Discussion of Questions Provided by the Committee to Fortune School
August 2019

Overview
At the June 2019 meeting, the Committee on Accreditation approved Fortune School to sponsor three teacher preparation programs:
- Preliminary Multiple Subject Teacher Preparation, Intern
- Preliminary Single Subject Teacher Preparation, Intern
- Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Disabilities, Intern

The Committee had a number of remaining questions for Fortune School and the questions were provided to the institution after the June 2019 meeting. The questions presented to FSE are provided in Appendix A.

Fortune School provided its response to the Committee members' questions (Appendix B).

Process to Address the Committee's Questions
Staff suggests the Committee review and discuss the response provided by Fortune School. Fortune School leadership will be available at the COA meeting to elaborate on any of the questions or to respond to additional questions. Staff suggests that the discussion at the COA meeting and any remaining questions be identified and discussed by specific teacher preparation program and by Common or Program standard. The three teacher preparation programs sponsored by Fortune School are required to meet the Commission's adopted Common and Program Standards. Links to the Commission-adopted Program and Common Standards are provided below:
- Common Standards
- Preliminary MS/SS Program Standards
- Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Disabilities

Staff Recommendation
That the Committee discuss with Fortune School leadership the responses they have submitted to the questions related to the three teacher preparation programs posed by the members of the COA and then take action if appropriate. The Committee may find that the supplementary information and discussion with Fortune School leadership has

- Addressed all the Committee's questions. If this is the case, no action is needed. A site visit will take place within 2-3 years in accordance with the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process as is required for all institutions with provisional approval status.
- Addressed many or most of Committee's questions but a few questions remain. The Committee could pose additional questions and ask Fortune School to provide additional information to be provided at the next Committee meeting.

- Not adequately addressed the Committee's questions. The Committee could direct staff to schedule a focused site visit to take place during the 2019-20 year focusing on the program or programs identified by the Committee.

Appendix A
Questions Posed by the Committee

1. Identify the courses in which subject matter pedagogy standards live and how they are addressed in the courses/program. Do this for both Multiple and Single Subjects programs and for all Single Subject content areas.

2. If this has not already been done, identify the faculty who are responsible for subject matter specific pedagogy.

3. What evidence can you provide that "visiting instructors" (or other IHE staff) involved in your program are qualified to support intern acquisition of content-specific pedagogical skills? Please share samples of instructor CVs or other documentation.

4. What evidence do you have that interns receive feedback on "assignments" related to content-specific instruction? Who provides this feedback? In what ways do students respond to this feedback, and what evidence exists to this effect?

5. In what ways is feedback from program completers collected, analyzed and reported to program leaders? To what degree is this feedback collected anonymously? Does feedback include information related to content-specific pedagogy, especially for candidates who secure teaching positions in secondary (grades 7-12) classrooms?

6. In what ways does Fortune Graduate School consistently collaborate with local IHEs or other postsecondary institutions? Aside from casually meeting and intermingling with other institutions at state and national conferences, does Fortune School have formal and sustained collaborations w/ other school districts and/or IHEs throughout the school year? If so, please provide evidence of such planned activities and or events, and how the collaboration has impacted the FSE programs. (Common Standard 1)

7. Course syllabi do not consistently provide information on course readings. Several syllabi make mention that course readings will be selected by the course instructor and thus, this is insufficient evidence to determine if coursework is aligned with best practices in the field. Course syllabi for all courses should include the required readings regardless of the course instructor. If some course syllabi do not include this information, how does the program ensure that the course readings are appropriate and reflect current best practices for all courses? What mechanisms are in place to approve the content of the courses offered?

8. With regards to ESMM 207, how can Education Specialist candidates be expected to achieve competency in (a) conducting standardized formal assessments and (b) conducting Curriculum Based Assessment, when there appears to be insufficient coverage of these critical concepts/skills or time and practice opportunities (to learn about and to practice conducting) when the course only offers one and two sessions to cover the content respectively. Structurally, the program does not appear to offer candidates sufficient opportunities to truly learn about and learn how to appropriately conduct formal and informal assessments for students with disabilities. You'll be hard

pressed to find an expert in assessment who will concur that dedicating one class session to formal standardized assessments is sufficient to ensure that candidates meet minimum qualifications to independently administer such assessments to students with disabilities and those who are being evaluated to determine if they qualify for special education services (page 230). Are there other courses or opportunities for candidates to learn these concepts?

9. As an example of possible misalignment with best practices in the field of special education, on page 20, when providing a description of ESMM206, FSE Lesson Plan Template assignment, the program writes the following,

> "...PARTICULARLY REFLECT ON HOW INSTRUCTIONAL INTERVENTIONS AND DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION SUPPORTED LEARNING FOR ALL STUDENTS WITH THE INCORPORATION OF TECHNOLOGY, INCLUDING SUBGROUPS AND STUDENTS WITH **AUTISTIC-LIKE LEARNING** CHARACTERISTICS WITHIN A DIVERSE SETTING (SPECIAL EDUCATION, ELL, GATE, ASD, AND/OR OTHER IDENTIFIED SUBGROUPS)."

It is not appropriate to make a reference to, "...students with autistic-like learning characteristics..." and causes pause as to the relevancy and currency of content area expertise of those who are responsible for the content and pedagogy of this program. How does the program ensure that the content is aligned with the most current research based best practices of the field? How do the instructors stay current with these research based practices?

10. The totality of training materials presented seems to lack depth, how does the program ensure that the training program is of sufficient rigor to ensure that candidates have the depth of knowledge required to begin in the profession?

11. How does the program ensure that faculty (instructors) have the necessary education, training, and expertise, to ensure that the program is evidence-based, current, and relevant to prepare effective education specialists? How does the program ensure that faculty remain current with research and best practices in the field of special education?

Fortune School of Education
Answers to COA Questions

1. Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to questions posed by members of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)'s Committee on Accreditation (COA). As you know, Fortune School of Education (FSE) was established in 1989 as Project Pipeline and has offered a District Internship Program through Mt. Diablo Unified School District for the past decade. In June 2019 the Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the Preliminary Multiple Subject/Single Subject District Intern Program and to the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Disabilities District Intern Program. We look forward to the Commission's accreditation site visit in 2021 per the Initial Institutional Approval process. Enclosed, please find responses to the questions proposed by the Committee on Accreditation. Before the responses to the COA's questions, here is some contextual information about FSE.

Timeline for Fortune School of Education (1989-2019)
- 1989 - Project Pipeline was established by Center USD superintendent Dr. Rex Fortune.
- 1993 - The institution was established as a nonprofit public benefit corporation and was approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing through sponsorship of Center Unified School District to offer an alternative teacher certification program.
- 1996 - 2001 - Project Pipeline expanded to the San Francisco Bay Area, opening centers in Alameda, Pittsburg, and Concord.
- 2007 - Project Pipeline connected with Mt. Diablo USD to serve as its LEA.
- 2009 - Project Pipeline renamed Fortune School of Education.
- 2019 - The Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the Preliminary Multiple Subject/Single Subject District Intern Program and to the Preliminary Education Specialist District Intern Program.

- 2021 - Site Visit from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, per accreditation Initial Institutional Approval requirements.

2. FSE's Higher Education Department

2.1. Leadership

- **Co-Deans (Administration and Quality of the District Internship Program)**

Reinforcing its commitment to continuous improvement, in May 2019 FSE hired two Co-Deans focused on the administration and quality of our district internship program.

- Dr. Roque Neto is responsible for instruction, academics, and accreditation. Dr. Neto is a co-founder of the College of Urban Education at Davenport University in Grand Rapids, MI, which specialized in the development of K-12 teachers and administrators. Dr. Neto was appointed chair of Graduate Programs Davenport. He also oversaw the administration and quality of teacher credentialing programs. Dr. Neto is a published author on education research and is a member of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) where he continues to serve on review and site visit teams.

- Dr. Angelo Williams responsibilities include instruction, clinical experience, supervision of FSE Field Supervisors, and FSE partnerships with districts. Dr. Williams is a faculty member at CSU Sacramento (Ed Dept.) and UC Davis. He has served in executive leadership positions at the CA School Boards Association (K-12), CA State Assembly and Senate (Education policy analyst), the CA Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Assistant Vice Chancellor) and the WK Kellogg Foundation (Education and Economic Development program Officer) .

- **Coordinator of Teacher Education**

- Ms. Carmy Preston has been with Fortune School of Education for over 10 years. She is responsible for the overall coordination and logistical planning for all higher education programs. This includes development of the higher education program calendars for courses, workshops, seminars, and events, as well as the management of the Learning Management System, *Schoology*. *Schoology* is the platform in which all higher education courses are overseen and Ms. Preston is responsible for developing the course shells for all classes and rostering students in each appropriate course. Additionally, she serves as the institution's Credential Analyst, responsible for overseeing all credential-related requirements and application processes for each student, as well as Student Records Officer,

responsible for maintaining all student grades for courses and field supervision and procession student transcripts throughout their time in the program.

- **Admissions Counselor**

  - Mr. Joseph McCray has worked in secondary and post-secondary education for over 14 years. His most recent tenures have been as a business teacher, high school dean, and now as an admissions counselor. Joseph has sat on numerous school site, school review committees and school accreditation teams, including WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges), ACICS (Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools), ACCSC (Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges).

2.2. FSE's Higher Education Committee

The Higher Education Committee (HEC) is made up of Fortune School of Education staff, faculty, and various stakeholders. The Committee meets a minimum of once per month to discuss and rule on various program items:
- District Intern Requests: District Changes, Extensions Requests, Leave of Absence
- Program Course Updates
- Program Field Supervision Updates
- Program Policy Updates
- Grievance Appeals
- Program Logistics: calendars, handbooks, workshops, seminars

Additional information about the Higher Education Committee can be found here:
- Higher Education Committee

COA Questions for Fortune School of Education
July 3, 2019

1. Identify the courses in which subject matter pedagogy standards live and how they are addressed in the courses/program. Do this for both Multiple and Single Subjects programs and for all Single Subject content areas.

Program Response:
In our submission we listed courses and assignments focused on addressing subject matter pedagogy. That information can be found in pages 153-167 in the Course Matrix. The Proficiency Alignment Matrix (pages 168-170) also indicates the alignment of each course with TPEs including alignment with TPE 3.

While we believe the model presented in our submission is organic and effective, we reevaluated our program scope and sequence based on subject-specific standards in July 2019. To ensure that we address the Committee members' concerns, we have made the changes described below:

Single Subject Program:
Effective Fall 2019.
A careful research indicated that having discipline-specific pedagogy courses in two parts and adding up to 6 units is a common practice among higher education institutions offering credentialing programs in California (e.g., University of San Francisco, CSU Monterey Bay, CSU Sacramento). To ensure that these concerns regarding subject matter pedagogy are satisfactorily addressed, we have made the following changes to our program proposal:
   1. We selected two courses that align with subject matter pedagogy standards:
       ● A6: Instructional Planning
           ○ Program: Pre-Service
           ○ Course Units: 2
       ● Module F1: Content Instructional Planning
           ○ Program: District Intern Program, Year 2
           ○ Course Units: 2.5
   2. We broke these courses into discipline specific courses parts A and B. A6 becomes part A for Science, Mathematics, Social Science, Physical Education, etc. (E.g., Science Instruction for Single Subject Candidates - Part A). Similarly, Module F1 becomes part B:
       ● A6: Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar A
           ○ Program: Pre-Service
           ○ Discipline-Specific Courses:
               ■ Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar A - English
               ■ Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar A - Mathematics
               ■ Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar A - Physical Education

- Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar A - Science
- Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar A - History/Social Science
- Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar A - World Languages
- Module F1: Content Instructional Planning
  - Program: District Intern Program, Year 2
  - Discipline-Specific Courses:
    - Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar B - English
    - Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar B - Mathematics
    - Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar B - Physical Education
    - Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar B - Science
    - Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar B - History/Social Science
    - Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar B - World Languages

3. We also added 1 unit to part A and 0.5 unit to part B. These changes will ensure that parts A and B of each discipline specific course add up to a total of 6 units.

The results of these updates are as follows:
- A6: Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminars A
  - Program: Pre-Service
  - Course Units: 3
- Module F1: Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminars B
  - Program: District Intern Program, Year 2
  - Course Units: 3

To ensure that there is continuity between Pre-Service and District Intern Program Year 2, we revised Module E Practicum in Year 1 (1.5 units) to cover subject specific content. The addition of this Year 1 Practicum revision will result in 7.5 units dedicated to subject matter pedagogy.

The updated Single Subject Scope & Sequence can be found here.

We are including a sample of the core elements (course description, learning outcomes, reading materials, and assignments) of a discipline-specific course as examples.

Multiple Subject Program:
1. We replaced A6 with English Instruction for Multiple Subject Candidates.
- A6: Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar - English
  - Program: Pre-Service
  - Course Units: 2

2. We also added 1 unit to English Instruction for Multiple Subject Candidates so that the course has a total of 3 units.
- A6: Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar - English
  - Program: Pre-Service
  - Course Units: 3

3. We added the following courses to the second year of the Multiple Subject program:
- Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar - Mathematics
  - Program: District Intern Program, Year 2
  - Course Units: 3
- Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar - History/Social Science & Visual/Performing Arts
  - Program: District Intern Program, Year 2
  - Course Units: 3
- Instructional Planning - Content Specific Seminar - Science, Health, & Physical Education
  - Program: District Intern Program, Year 2
  - Course Units: 3

The updated Multiple Scope & Sequence can be found here.

We are including a sample of the core elements (course description, learning outcomes, reading materials, and assignments) for the Mathematics Instruction for Multiple Subject District Interns as an example.

2. If this has not already been done, identify the faculty who are responsible for subject matter specific pedagogy.

Program Response:
With the changes presented above to the Single and Multiple Subject programs, we are currently selecting new instructors for the subject matter pedagogy courses. For specifics in the hiring criteria see job announcement posted on EdJoin.

3. What evidence can you provide that "visiting instructors" (or other IHE staff) involved in your program are qualified to support intern acquisition of content-specific pedagogical skills? Please share samples of instructor CVs or other documentation.

Program Response:
Effective Fall 2019: Based on program revisions during July 2019, FSE is moving away from the "visiting instructor" model and will focus on hiring instructors of record for *each* content specific course. We are currently selecting new instructors for the subject matter pedagogy courses. For specifics in the hiring criteria see job announcement posted on EdJoin.

4. What evidence do you have that interns receive feedback on "assignments" related to content-specific instruction? Who provides this feedback? In what ways do students respond to this feedback, and what evidence exists to this effect?

 Program Response:
Our previous submission included a Course Matrix linking TPE elements to specific assignments (see pages 153-167). Our previous submission also contained the Proficiency Alignment Matrix for Multiple and Single Subject courses indicating the alignment of each course with each TPE (see pages 168-170).

With the most recent changes, each discipline-specific course has assignments directly aligned to the learning outcomes, which are aligned to specific TPE elements. For illustration, see sample of core elements (course description, learning outcomes, reading materials, and assignments) for Single Subject and Multiple Subject. Instructors of Record for each content-specific course will provide feedback to students based on grading rubrics. Instructors will provide feedback to students via Schoology and/or in person. Students will have the opportunity to respond to the feedback through the LMS or in person.

5. In what ways is feedback from program completers collected, analyzed and reported to program leaders? To what degree is this feedback collected anonymously? Does feedback include information related to content-specific pedagogy, especially for candidates who secure teaching positions in secondary (grades 7-12) classrooms?

Program Response:
Upon the completion of every course, students are required to complete two surveys:
    1) course as a whole
    2) an instructor evaluation

All surveys are anonymous. These surveys are collected by the FSE Coordinator of Teacher Education and the results are presented to FSE Co-Deans each semester. FSE Co-Deans present the anonymous student survey data at Higher Education Committee (HEC) meetings to review program effectiveness and as a part of FSE's continuous improvement process.

Examples of current survey results can be found here:
- Module G3: Healthy Environments for Student Learning
- ESMM 203: Application of Legal Issues in Special Education

Recently we revised the Course Evaluation Survey. We have replaced the item "The course content improved my understanding of the related Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)" with 6 items, each one of them addressing a TPE. The revised Course Evaluation Survey is effective Fall 2019 and can be found here:
- Course Evaluation Survey

Effective Fall 2019, FSE will be implementing a revised Recent Graduate Survey. This survey will be sent to program completers for the past 5 years. The survey addresses several TPE elements, including content-specific pedagogy. It can be found here:

- Recent Graduate Survey

6. In what ways does Fortune Graduate School consistently collaborate with local IHEs or other postsecondary institutions? Aside from casually meeting and intermingling with other institutions at state and national conferences, does Fortune School have formal and sustained collaborations w/ other school districts and/or IHEs throughout the school year? If so, please provide evidence of such planned activities and or events, and how the collaboration has impacted the FSE programs. (Common Standard 1)

Program Response:
 From Common Standard 1:
"The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation."
"Required documentation:" *Published policy documents (for example faculty handbooks, retention and tenure policies, contracts, MOUs, agendas) ensuring that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation"*

In accordance to the requirements of Common Standard 1, in previous submission, we included two samples of meeting agendas as evidence of regular and systematic collaboration with a local university. These meetings included the following:

1) Fortune's leadership team and faculty and a representative from University of the Pacific (Dr. Michael Elium).
2) A sample of a meeting agenda with Sacramento City USD. This meeting specifically addressed terms of our collaboration.
3) Information with sequence of dates for meetings including Fortune's leadership, candidates, and members of the broader educational community.

We are resubmitting these artifacts with this file.

Currently, Fortune works with a broad section of the education community. We have MOUs with over 60 districts, we partner with several colleges and universities, and we are continuously working to expand our partnerships. Below you will find select pieces of evidence that demonstrate our large range of partnerships aimed at improving educator preparation and education as a whole:

(i) a sample template of the MOUs we use when partnering with school districts, a comprehensive list of our school district partners (which is also available to the public on our website), and the number of FSE interns in each school district from the last 2 years.

(ii) a statement from <u>Dr. Jeffery Armstrong</u>, President Of Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, attesting to the continuous collaboration between Fortune's instructional personnel and members of his institution.

(iii) a statement from the Center of Educational Policy Research at Harvard University attesting the collaboration of <u>Mr. Matt Taylor (FSE instructor) in supervising</u> fellow <u>Dominic Zarecki in the Strategic Data Project Fellowship</u>.

(iv) <u>Mr. Matt Taylor's CV</u> demonstrating his membership to the Yolo County Board of Education. Additionally, Mr. Matt Taylor teaches at William Jessup University with many opportunities to collaborate with colleagues in the field of education.

(v) <u>statement by Dr. Nancy Golz</u> (Dean of the Learning Resource Center and Distance Education at Merced College) demonstrating Dr. Roque Neto's continuous and systematic collaboration aimed at improving educator preparation through research projects. These research projects resulted in presentations in national and regional conferences, and publications in peer-reviewed journals.

(vi) <u>our new Faculty Evaluation Guidebook</u>. Faculty collaboration with colleagues from P-12 and Higher Education institutions accounts for 20% of instructors' annual evaluation.

7.   Course syllabi do not consistently provide information on course readings. Several syllabi make mention that course readings will be selected by the course instructor and thus, this is insufficient evidence to determine if coursework is aligned with best practices in the field. Course syllabi for all courses should include the required readings regardless of the course instructor. If some course syllabi do not include this information, how does the program ensure that the course readings are appropriate and reflect current best practices for all courses? What mechanisms are in place to approve the content of the courses offered?

<u>Program Response:</u>
Effective Fall 2019.

Revised Scope and Sequence Documents, per program:
- <u>Education Specialist</u>
- <u>Multiple Subject</u>
- <u>Single Subject</u>

We have adopted the <u>Annual Course Syllabus Review Protocol--also included for your review</u>. Our protocol, which covers all program tracks for Education Specialist Mild to Moderate, Multiple Subject, and Single Subject, includes the following steps:
-   Annual review of reading materials by instructor and Co-Dean.
    -    For example, specific hiring criteria for instructors can be found in the <u>job announcement posted on EdJoin</u>
-   Recommendation sent by Co-Dean to the Higher Education Committee.

- Approval of recommended changes by the Higher Education Committee.

During the Higher Education Committee meeting for the syllabus approval recommendations, additional experts in the content area will be invited to attend and advise.

Based on the syllabi we submitted, these are the courses that did not list required readings and indicate that readings and other resources will be selected by instructors:

7.A. General Education (Multiple Subject and Single Subject)

Upon review of the COA's concern regarding unidentified reading materials in courses, an audit was completed in July 2019 to identify the specific courses in which reading materials were not specifically identified. These courses have now been revised to include the following reading materials, effective Fall 2019:

(i) Module G1 - Technology in the Classroom
Since our submission we have updated this syllabus to include required materials. The current reading list is presented below.

Required text:
Hamilton, B. (2018). *Integrating technology in the classroom: Tools to meet the needs of every student (2nd Edition).* International Society for Technology in Education.

Supporting materials:
- Teachers know best: What educators want from digital instructional tools 2.0. Available at: https://s3.amazonaws.com/edtech-production/reports/Teachers-Know-Best-2.0.pdf
- Blended Learning Universe - Blended learning models. Available at: https://www.blendedlearning.org/models/
- Blending technology and classroom learning. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0TbaHimigw
- Introduction to blended learning. Available at: https://www.khanacademy.org/partner-content/ssf-cci/sscc-intro-blended-learni
- Kids: Safety Tips. Available at: https://archives.fbi.gov/archives/fun-games/kids/kids-safety
- Be safer online. Available at: https://www.missingkids.org/NetSmartz
- 5 myths and truths about kids' Internet safety. Available at: https://www.commonsensemedia.org/blog/5-myths-and-truths-about-kids-internet-safety
- Your online life, permanent as a tattoo. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/juan_enriquez_how_to_think_about_digital_tattoos
- Design time. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ci6Sfy7IeVo
- Inside Design Tech High School. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A7SEcHtHo7g

- Inside an environmental science school:
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YtO3q6l8PUk
- Can digital immigrants teach digital natives? Available at:
  https://www.teacherswithapps.com/blog-can-digital-immigrants-teach-digital-natives/
- Digital native or digital immigrant, which language do you speak? Available at:
  https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Digital-natives-and-digital-immigrants.aspx
- Digital natives Vs. Digital immigrants. Available at:
  https://www.nextgenlearning.org/articles/digital-natives-vs-digital-immigrants
- The challenges of raising a digital native. Available at:
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eRQdAOrqvGg
- 9 technology tools to engage students in the classroom. Available at:
  https://www.teachthought.com/technology/9-technology-tools-engage-students-classroom/
- Teacher recommended: 50 favorite classroom apps. Available at:
  https://www.kqed.org/mindshift/41165/teacher-recommended-50-favorite-teaching-apps

(ii) Practicum (B - G) syllabi
Each practicum is directly connected to a course (e.g. Practicum B: Foundations of Teaching is connected to Module B: Foundations of Teaching). Practicums use the same required texts and resources listed in the courses to which they are connected. All courses connected to practicums have required texts/resources listed in the syllabi submitted to CTC.

(iii) ED 206 and ED 405 - Field Supervision (Years 1 and 2).
Supervisors will select from the following texts for students enrolled in ED 206 (Year 1) and ED 405 (Year 2) Field Supervision.
1. MARZANO, ROBERT J., MARZANO, JANA S., DEBRA J. PICKERING AND JANE E. POLLOCK. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT THAT WORKS. ALEXANDRIA: ASCD, 2003.
2. MARZANO, ROBERT J. & DEBRA J. PICKERING AND JANE E. POLLOCK. CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION THAT WORKS. ALEXANDRIA: ASCD, 2001.
3. LEMOV, DOUG. TEACH LIKE A CHAMPION 2.0 - 62 TECHNIQUES THAT PUT STUDENTS ON THE PATH TO COLLEGE. SAN FRANCISCO: JOSSEY-BASS, 2015.
4. HIMMELE, P & HIMMELE, W. TOTAL PARTICIPATION TECHNIQUES: MAKING EVERY STUDENT AN ACTIVE LEARNER (2nd Edition). ALEXANDRIA, VA: ASCD, 2017.

7.B. Special Education

(i) ED309 - Technology in the Classroom

Since our submission we have updated this syllabus to include required materials. The current reading list is presented below.

Required text:
Dell, A. G., Newton, D., & Petroff, J. G. (2016). *Assistive technology in the classroom: Enhancing the school experiences of students with disabilities (3rd Edition)*. Pearson.

Supporting materials:
- Teachers know best: What educators want from digital instructional tools 2.0. Available at: https://s3.amazonaws.com/edtech-production/reports/Teachers-Know-Best-2.0.pdf
- Blended Learning Universe - Blended learning models. Available at: https://www.blendedlearning.org/models/
- The blended learning environment: A viable alternative for special needs students. Available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1125804.pdf
- Introduction to blended learning. Available at: https://www.khanacademy.org/partner-content/ssf-cci/sscc-intro-blended-learning
- Kids: Safety Tips. Available at: https://archives.fbi.gov/archives/fun-games/kids/kids-safety
- Be safer online. Available at: https://www.missingkids.org/NetSmartz
- 5 myths and truths about kids' Internet safety. Available at: https://www.commonsensemedia.org/blog/5-myths-and-truths-about-kids-internet-safety
- Your online life, permanent as a tattoo. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/juan_enriquez_how_to_think_about_digital_tattoos
- Design time. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ci6Sfy7IeVo
- Inside Design Tech High School. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A7SEcHtHo7g
- Can digital immigrants teach digital natives? Available at: https://www.teacherswithapps.com/blog-can-digital-immigrants-teach-digital-natives/
- Digital native or digital immigrant, which language do you speak? Available at: https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Digital-natives-and-digital-immigrants.aspx
- The challenges of raising a digital native. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eRQdAOrqvGg
- 9 technology tools to engage students in the classroom. Available at: https://www.teachthought.com/technology/9-technology-tools-engage-students-classroom/
- Teacher recommended: 50 favorite classroom apps. Available at: https://www.kqed.org/mindshift/41165/teacher-recommended-50-favorite-teaching-apps
- The use of technology in special education. Available at: https://elearningindustry.com/use-of-technology-in-special-education

- Five top technology trends in special education. Available at: https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2018/12/05/five-top-technology-trends-in-special-education.html
- 15 assistive technology tools and resources for students with disabilities. Available at: https://www.teachthought.com/technology/15-assistive-technology-tools-resources-for-students-with-disabilities/
- How assistive technology supports special education students. Available at: https://www.advancementcourses.com/blog/assistive-technology-special-ed

(ii) ESMM 620 and ESMM 730 - Field Supervision (Years 1 and 2).
Supervisors will select from the following texts for students enrolled in ESMM 620 (Year 1) and ESMM 730 (Year 2) Field Supervision.

5. MARZANO, ROBERT J., MARZANO, JANA S., DEBRA J. PICKERING AND JANE E. POLLOCK. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT THAT WORKS. ALEXANDRIA: ASCD, 2003.
6. MARZANO, ROBERT J. & DEBRA J. PICKERING AND JANE E. POLLOCK. CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION THAT WORKS. ALEXANDRIA: ASCD, 2001.
7. LEMOV, DOUG. TEACH LIKE A CHAMPION 2.0 - 62 TECHNIQUES THAT PUT STUDENTS ON THE PATH TO COLLEGE. SAN FRANCISCO: JOSSEY-BASS, 2015.
8. HIMMELE, P & HIMMELE, W. TOTAL PARTICIPATION TECHNIQUES: MAKING EVERY STUDENT AN ACTIVE LEARNER. ALEXANDRIA, VA: ASCD, 2017.

ADDITIONALLY, we had added a note to the required text for ***ESMM203 Application of Legal Issues in Special Education***. The note said "Will change for 2019-20 Academic Year."
Currently we are using the following required texts:
- Laws, regulations & policies: Federal and state legislation, laws, regulations, policies, legal advisories, and guidance. Available at: https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/lr/
- Yell, M. L. (2018). *The law and special education (5th edition)*. Pearson.

8. With regards to ESMM 207, how can Education Specialist candidates be expected to achieve competency in (a) conducting standardized formal assessments and (b) conducting Curriculum Based Assessment, when there appears to be insufficient coverage of these critical concepts/skills or time and practice opportunities (to learn about and to practice conducting) when the course only offers one and two sessions to cover the content respectively. Structurally, the program does not appear to offer candidates sufficient opportunities to truly learn about and learn how to appropriately conduct formal and informal assessments for students with disabilities. You'll be hard pressed to find an expert in assessment who will concur that dedicating one class session to formal standardized assessments is sufficient to ensure that candidates meet minimum qualifications to independently administer such assessments to students with disabilities and those who are

being evaluated to determine if they qualify for special education services (page 230). Are there other courses or opportunities for candidates to learn these concepts?

Program Response:
Candidates' learning opportunities focused on assessing student learning beginning during Pre-Service with the following:

- *A3: Preparing to Teach Reading & Language Arts* in which candidates are exposed to informal reading inventories and opportunities to utilize curriculum-based and other informal reading assessments to identify student strengths and areas for targeted instruction within their reading skills and

- *A6: Individualized Education Program Development and Implementation* in which candidates learn how IEP's are based on assessment of students' present levels of performance to determine goals and drive services. Candidates explore standardized as well as informal assessments to determine student needs in addition to discussing the process for using assessment data to determine eligibility for special education services.

Additional opportunities to explore and hone assessment skills continue during the Year 1 program as interns work with their mentors and field supervisors on all aspects of case management, including assessment. All Year 1 coursework addresses the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) "District Interns will demonstrate the ability to analyze, assess, and use information to drive decision making" with specific coursework and assignments targeted to Education Specialists.

In *Module C: Planning for Data-Driven Instruction*, District Interns complete a Student Assessment Inventory as a measurable artifact and a Long-Term Plan with Aligned Assessment as a Competency-Based Artifact:

1. **STUDENT ASSESSMENT INVENTORY** *(MEASUREABLE ARTIFACT)*
   CANDIDATES DEVELOP A STUDENT ASSESSMENT INVENTORY. DATA FROM ASSESSMENTS PLAY A CRITICAL ROLE IN IMPROVING INSTRUCTION AND LEARNING. ASSESSMENTS PROVIDE CONSISTENT MEASURES THAT ALLOW TEACHERS, PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S), AND STUDENTS THEMSELVES TO MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS, UNDERSTAND SPECIFIC STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES, AND SET LEARNING GOALS/OBJECTIVES. A STUDENT ASSESSMENT INVENTORY PROVIDES IMPORTANT INFORMATION TO TEACHERS ABOUT ASSESSMENTS FROM A STUDENT PERSPECTIVE.

2. **LONG-TERM PLAN WITH ALIGNED ASSESSMENT** *(COMPETENCY-BASED ARTIFACT)*
   USING THE STANDARDS AND CURRICULUM OF CANDIDATES' CLASSROOMS, CANDIDATES WILL DEVELOP A 4-6 WEEK LONG-TERM PLAN. IN ADDITION TO THIS, CANDIDATES WILL ALSO DEVELOP ONE ALIGNED SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT, AS WELL AS A MINIMUM OF TWO ADDITIONAL FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS. CANDIDATES SHOULD EMPLOY A VARIETY OF ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES, AS WELL AS NOTE HOW THEY WILL PROVIDE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENT SUBGROUPS AND EXTENSIONS OF STUDENT LEARNING INCLUDING ENGLISH LEARNERS AND STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS. THESE PLANS WILL BE PRESENTED DURING THE LAST

MEETING OF THE COURSE, AND CANDIDATES WILL THEN REFLECT ON THE COLLABORATIVE FEEDBACK THEY RECEIVED. *FOR A MORE THOROUGH DETAILING OF THIS ASSIGNMENT, PLEASE SEE THE DOCUMENTS, EXEMPLARS, AND RUBRIC POSTED ON SCHOOLOGY.*

In Module D: Supporting Diverse Learners, District Interns complete a Case Study with Modified Lesson Plan and Materials as a Competency-Based Artifact.

1. **CASE STUDY WITH MODIFIED LESSON PLAN AND MATERIALS** *(COMPETENCY-BASED ARTIFACT)*

   CANDIDATES WILL PREPARE A CASE STUDY OF A PARTICULAR STUDENT, AS WELL AS A LESSON PLAN MODIFIED WITH THAT STUDENT'S NEEDS IN MIND WITH APPROPRIATE MODIFIED MATERIALS. THE CASE STUDY OF THE STUDENT SHOULD INCLUDE: STUDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION; ASSESSMENT DATA FROM A VARIETY OF SOURCES, BOTH FORMAL AND INFORMAL; DOCUMENTED COLLABORATION AND DISCUSSION WITH THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S); AND INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES AIMED AT SUPPORTING THE STUDENT. THE LESSON PLAN AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS SHOULD BEAR OUT THE EVIDENCE OF THIS CLOSE STUDY, DEMONSTRATING CLEAR MOMENTS OF APPROPRIATE DIFFERENTIATION AND SCAFFOLDING. THESE MATERIALS WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE CLASS DURING THE FINAL MEETING OF THE COURSE FOR FEEDBACK AND FURTHER COLLABORATION, FOLLOWED BY A REFLECTION AND NEXT STEPS. *FOR A MORE THOROUGH DETAILING OF THIS ASSIGNMENT, PLEASE SEE THE DOCUMENTS, EXEMPLARS, AND RUBRIC POSTED ON SCHOOLOGY.*

In **ED 200: Methodology of Teaching Reading and Writing**, District Interns will complete a comprehensive Informal Reading Inventory as a Competency-Based Artifact and will prepare a thorough academic report based on these assessments. Instruction for this course includes practice using reading assessments to assess word reading, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, and phonemic awareness. Interns additional learn how to utilize assessment findings to recommend instructional strategies to address areas of need.

In **ESMM 201: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning**, District Interns complete a Functional Assessment Analysis and learn to operationalize and measure behaviors to track data. They also address Social Emotional Learning Skills Using Formative Assessments as a Measurable Artifact.

1. **SEL SKILLS USING FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS:** *(MEASUREABLE ARTIFACT)*

   BUILDING SEL SKILLS THROUGH FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS (RESOURCE: R.J. MARZANO). MEASURE AND EVALUATE YOUR STUDENTS' SEL DEVELOPMENT BY USING A PROGRESSION CHART AND STRATEGIES THAT INCLUDE PROBING DISCUSSIONS, UNOBTRUSIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND STUDENT-GENERATED ASSESSMENTS.

In **ESMM 203: Application of Legal Issues in Special Education**, District Interns analyze Present Levels of Performance in IEP documents as well as academic and psycho-educational reports as Measurable Artifacts.

1. **ANALYSIS IEP PRESENT LEVELS/ACADEMIC REPORT/PSYCHO-EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION** (MEASUREABLE ARTIFACT)
   A "STATEMENT OF THE CHILD'S PRESENT LEVELS OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE," INCLUDING AN EXPLANATION OF "HOW THE CHILD'S DISABILITY AFFECTS THE CHILD'S INVOLVEMENT AND PROGRESS IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM." REVIEW SPECIAL EDUCATION ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT MEASURES BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (CDE), SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION (SED) AND DIVE DEEPLY INTO THE PROCESS OF DISSEMINATING EDUCATIONAL DATA FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION FOR ALL STUDENTS, WITH AN EMPHASIS ON STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. PROVIDE RESOURCES THROUGH A TEACHER-GUIDED ACTIVITY FOR UNDERSTANDING THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF A PSYCHO-EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT SO THAT IT IS LEGALLY DEFENSIBLE.

In *ESMM 204: Transition Planning in Special Education*, District Interns explore and utilize appropriate transition assessments for creating transition plans.

In *ESMM 205: Collaboration, Consultation, and Case Management*, District Interns develop a case management plan for progress monitoring all goals and services and meeting timelines for all students on their caseload.

In *ESMM 206: Strategies for Teaching Students with Disabilities*, District Interns complete a Technology Assessment Plan and an Adaptation Plan as Measurable Artifacts which include opportunities to hone assessment skills and identify accurate baseline data and progress monitoring to ensure effectiveness of strategies.

1. **TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT PLAN** *(MEASUREABLE ARTIFACT)*
   THE ASSIGNMENT INVOLVES SELECTING, CONSTRUCTING, AND IMPLEMENTING ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES APPROPRIATE TO THE LEARNING OUTCOMES. INTERNS WILL (1) APPLY TECHNOLOGY IN ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING OF SUBJECT MATTER USING A VARIETY OF ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES; (2) USE TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES TO COLLECT AND ANALYZE DATA, INTERPRET RESULTS, AND COMMUNICATE FINDINGS TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE AND MAXIMIZE STUDENT LEARNING; (3) APPLY TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES TO ENABLE AND EMPOWER LEARNERS WITH DIVERSE BACKGROUNDS, CHARACTERISTICS, AND ABILITIES.

2. **ADAPTATION PLAN:** *(MEASURABLE ARTIFACT)*
   COMPLETE DETAILED ADAPTATION PLAN FOR A STUDENT ON YOUR CASELOAD. CREATE A STUDENT GOAL PROFILE INCLUDING ACCURATE BASELINE DATA, CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE GOALS WILL BE MET, BENCHMARKS, PROGRESS MONITORING PLAN. IDENTIFY OR CREATE A COMMUNICATION DOCUMENT FOR SHARING INFORMATION ABOUT A STUDENT'S GOALS AND ADAPTATIONS WITH PERSONNEL WHO SUPPORT THE STUDENT.

In *ESMM 207: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities*, District Interns complete 40 hours of coursework to refine the knowledge and skills required for

evaluating the educational needs of diverse populations of students using both formal and informal assessment techniques.

In July 2019, this course went through an audit and subsequent revisions based on concerns presented by the COA. The revised syllabus for this course reflects updated assignments that include gathering multiple measures, completing triennial assessment and annual assessment reports, and reviewing the assessment protocols for standardized assessments. The revised syllabus for this course can be found here:

- ESMM 207: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities

9. As an example of possible misalignment with best practices in the field of special education, on page 20, when providing a description of ESMM206, FSE Lesson Plan Template assignment, the program writes the following,

"...PARTICULARLY REFLECT ON HOW INSTRUCTIONAL INTERVENTIONS AND DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION SUPPORTED LEARNING FOR ALL STUDENTS WITH THE INCORPORATION OF TECHNOLOGY, INCLUDING SUBGROUPS AND STUDENTS WITH AUTISTIC-LIKE LEARNING CHARACTERISTICS WITHIN A DIVERSE SETTING (SPECIAL EDUCATION, ELL, GATE, ASD, AND/OR OTHER IDENTIFIED SUBGROUPS)."

It is not appropriate to make a reference to, "...students with autistic-like learning characteristics..." and causes pause as to the relevancy and currency of content area expertise of those who are responsible for the content and pedagogy of this program. How does the program ensure that the content is aligned with the most current research based best practices of the field? How do the instructors stay current with these research based practices?

Program Response:
We absolutely agree with the comment above and we have revised this part to read as follows:

> **"...PARTICULARLY REFLECT ON HOW INSTRUCTIONAL INTERVENTIONS AND DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION SUPPORTED LEARNING FOR ALL STUDENTS, INCLUDING STUDENTS ON THE AUTISM SPECTRUM, WITH THE INCORPORATION OF TECHNOLOGY AND USE OF FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT."**

To ensure that the content is aligned with the most current research and best practices of the field, we will be systematically and continuously reviewing our syllabi (see Annual Course Syllabus Review Protocol). This instrument (Annual Course Syllabus Review Protocol) assesses alignment with state standards and best practices in the field.

We ensure this alignment by following out protocol:

We have adopted the Annual Course Syllabus Review Protocol--also included for your review. Our protocol, which covers all program tracks for Education Specialist Mild to Moderate, Multiple Subject, and Single Subject, includes the following steps:
- Annual review of course syllabus by instructor and Co-Dean.
    - For example, specific hiring criteria for instructors can be found in the job announcement posted on EdJoin
- Recommendation sent by Co-Dean to the Higher Education Committee.
- Approval of recommended changes by the Higher Education Committee.

During the Higher Education Committee meeting for the syllabus approval recommendations, additional experts in the content areas will be invited to attend and advise.

Similarly, to ensure that our instructors stay current with research-based practices we require them to attend a minimum of 10 hours of professional development per year (see Faculty Evaluation Guidebook and Employment Contract):

From the Faculty Evaluation Guidebook (p. 2):
> *2.2.3. Professional Development*
> *Fortune School of Education requires its instructors to remain abreast of their discipline most current research, trends, and best practices. Instructors are required to attend a minimum of 10 hours of relevant professional development. These hours can be completed through professional development sessions offered by Fortune School of Education and/or another educational organization. If an instructor plans attending professional development sessions offered by another organization, at the beginning of each year, instructors will deliver the Professional Development Plan to their supervisor identifying professional development activities they plan attending and how Fortune School of Education can help them. Requests for financial support to attend out-of-town educational events will be presented to the Higher Education Committee. Evidence of attendance of activities listed in the Professional Development Plan will be submitted to the supervisor in May as part of the narrative of the achievements. Additionally, instructors are required to attend the in-person and online development sessions offered by Fortune. (Professional Development Plan Form - Appendix D)*

COA Questions for Fortune School of Education
July 8, 2019

1. The totality of training materials presented seems to lack depth, how does the program ensure that the training program is of sufficient rigor to ensure that candidates have the depth of knowledge required to begin in the profession?

Program Response:

The Report of Findings composed by the CTC staff and reviewers (August 2018 - May 2019) shows that our Education Specialist Intern Program is aligned with the adopted standards, ensuring that candidates meet the requirements to successfully begin in the profession. Additionally, other COA members have pointed out specific issues (see questions 7, 8, and 9 above), which we have addressed.

We ensure that candidates have the depth of knowledge required to begin in the profession by:
- hiring qualified instructors (see Job Post Template);
- systematically and routinely reviewing our syllabi to ensure that faculty and candidates have access to the most current research and best practices (see Annual Course Syllabus Review Protocol);
- requiring our instructors to attend a minimum of 10 hours of professional development per year (see Faculty Evaluation Guidebook and Employment Contract).
- Qualification of Field Supervisors
- Qualification of On-Site Mentors
- Evaluation by Principals
- Attending CTC trainings and events.

2. How does the program ensure that faculty (instructors) have the necessary education, training, and expertise, to ensure that the program is evidence-based, current, and relevant to prepare effective education specialists? How does the program ensure that faculty remain current with research and best practices in the field of special education?

Program Response:
FSE selects and hires qualified instructors that have the necessary education, training, and expertise, to ensure that the program is evidence-based, current, and relevant. Our instructors usually work in the field. We are attaching of resumes for two of our instructors (Erin Sipes and Marilyn Delgado) to illustrate the qualifications and expertise of the instructors we hire for the Education Specialist program.
We ensure that faculty remain current with research and best practices in the field of special education by requiring our instructors to attend a minimum of 10 hours of professional development per year in their field of expertise (see Faculty Evaluation Guidebook and Employment Contract).