redesign process involves leadership and team building, engagement of stakeholders, orientation to relevant standards, revision of course content and sequencing, and development of powerful clinical experiences. Successful redesign efforts use a backward planning approach keyed to what candidates should know and be able to do by the time they complete the program.

## How Are Blended Programs Approved?

A critical part of program redesign involves procedures for obtaining program approval from the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE). Faculty submit their programs for approval using ODHE forms and protocols. Once a program is submitted, a panel reviews it and makes recommendations to the ODHE. The review process orients to relevant general and special education standards as well as to ODHE's dual licensure crosswalks. The review panel includes faculty from educator preparation programs across the state. For more information about the ODHE state review process for dual licensure programs, please visit the [ODHE website](#).

## Setting the Stage

This section of the guide discusses the early steps in the redesign process. These steps relate to three key issues: (1) building trust and getting buy-in, (2) identifying project leadership and establishing a core team, and (3) planning and organizing the work.

### Building Trust and Getting Buy-in

Building trust and getting buy-in are two crucial first steps in the process of redesigning educator preparation programs. These steps are extremely important because institutional politics can either facilitate *or* impede curriculum change in colleges and universities. Establishing strong alliances within the institution of higher education (IHE) as well as with key partners beyond its boundaries helps curriculum-redesign teams navigate the—often complex—political challenges. Specific steps that IHEs can take include the following:

- Ensuring that everyone impacted by the curriculum change has a voice in the redesign work;
- Remaining highly attentive to the concerns of P20 partners;
- Negotiating and making a commitment to a shared vision, mission, and core values;
- Ensuring that a strong contingent of stakeholders agrees with the intent and direction of the redesign work, while acknowledging that not all stakeholders will be equally supportive; and
- Developing written materials describing the rationale for (and research behind) the planned redesign.

### Identifying Project Leadership and Establishing a Core Team

Another early step in the redesign process relates to project leadership. IHEs not only need to identify individuals to lead the curriculum work, they also need to establish and empower a core leadership team.

Many grant-recipient IHEs have found it helpful to place two individual leaders at the helm—one with special education background and expertise and the other with general

education background and expertise. These project leaders need to be able to articulate the aims and methods of the redesign work in clear and concise terms as well as to champion it persuasively. Prior experience navigating the political and bureaucratic complexities of curriculum change makes this work easier for the one or two faculty members who take the lead, but newcomers to this type of work have also been effective in leading some of the curriculum redesign projects sponsored by the Deans Compact.

Once leaders are in place, they begin work to establish a core redesign team (or guiding coalition). This team commonly includes faculty members with relevant expertise, for example, in a special education field, a relevant content area, and/or a particular grade band. Some institutions also choose to include P20 representatives as part of their core team. Core redesign teams work well when they are large enough to enable members to share the workload, but small enough to promote smooth coordination and clear lines of communication.

Core teams meet regularly, with the frequency of meetings varying somewhat based on the amount of work that needs to be completed and exigencies specific to each IHE. Whatever the schedule of meetings, however, the progress of the work depends on frequent opportunities for communication and collaboration.

### **Planning and Organizing the Work**

Productive curriculum work involves careful planning—an activity for which team leaders typically take point. At the beginning of the curriculum-redesign work, their planning focuses on (1) specifying necessary tasks, (2) determining how the work can be accomplished, (3) developing meeting schedules for the core team and other stakeholder groups, (4) establishing workable timelines, and (5) designing a communication strategy. Somewhat later on, team leaders might want to readjust initial plans and also identify and sequence the steps required for obtaining program approval, both from institutional governance bodies and from the ODHE.

Once team leaders initiate planning efforts, they then seek agreement from other core team members. Discussing the plan and coming to consensus about it typically comprise the agenda of the first core team meeting. Soon thereafter, the team reviews all the necessary tasks—developing crosswalks to align the curriculum to applicable standards, developing or revising course descriptions, drafting or revising syllabi, and developing materials to guide clinical experiences (including internships). Ensuring that core team members are aware of relevant requirements and procedures is an important next step. Leaders, therefore, typically alert the core team to relevant standards, university processes and timelines for obtaining approval of new programs, and state requirements—notably, the ODHE program review process and timelines. They also point team members to resources that will help them with their work (see Appendix B) as well as to shared repositories to support online collaboration and the maintenance of archival files. To assist with the planning process, a planning checklist is provided in Appendix C.

## **Curriculum Redesign**

Core teams typically use a backward-planning approach to curriculum design. The process begins with a clear understanding of desired program outcomes and then proceeds to the development of the curriculum components (e.g., course work, clinical experiences) most likely to produce these desired outcomes.

The experience of Compact-supported teams that have been successful in developing blended programs suggests that a comprehensive approach is necessary. Teams that have tried to make minor program adjustments or retrofitted new outcomes to existing courses and clinical experiences have met with frustration.

### **Program Outcomes**

Teams begin their work to develop blended programs by defining program outcomes (i.e., the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates should possess upon program completion). These outcomes align with the program's mission and vision, embed insights from current research, and reflect relevant standards (e.g., the program standards disseminated by the Council for Exceptional Children–CEC). In recent years, various professional groups (e.g., CEC, CEEDAR) have defined evidence-based instructional practices at a more granular level than is typical for standards documents. Two sets of “high-leverage practices,” one from Teaching Works (2020) and the other from CEEDAR/CEC (McLeskey & Brownell, 2015) are prominent examples.

The Impact Evaluation Committee of the Deans Compact used these two exemplars as the basis for creating a comprehensive list of inclusive instructional practices. The Committee then conducted a statewide survey to identify the practices from the comprehensive list that were most relevant to IHEs in Ohio (see Appendix D).

### **Standards Crosswalks**

Teams create crosswalks to test the alignment between relevant standards and program-specific outcomes. These crosswalks help teams determine the need to modify or redesign courses and/or clinical experiences. Sometimes the crosswalks show critical gaps in the curriculum, calling for the development of new courses or clinical experiences.

Once teams have determined ways to ensure alignment with relevant standards, they finalize their crosswalks to show how their redesigned programs address the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the standards implicate. These finalized crosswalks play a crucial role in program approval and accreditation.

### **Curriculum Components and Related Documents**

Teams also develop documents that detail all curriculum components. The most important of these are:

- ***Program Plans: Scope and Sequence***

These plans depict the sequence and timing of courses, ensuring that they align with the stipulated time frame, typically spanning four years and approximately 120 credit hours for public institutions.

- ***Course Descriptions***

Course descriptions briefly specify the content of the courses in the curriculum, their credit hours, and any prerequisites or corequisites. Universities typically list course descriptions in their undergraduate and graduate catalogs.

- ***Course Syllabi***

More extensive than a course description, a syllabus typically includes: anticipated course outcomes; alignment of course outcomes with applicable standards; session content and meeting dates; required and optional readings; course assignments and examinations; course grading practices; relevant policies (e.g., course attendance policies, academic honesty policies, and so on); and other course-related resources.

- ***Guides to Required Clinical Experiences (Including Internships)***

These documents describe all requirements for practical engagement in classrooms and schools. Essential considerations include the minimum hours required for each field experience; the structure of each experience; activities included in each experience (e.g., observation, practice teaching, attendance at meetings, and so on), and the competencies that a candidate must demonstrate in order to pass each experience (including the internship).

- ***Key Assessments***

An important part of the curriculum package is the key assessment document. This document includes descriptions of all assessments that candidates must pass in order to complete an educator preparation program. Some of the assessments described in the document might be traditional paper and pencil assessments (e.g., the development of a set of lesson plans). Others might be performance assessments (e.g., one or more demonstration lessons), and still others might be standardized assessments (e.g., the Ohio Assessments for Educators—OAEs). Taken together, key assessments provide documentation of candidates' performance in relation to essential program outcomes (i.e., the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that represent successful program completion).

To assist teams with the process of curriculum redesign, a checklist is provided in Appendix E.

## **Program Approval**

Once a team has developed all required curriculum documents, the next step is to obtain internal and external approval. Teams typically orient themselves to these steps—especially to required timelines—even during the planning and design phases of their work. Failure to meet timelines for program approval may result in significant delays in program implementation..

### **Internal Approval**

When most of the program design tasks are complete, teams can proceed with the steps in the internal approval process. All universities have their own curriculum policies and approval mechanisms, usually documented in handbooks such as the academic affairs handbook or the faculty handbook.

But despite differences across IHEs, some steps in the curriculum-approval process are common across institutions. These steps include: preparation of necessary documents and proposals, discussion (and sometimes approval) at the department and college levels, submission to a university curriculum committee, and finally, discussion and approval by a faculty governing body (e.g., a curriculum committee, a faculty senate).

As teams move their curriculum proposals through the necessary steps, they need to be cognizant of potential pitfalls. Two such pitfalls can interfere with program approval.

- First—errors or gaps in the documentation can slow the process down. To avoid such delays, curriculum documents should be carefully developed and reviewed, using formats acceptable to the IHE, prior to their submission.
- Second, given the nature of university politics, teams should seek the support of university leaders as well as cultivate necessary alliances. For example, having strong support from the dean of the college can be extremely useful. Meeting several times with the chair of the curriculum committee to get advice and support can also be helpful. Of course, ensuring that key stakeholders are part of the design process greatly reduces the likelihood that disgruntled colleagues will offer vocal opposition to the curriculum proposal during the approval process.

### **External Approval**

Once a university has endorsed a new or redesigned program, the next step is to seek state approval. For instance, in Ohio, submissions to the ODHE are accepted during fall and spring at specified times. Teams must prepare all required forms and

documentation, such as faculty curriculum vitae, syllabi, and key assessment documents. More details about the state review process can be found on the [ODHE website](#). A checklist to help with the steps in the approval process is provided in Appendix F.

### **Initiating and Sustaining New (and Redesigned) Programs**

Curriculum efforts do not end with program approval. Rather, program faculty undertake on-going work to ensure that the new or redesigned program recruits and retains high-quality candidates, represents itself accurately to candidates and to the public, engages in continuous improvement, and obtains national accreditation.

#### **Marketing and Recruitment**

Attracting students to the new (or redesigned) program is essential. Program faculty typically market their program and recruit students by using some of the following strategies:

- Updating the IHE's website with details about the new program, including its vision, mission, core values, intended outcomes, illustrative four-year plans, and faculty contacts;
- Collaborating with admissions office staff to arrange targeted recruitment events;
- Sharing information about the new (or redesigned program) with educators in partner institutions (e.g., P-12 schools);
- Participating in recruitment fairs; and
- Establishing new partnerships (e.g., two-plus-two programs with community colleges) that are intended to augment enrollment.

#### **Enrollment and Advising**

In most IHEs, various offices contribute to the success of academic programs, including those that prepare educators. The Registrar's office, for example, maintains and disseminates information about the program; college or university advisors help students make wise decisions about semester-by-semester registration for courses and longer-term academic planning; and the financial aid office assists with loans and scholarships. Faculty in educator preparation programs help the staff from these offices do their jobs effectively. Among other approaches, faculty visit these offices periodically to forge positive working relationships with office staff, supply these offices with attractive and accurate materials about the program, and invite staff from these offices to meet with their incoming freshmen and transfer students.

#### **Ongoing Evaluation and Continuous Improvement**

Engaging in a process of continuous improvement is imperative for education programs across all levels, preschool through graduate school, including educator preparation programs. As societal demands shift, priorities of schooling change, and research

uncovers more (or different) evidence-based teaching strategies, educator preparation programs need to adapt. Their continuous improvement is necessary for ensuring that newly prepared educators who enter the workforce are both confident in their use of evidence-based practices and are also forward-thinking.

Continuous improvement of an educator preparation program requires on-going collection and analysis of data. Accreditation bodies and state education agencies require that certain data be collected and reviewed, but preparation programs may want to consider other data as well. For example, IHEs might consider gathering data specific to inclusive programs, emphasizing feedback from P20 partners regarding candidates' knowledge and skills in the use of inclusive practices.

Not all such data need to generate metrics; qualitative data can augment quantitative indicators such as performance assessment scores, OEA scores, and licensure applications. Individual or focus-group interviews with education leaders in partner districts, for instance, might help faculty in educator preparation programs assess the extent to which clinical experiences including internships contribute to the development of candidate competencies.

Sharing results from data collection efforts with key stakeholders is also a critical step in the continuous improvement process. Keeping stakeholders informed supports simultaneous improvement across institutions (e.g., IHEs and P-12 schools). It also helps a preparation program sustain a positive working relationship with stakeholder groups, ensuring that future redesign efforts will benefit from a strong alliance between the preparation program and the schools and districts with which it partners.

## **Accreditation**

The accreditation of educator preparation programs ensures their overall quality and professional standing. Current programs can seek accreditation through one of two entities: the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) or the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP).

When an educator preparation program is accredited, this accomplishment signals to candidates and to the public at large that the program meets or exceeds established standards related to its curriculum, clinical experiences, faculty expertise, resources, and outcomes. Maintaining program accreditation is important for several reasons:

- **Quality Assurance and Accountability:** Accreditation ensures that educator preparation programs maintain high standards. It provides external assurance that the program provides a robust professional education, adequately preparing candidates for work as a professional educator.
- **Consistency and Standardization:** Accreditation provides a standardized measure against which educator preparation programs can be judged. This approach ensures that programs orient to similar perspectives on teaching,



support and related service provision, and educational leadership, including prevailing understandings of the instructional practices with the strongest evidence base.

- **Informed Decision-making:** For prospective students and employers, accreditation serves as a reliable indicator of the adequacy of preparation.
- **Enhancement of Programs and Continuous Improvement:** The accreditation process typically involves self-evaluation and peer review. This approach helps IHEs identify program components that need improvement, expansion, or adjustment. The periodic review associated with maintaining accreditation ensures that institutions regularly revisit and refine their programs in response to new research, evolving professional standards, and feedback from knowledgeable peers.

## References

McLeskey, J., & Brownell, M. (2015). *High-leverage practices and teacher preparation in special education* (Document No. PR-1). University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center. <http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/best-practice-review/>

Teaching Works. (2023). *High leverage practices*. University of Michigan. <https://library.teachingworks.org/curriculum-resources/high-leverage-practices/>

## Appendix A Glossary

**Blended Educator Preparation Programs:** Also called “merged programs,” these programs combine content and clinical experiences that address both general education and special education standards within a four-year curriculum sequence.

**Clinical Experiences:** These practical, hands-on experiences give candidates in educator preparation programs opportunities to observe and apply evidence-based instructional practices in classroom settings. These experiences demonstrate the applicability of theoretical knowledge to real teaching situations.

**Double Licensure Programs:** These programs connect two separate educator preparation programs, one focusing on general education and another focusing on special education. The content and clinical experiences of each of the programs are retained intact. Double licensure programs often require the completion of a five- or six-year curriculum sequence.

**Dual Licensure Programs:** Also called, “integrated licensure programs,” these programs combine general and special education content and clinical experiences, addressing all requirements for both licenses.

**Inclusive Educator Preparation Programs:** These programs prepare candidates to work with all students by teaching them to use a comprehensive set of evidence-based practices that accommodate a wide range of learner needs.

**Internships:** Also called “student teaching,” these extensive (often half-year or year-long) clinical experiences typically occur toward the end of each teacher candidate’s work in an educator preparation program. As a culminating educational experience, the internship also provides an opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate their proficiency with evidence-based instructional practices.

**Program Outcomes:** These statements codify the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates should possess upon completion of their educator preparation programs.

## Appendix B Relevant Resources

**(Note: National resources are in the yellow rows, and Ohio resources are in the orange rows.)**

Resource	Importance of the Resource For Program Design	Location
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation Standards	EPPs in Ohio apply for CAEP accreditation; proactively keeping the CAEP accreditation process and standards in mind during program design is helpful	<a href="https://caepnet.org/">https://caepnet.org/</a>
Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards	For CAEP accreditation, EPPs must show evidence of alignment to InTASC standards in programs	<a href="https://ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-and-learning-progressions-teachers-10">https://ccsso.org/resource-library/intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-and-learning-progressions-teachers-10</a>

Resource	Importance of the Resource For Program Design	Location
Specialized Professional Association Standards	Varies based on content area. For a full list related to Ohio licensure, refer to ODHE's website. SPA Accreditation for EPPs is optional because we have a state-specific review process, but all EPPs use SPA standards to inform program design	<a href="https://highered.ohio.gov/educators/academic-programs-policies/academic-program-approval/educator-preparation/ed-prep-institutions">https://highered.ohio.gov/educators/academic-programs-policies/academic-program-approval/educator-preparation/ed-prep-institutions</a>
Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR)	CEEDAR has provided support to Ohio throughout the past several years and the website includes many innovation configurations on various topics that are helpful to teams when developing inclusive preparation content	<a href="https://cedar.education.ufl.edu/">https://cedar.education.ufl.edu/</a>
High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities	(CEEDAR) and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) has developed and published a set of high-leverage practices (HLPs) for special educators and teacher candidates. The HLPs are organized around four aspects of practice: Collaboration, Assessment, Social/emotional/behavioral, Instruction. The HLPs describe inclusive practices that are helpful when developing dual and blended program content	<a href="https://highleveragepractices.org/">https://highleveragepractices.org/</a>
Ohio Department of Education (ODE): Ohio's Whole Child Framework	Ohio's strategic plan for education; this plan informs initiatives in P20 and EPP settings	<a href="https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Student-Supports/Ohios-Whole-Child-Framework">https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Student-Supports/Ohios-Whole-Child-Framework</a>

Resource	Importance of the Resource For Program Design	Location
Ohio Department of Education: Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession	The standards represent what is known about the practices of highly effective teachers and represent an aligned system of expectations for Ohio's educators.	<a href="https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Equity/Ohio-s-Educator-Standards">https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Equity/Ohio-s-Educator-Standards</a>
Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE): Ed Prep	ODHE is the state accrediting agency for institutions of higher education; the EPP website includes resources for program review including requirements for dual licensure programs; it is helpful to understand the program review process and expectations prior to building a new program	<a href="https://highered.ohio.gov/educators/academic-programs-policies/academic-program-approval/educator-preparation/ed-prep-introduction/ed-prep-intro">https://highered.ohio.gov/educators/academic-programs-policies/academic-program-approval/educator-preparation/ed-prep-introduction/ed-prep-intro</a>
Ohio Deans Compact on Exceptional Children	The Compact website includes information and resources from previous incentive grant projects	<a href="https://www.ohiodeanscompact.org/">https://www.ohiodeanscompact.org/</a>
P20 Literacy Collaborative	ODE Office of Exceptional Children and the Compact developed this resource to share model syllabi, related course materials, and additional resources grounded in the science of reading	<a href="https://ohiop20litcollab.org/">https://ohiop20litcollab.org/</a>

Resource	Importance of the Resource For Program Design	Location
Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC)	A partnership between the Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA) and ODE; provides educators with resources they need to develop shared and effective leadership at every level; there are several resources/ modules that are helpful to consider when designing content, especially in Educational Leadership programs	<a href="https://ohioleadership.org/">https://ohioleadership.org/</a>

**Appendix C  
Planning Checklist**

Component	Accomplished?	Team Notes
Have strong leaders been identified?		
Has trust and buy-in been gained from the <i>majority</i> of the identified stakeholders including university leadership?		
Has a core team been identified with representation from all areas?		
Has a meeting schedule been discussed and/or established?		
Has a rough draft of a task list been created, including who will broadly lead each item/category?		

<b>Component</b>	<b>Accomplished?</b>	<b>Team Notes</b>
Has a reliable, accessible cloud location for information sharing been created/established?		
Has the team agreed upon mission, values, and/or goals?		
Has a P20 Advisory Board been identified?		
Does the team have an understanding of relevant standards?		
Has the team reviewed existing resources?		
Does the team know the requirements and timelines?		
Has a final task list and timeline/ calendar been developed?		

**Appendix D**  
**High Priority High-Leverage Inclusive Teaching Practices for Ohio IHEs**

<b>Category</b>	<b>High-leverage Practices</b>
Planning for Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● create and maintain a caring and respectful learning environment.</li> <li>● structure and maintain a consistent and organized learning environment.</li> <li>● connect learning to students' prior experiences in order to make it more authentic.</li> </ul>

Category	High-leverage Practices
Delivering Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● build a sense of trust in my students.</li> <li>● make content explicit through explanations, models, representations, and examples.</li> <li>● re-explain content in alternative ways if students don't seem to understand.</li> <li>● support students' learning by providing help of various sorts (that is, scaffolds such as focusing questions, partial answers, and graphic organizers).</li> <li>● provide constructive feedback to guide students' behavior.</li> <li>● provide varied learning opportunities for individual students or groups of students.</li> <li>● address misbehavior (e.g., disruptive or non-compliant behavior) by using evidence-based practices.</li> </ul>
Assessing Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● identify students' academic strengths.</li> <li>● use progress monitoring to inform instruction.</li> <li>● use student performance data and other feedback from students to improve my instructional strategies.</li> </ul>
Learning Together through Collaborative Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● make ethical professional decisions.</li> <li>● talk in simple language about a student with parents or other caregivers in ways that demonstrate my respect for students as well as for their parents and caregivers.</li> </ul>

### Appendix E Curriculum Redesign Checklist

Component	Accomplished ?	Team Notes
Has the team discussed how to implement a backward design framework?		
Has the team agreed on the outcomes for the program?		
Has the team designed the clinical internship and field experiences with input from P20 partners?		

<b>Component</b>	<b>Accomplished ?</b>	<b>Team Notes</b>
Has the team created crosswalks for all applicable standards?		
Has the team developed program plans?		
Has the team developed new course materials including:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Syllabi?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessments?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Readings/ resources?</li> </ul>		
Has the team created or updated the field experience/internship handbook?		
Has the team gotten feedback and input from P20 partners throughout the process?		

**Appendix F  
Curriculum Approval Checklist**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Accomplished?</b>	<b>Team Notes</b>
Has the team gone through the process of gaining feedback for internal approval with the following groups?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department faculty</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other faculty from relevant departments</li> </ul>		



Component	Accomplished?	Team Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● College faculty</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The university curriculum committee</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The faculty senate and/or upper university leadership</li> </ul>		
<p>Has the team gone through the process of gaining external approval from ODHE.</p>		