

# Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at

## California School for the Deaf, Fremont

Professional Services Division

March 2024

### Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **California School for the Deaf, Fremont**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

### Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	<b>Met with Concerns</b>
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	<b>Met</b>
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	<b>Met</b>
4) Continuous Improvement	<b>Met with Concerns</b>
5) Program Impact	<b>Met</b>

### Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction	6	5	1	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

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

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Accreditation Team Report**

**Institution:** California School for the Deaf, Fremont

**Dates of Visit:** February 26-28, 2024

**Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations**

**Previous History of Accreditation Status**

<b>Accreditation Reports</b>	<b>Accreditation Status</b>
<a href="#">June 2016</a>	<a href="#">Accreditation with Stipulations</a>
<a href="#">June 2017</a>	<a href="#">Recommendation to Remove Stipulations</a>
<a href="#">November 2017</a>	<a href="#">Recommendation to Remove Remaining Stipulations</a>
<a href="#">June 2018</a>	<a href="#">Accreditation</a>

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, mentors, candidates, completers, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All preconditions have been determined to be **aligned**.

Program Standards

All Teacher Induction program standards were met with the exception of Program Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services which was **met with concerns**.

Common Standards

Common Standards 2, 3, and 5 were **met**. Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation and Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement were **met with concerns**.

### Overall Recommendation

The team recommends the following stipulations:

That within one year of this action, the institution must submit written documentation to the team lead and Commission consultant documenting all actions to address the stipulations noted below:

1. that the institution provides evidence that the education unit and teacher induction program have regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.
2. that the institution provides evidence to confirm that multiple sources of data, including feedback from key constituencies about the quality of the preparation, are used for continuous improvement of the teacher induction program.
3. that the institution provides clear and consistent evidence that program leadership provides formative feedback to mentors on their work.
4. that the institution provides a 6-month progress report to the Commission consultant related to the stipulations above.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements:

#### Teacher Induction

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California School for the Deaf, Fremont be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California School for the Deaf, Fremont be granted full approval in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

## Accreditation Team

### Team Lead:

Conni Campbell  
San Diego County Office of Education

### Programs Reviewer:

Dawn Aguila  
Santa Ana Unified School District

### Common Standards:

Beth Bythrow  
Los Angeles Unified School District

### Staff to the Visit:

William Hatrick  
Commission on Teacher Credential

### Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission  
Program Review Submission  
Common Standards Addendum  
Program Review Addendum  
Candidate Advisement Materials  
Accreditation Website  
Candidate Modules  
Memoranda of Understanding

Candidate Files  
Assessment Materials  
Teacher Induction Handbook  
Survey Results  
Precondition Responses  
Accreditation Data Dashboard  
Training Materia

### Interviews Conducted

<b>Constituencies</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Candidates	4
Completers	8
Employers - Site Administrators	5
Institutional Administration	6
Program Coordinator	1
Mentors	5
Credential Analyst	1
Advisory Board Members	5
Institution of Higher Education Partners	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

### Background Information

The California School for the Deaf (CSD) is located in Fremont, California. Over the school's 163 years in operation, it has been located in Berkeley and San Francisco, and opened at its present 91-acre location in 1980. The school enrollment includes children as young as 14 months in the Early Childhood Education program and continues through elementary, middle, and high school. Of the approximately 300 students, 54% are Hispanic, 21% are White, 11% are Asian, 7% are African American, with the remaining 7% being American Indian, Filipino, Pacific Islander, and two or more races. The educational program is 100% bilingual (American Sign Language and English) with a 10:1 student-to-teacher ratio. Additionally, 86% of the teachers and staff are Deaf. CSD has graduates who have gone on to become experts in the field of visual and performing arts, athletics, business, educational administration, political and community service, law, medicine, publishing, and writing. The vision statement for CSD Fremont is to be an internationally renowned leader of bilingual education, providing a positive learning environment in which all Deaf students thrive. CSD is recognized for its academic rigor and direct instruction in ASL and English.

### Education Unit

The California School for the Deaf induction program was first accredited by the Commission in 2011. Its mission is to provide impactful and planned professional development opportunities for participating teachers; mentors who collaborate with participating teachers on agreed-upon goals, reflective practices, and student achievement; and the program supports new teachers through coaching by experienced curriculum specialists. The induction program currently has 1 program director, 1 coordinator, and 5 mentor teachers. The director and coordinator report to the CSD superintendent who is also the unit head. There are currently 4 enrolled candidates for teacher induction.

**Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Number of Program Completers (2022-23)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Enrolled (2023-24)</b>
Teacher Induction	5	4

### The Visit

This site visit was conducted virtually. Institutional and program constituencies were interviewed via technology.

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

## PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be **met**.

## PROGRAM REPORTS

### Teacher Induction

#### Program Design

The Teacher Induction program operates within the California School for the Deaf (CSD) in Fremont, CA, a State Special School overseen by the California Department of Education (CDE). This program is designed to support teachers spanning from early childhood education through 12th grade in both general education and deaf and hard-of-hearing education. Oversight of the induction program is managed by the program director and induction coordinator. The program director assumes the role of the CORE (Curriculum, Outreach, Resources and Education) department supervisor, while the induction coordinator functions as one of the teacher specialists/mentors within CORE. The superintendent serves as the program unit head.

Collaboration between the induction program and the human resources department is integral to identifying eligible candidates and recommending completers for clear credentials. A structured process ensures ongoing communication between the induction leadership team and the credential analyst. Interviews confirmed that there is a process in place for ongoing communication to ensure that qualified candidates are enrolled in the induction program. Regular meetings are convened between the program leadership, advisory board, and superintendent throughout the year. These interactions facilitate strategic planning, feedback gathering, and alignment with program goals. Interviews with program leadership confirmed that they have both regularly scheduled meetings with their advisory board members as well as informal meetings with members as needed in order to collaborate and receive input on program practices.

The leadership team also engages in frequent communication with mentors and Curriculum and Instruction (CORE) teacher specialists. This communication occurs through weekly department meetings, reminder emails, and updates on the induction website. Mentors play a crucial role in the program by providing support and guidance to assigned candidates. They actively participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) aimed at discussing best practices and ensuring program adherence to CTC standards. Mentors confirmed during interviews that they meet regularly to review best practices and support structures in place for their assigned candidates.

The teacher induction program assigns qualified mentors and provides guidance and clear expectations for the mentoring experience based on the program's design. All of the program's mentors are teacher specialists who have the same credentials as the candidate(s) they support. A review of the program requirements indicates that mentors must have a California clear credential, a minimum of three years of successful teaching experience, and an administrator as well as the induction specialist's approval. The mentors' roles are built into

their job description which allows for dedicated time for regular mentor and candidate interactions, observations, and other activities as outlined in the Individual Learning Plan (ILP). There was a great need for an induction program to be brought to CSD since it is a Deaf education program. By providing their own program, they are ensuring that their mentors have the appropriate knowledge of the context and the content area of their candidates' teaching assignments.

Candidates attested during interviews to the high qualifications of their mentors, describing them as "always available to support me whenever I need it." Instances were recounted where mentors went above and beyond, such as scheduling multiple meetings per week or conducting additional observations to address individual needs. Candidates further expressed appreciation for the program's on-campus presence, highlighting the ease of communication through American Sign Language (ASL) and the elimination of the need for interpreters during observations. One candidate remarked, "I don't think I would have learned as much as I know now without having the program here on campus."

The program's design features are crafted to enhance candidates' professional practice and bolster their retention in the field. Survey data from candidates over the past two years underscores the efficacy of these features, with all respondents indicating feeling either "well matched" or "moderately well matched" with their mentors. Additionally, mentors received an average rating of 4.4 out of 5 when respondents were asked to assess the productivity, relevance, and meaningfulness of meetings in addressing their current challenges and goals.

The mentors' main responsibilities include coaching their candidate(s) through the use of just-in-time support based on a trusting relationship, ILP development, and documentation as well as formative feedback based on evidence gathered during observations. Mentors are trained using resources from *Mentoring Matters*, *Art of Coaching*, and research-based articles and professional publications.

Interviews with mentors affirm their commitment to regular team meetings to explore mentoring scenarios, engage in book studies, and assess candidate progress. Furthermore, the program facilitates opportunities for mentor collaboration within the CORE department meetings, enabling mentors to connect with peers in professional learning networks. Program documents reveal that program leadership equips mentors with slide decks, resources, and professional literature to reinforce mentoring best practices, encompassing adult learning principles, mentoring instruments, and program processes like the ILP.

Survey responses from mentors underscore the effectiveness of support provided by the induction coordinator, with 100% indicating they "received useful guidance throughout the year." Additionally, mentors reported ample opportunities for collaboration with other support providers for professional development and problem-solving, with an average rating of 3.5 out of 4. These findings affirm the program's commitment to fostering a supportive environment for mentorship, professional growth, and collaborative problem-solving.



The program actively solicits input from its constituents through both formal and informal channels. Program leadership maintains regular meetings with members of their advisory board to exchange best practices and collaborate on topics pertinent to the Deaf community. Close partnerships are fostered with institutions of higher education at Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) and other constituents within the school community. RIT is home to the National Technical Institute for the Deaf and is home to the world's first and largest technological college for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

Advisory board members confirmed during interviews that program leadership shares slideshows containing program data, facilitating discussions surrounding strengths and areas needing support. Surveys are administered to candidates, mentors, and site administrators annually at regular intervals, as evidenced by program documents. Constituent interviews reaffirmed that regular opportunities exist for providing feedback on program practices.

Site administrators emphasized their involvement in "regular meetings with mentors and candidates to identify areas requiring support and to assist candidates in setting goals." Given the program's size, interactions between mentors, candidates, and site administrators occur frequently on an informal basis. Many constituents reported during interviews that they engage in daily interactions and feel comfortable addressing any just-in-time needs as they arise.

Program leadership integrates feedback from all constituent groups to inform revisions to program practices. Since 2018, the program has consistently operated with the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) as its cornerstone. Minor adjustments to the ILP and mentor training have been implemented based on feedback gleaned from surveys. Mentors disclosed during interviews that they convene annually at year-end to review program feedback from constituents and propose changes to program documents and practices accordingly.

Examples shared during interviews illustrate the breadth of these revisions, encompassing the pacing and content of provided trainings, color-coded elements within the ILP document, and the incorporation of video modules aimed at supporting both mentors and candidates in navigating the ILP process.

#### Course of Study (Mentor/Coaching System)

The induction program's mentors are teacher specialists who have the same credentials as the candidate(s) they support. They are matched based on content area or grade level expertise within 30 days of beginning their induction program. Interviews with candidates confirmed that they meet their assigned mentor at the induction orientation meeting at the beginning of the school year. Both just-in-time and longer-term supports are documented on collaborative logs that are submitted by the candidates monthly. A review of program documents and interviews with candidates confirmed that these logs are used to document the support they receive on individualized needs as well as progress made on their ILP goals.

A review of sample portfolios from current candidates confirmed that candidates complete an ILP that chronicles their participation in the induction program. The CSD Fremont ILP addresses the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)* and provides the road map for

candidates' induction work during their time in the program. In addition to CSTP 1-6, the California School for the Deaf developed CSTP Standard #7, *Developing as a Teacher of Deaf Children*, to ensure that teachers in their program are highly qualified in their knowledge of the bilingual philosophy and can meet the needs of their student population.

The ILP is organized by professional teaching goal cycles. Each year, candidates work on up to three goals from within the CSTP unless they have been approved for the Early Completion Option (ECO). ECO participating teachers complete four goals on their ILPs within a year. Candidates are strongly encouraged to choose at least one element from CSTP 2. They may choose to use the same standards that they are using with their own direct supervisors in order to streamline their efforts. Interviews with administrators confirmed that candidates have this as an option, not a requirement.

The ILP is collaboratively developed at the beginning of the candidate's program by the candidate and the mentor, with input from the site administrator. Activities contained within the ILP include attendance at induction program meetings, regular collaboration with their assigned mentor, CSTP self-assessment - identifying strengths and areas for growth, and cycles of inquiry contained within a document called the Individual Induction Plan (IIP). In addition, the ILP requires candidates to complete a class profile, observe colleagues, attend professional learning opportunities to support their individualized goals in the ILP, develop lesson and unit plans with identified focus students, collect assessment data, analyze the data collected, reflect on growth made, and identify their participation in the larger professional learning community. Progress on the ILP is monitored and reviewed at regular intervals by the assigned mentor. Interviews with mentors and candidates confirmed that they regularly review progress on the ILP at their weekly meetings. Candidates also shared that the program coordinator regularly reviews progress and provides feedback on the ILP to support successful completion.

Candidates have access to professional learning opportunities through the New Teacher Mentoring Program, which provides topics based on teacher need and is open to all new teachers, not just the induction candidates. Candidates can self-select their professional learning based on their CSTP focus and/or content area or other areas of interest, as outlined in the ILP. Candidates also have opportunities to observe their colleagues as part of their professional learning, attend content-area focused professional learning, as well as attend training specific to the bilingual philosophy of Deaf education. Interviews with candidates, mentors, and program leadership confirmed that the professional learning is individualized and based on the CSTP and goals set on the ILP. Candidates provided examples of professional learning they were able to attend that directly aligned with their content areas.

In addition to weekly support on the ILP from their assigned mentors, candidates are also observed by the mentor and receive formative feedback on progress made toward their goals and the CSTP. Program leadership regularly reviews candidate progress on the ILP through the use of comments on Google documents. At both the midpoint and end of the year, leadership conducts a more formal review of candidate progress. Interviews with program leadership and

a review of program documents confirmed that a mid-year survey monitoring candidate completion is administered, and a completion document/portfolio review is completed at the end of each year. A review of the program handbook indicates that CSD Fremont has a process in place for candidates who may need additional time or support in completing program requirements.

The program seeks feedback from candidates on the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates through surveys as well as informally through conversations with program leadership. Candidates confirmed in interviews that they have opportunities to provide feedback about their mentors, program processes and their experience with the ILP. This data is reviewed by mentors and program leadership in order to make improvements to the program components. Although mentors confirmed in interviews that they review the data for program improvements, a review of evidence did not indicate how mentors receive formative feedback from program leaders on their work. Documents reviewed and interviews with program leadership indicated that the mentors provide feedback to each other and that there are conversations with mentors as needed based on candidate feedback, but no system is in place for leaders to provide all mentors with formative feedback. A review of program documents provided evidence of procedures in place for the reassignment of mentors if the pairing is not effective.

#### Assessment of Candidates

Candidates enrolled in the CSD Fremont induction program are assessed in a variety of ways. Candidates self-assess by ranking themselves on all 38 elements on the CSTP Continuum of Teaching Practice twice per year and submitting a survey at the end of Year 2 documenting their growth toward mastery on all 38 elements over time. This work is also documented on their co-assessment form which is included in the ILP. Mentors provide ongoing feedback as the pairs work together weekly. A review of documents also indicated that mentors include post-observations feedback on the candidate's ILP. Each candidate receives a minimum of three induction observations each year from their mentor.

A review of the program's published materials indicates that there is a portfolio review document completed by the induction coordinator to confirm program completion. The completion document includes all elements of the ILP. Interviews with the candidates and induction leadership confirmed that the coordinator reviews completion of program requirements at the middle and end of year points.

Candidates are also assessed through regular ILP feedback by both the induction coordinator and their assigned mentor. The program director and mentors review year two candidates' ILPs. Candidates confirmed in interviews that they receive regular feedback on their ILP and shared examples of how program leadership supported them in revising the ILP when necessary. The program coordinator reviews all candidate progress through a mid-year review and informs candidates of any missing items or concerns noted on their progress toward successful completion. In addition to the ILP and related components, all year two candidates complete an

exit interview to demonstrate their professional growth and learning over the course of the program. A review of program documents confirmed that there are rubrics used by program leadership and mentors to indicate candidate competence.

The program has procedures in place to support candidates who are not making successful progress. Mentors and mentors are responsible for providing additional support, as needed. The team works together to provide an individual approach to support the candidate. This plan usually involves a combination of more frequent meetings and observations as well as more “bite-sized” feedback so the teacher can focus on one specific skill at a time. A review of the program handbook and documents indicates that candidates are informed of these systems of support and that they are readily available. Administrators and mentors indicated during the interviews that there are little to no instances of candidates not succeeding due to the coordinated efforts of the CSD Fremont program’s team. Candidates shared during interviews that there were “no surprises as to how we are progressing.” They indicated that they receive as much support as they need in order to be successful in meeting program requirements.

Candidates are informed of the program completion requirements, as evidenced by a review of the program handbook and website. Candidates confirmed during interviews that they participate in an orientation meeting and receive “a list of everything required so it helps us proceed and not feel overwhelmed.” At regular intervals throughout the year, mentors review and sign the candidates’ ILPs indicating that they are meeting the program requirements. Program leadership has also provided online modules with videos explaining each portion of the ILP requirements. Both candidates and mentors indicated during interviews that these videos have been instrumental in keeping them on track. At the completion of each year, candidate progress is evaluated by the program coordinator.

Completion requirements are closely monitored throughout the year by the program coordinator. Once program completion has been determined, the induction coordinator works closely with the human resources credential technician. A review of the program website demonstrates that the HR credentials technician reviews the candidate’s credentials, verifies induction program completion, and makes the recommendation for the California clear credential.

### Findings on Standards

After review of all available information including interviews with candidates, program completers, program leadership, mentors, site administrators and other constituency groups, the team determined that all program standards are met for the California School for the Deaf, except for the following:

### **Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services – Met with Concerns**

Although interviews confirmed that mentors collaborate and provide each other with feedback, there was not clear evidence that program leadership provides formative feedback to mentors on their work.

### **INSTITUTION SUMMARY**

In its thirteenth year of implementation, the California School for the Deaf at Fremont provides a site-specific induction program for their 4 candidates that is well integrated into the school's infrastructure. CSD Fremont offers both a daytime program as well as a residential option for students unable to make the daily commute. Collaboration and support are strongholds throughout the entire school and can be used to describe the teacher induction program as well. Program leadership, mentors, and subject matter experts are well qualified for their positions and committed to the mission and vision of the induction program which is rooted in research-based practice specifically for bilingual educators. When asked how often a teacher in the induction program receives support, the induction candidates responded "as often as needed. Our mentors are available to us 24/7."

The program coordinator provides the main support for the program's structure, with help from the CORE curriculum team who also serve as mentors. Interview evidence provided during the site visit confirmed the coordinator is accessible and involved, organizing mentor training, providing consistent feedback to candidates on their ILPs, and managing an assessment system to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements. Together, the mentors and the district's CORE curriculum team provide ample "just in time" and long-range support as identified by the candidates themselves. The program's advisory committee, acting as a leadership team, meets one to three times per year to discuss the budget, credential application process, individual candidates, and to provide input, feedback, and advice on the operations of the program. Leadership collects data on program effectiveness in both formal and informal ways, such as verbal feedback, and has made appropriate program modifications based on findings. A more systematic and robust approach to collecting, analyzing, and using formal candidate and program completion data, as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations, would enhance the program's continuous improvement process to document appropriate modifications based on findings.

Interviews and direct evidence provided during the site visit affirm the success of Induction candidates in both accreditation activities (ILP completion) and in the performance of their job responsibilities. A focus on and commitment to supporting new teachers to make a positive impact as educators was clearly communicated throughout program multiple constituency group interviews, which has fostered student achievement in their bilingual school community, growth and development of effective classroom practice, and benefits for the wider educational community.

**COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS**

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<b><i>No response needed</i></b>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	<b>Consistently</b>
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	<b>Consistently</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	<b>Consistently</b>
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	<b>Consistently</b>
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	<b>Consistently</b>
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	<b>Consistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 1: Met with Concerns**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard**

CSD Fremont articulates a vision of teaching and learning based on bilingual education philosophy and pedagogy. All beginning teachers learn the Seven Principles of ESL Teaching (Freeman & Freeman) and receive ASL-English Bilingual Professional Development (AEBPD) that foster problem-solving, critical thinking, and effective language use in both ASL and English that is geared for Deaf and Hard of Hearing students to meet the California adopted P-12 content standards. Qualified faculty who represents and support diversity and excellence serve as mentors to beginning teachers as part of their employment, and together with unit leadership’s coordination, advisement and professional development, qualified support and sufficient resources are provided to the induction program participants. Interviews with every constituency group confirmed that induction program leadership, mentors, and subject-matter experts provide supervision of induction candidates within a supportive, purposeful, and collegial community.

The institution actively involves instructional personnel and relevant constituencies on their campus in the organization, coordination, and decision making through regular Instructional Management Team (IMT) meetings, Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meetings and Induction Advisory meetings. Interview evidence made it clear that CSD collaborates with colleagues in P-12 settings by attending the annual Induction conference, the California Education Administrators of Schools for the Deaf conference (CEASD), and national tournaments with other deaf schools where principal roundtables are held to share best practice for Deaf education. CSD also collaborates with colleges and universities, such as Western Oregon University and Rochester Institute of Technology, to recruit qualified teachers and share best practice. While there is some evidence that CSD collaborates with colleagues in both P-12 and university settings, it is not evident that the education unit has regular and systematic collaboration with P-12, college, university, and members of the broader educational community specifically to improve educator preparation.

Members from the executive team confirmed that they provide leadership and appropriate financial and human resources for professional development and robust program support. The unit hires and retains faculty who represent and support diversity, and additional recruitment efforts are being explored, although additional growth in this area would benefit the program and the district.

The induction program is staffed with a K-12 Literacy Coach Teacher Specialist who serves as the program coordinator, and qualified induction mentors for field-based support and supervision. The program director recently became the superintendent, and a new program director was hired but is still learning the role. Interviews with the district’s professional development personnel called the CORE team highlighted that the program’s mentors and candidates all engage in research-based professional development aligned with California content standards and effective professional practices to serve all students. A review of candidate files confirmed that each recommendation for a credential is organized, analyzed, and reviewed appropriately.

**Rationale for the Finding**

While there is some evidence that the institution collaborates with colleagues in both P-12 and university settings, it is not evident that the education unit has regular and systematic collaboration with P-12, college and university units, and members of the broader educational community specifically to improve educator preparation. Reestablishing former partnerships, broadening the advisory committee, and formalizing systems for collaboration that improves educator preparation would benefit the program and the school.

<b>Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	<b>Consistently</b>
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	<b>Consistently</b>
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	<b>Consistently</b>
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 2: Met**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard**



Review of documents and interviews with leadership members and school administrators confirm that candidates to the CSD Teacher Induction program are recruited and supported to ensure their successful entry into the profession. Many of the participating teachers come to the institution as intern teachers or on provisional permits. The leadership and credential analyst confirmed that the program assesses every newly hired teacher's eligibility for induction and accepts applicants according to clearly defined criteria. Leadership reports that having the induction program on campus with its embedded ASL and bilingual philosophy has been key to teacher recruitment. The reputation of the school and supportive environment for new teachers of Deaf education has enabled CDE to retain new teachers from across the nation.

Review of student enrollment data indicates that CSD has a high percentage of students from diverse backgrounds and academic levels. The institution aims to have teachers and staff who reflect the diversity of their students. The school superintendent, director of instruction, the dean of students, and the HR Department are constantly and purposefully recruiting candidates to diversify the educator pool at CSD. They "make every attempt to reach out to people of color to come and work at CSD". The institution has several working relationships with Deaf schools and colleges/universities across the United States, including an MOU with Rochester Institute of Technology.

CSD provides support to candidates through an orientation at the start of the school year and offers continuing support through various professional development opportunities conducted by the CORE Department throughout the school year. The Induction program supports participating teachers through sustained coaching by curriculum teacher specialists. The specialist serves as the candidate's mentor through the induction program. The mentors meet weekly to provide advice and assistance for various candidate needs including tips and strategies classroom management, content area curriculum, reinforcement of CSD provided professional developments, and specific advice for the ILP. Induction staff also provide personalized, frequent detailed feedback throughout the ILP process. Participating teachers shared that their mentors "have an open door policy and are available 24/7 for advice and support". To further enhance this collaboration, the CORE team created ASL scripted modules for all aspects of the ILP process. The mentors and the program coordinator meet regularly to discuss the candidates' progress. In interviews with principals and mentors, it was shared that mentors are "in classrooms every day" ensuring that "teachers needing support never fall through the cracks". Mentors formally observe candidates a minimum of three times per year using the observation cycle (pre-observation conference, observation, post-observation conference) format.

The participating teachers and mentors and program leadership reported in interviews that teachers are consistently provided with "whatever it takes to be successful" and that a clearly defined process exists for those who need additional assistance. Several participating teachers and program completers reported they were given additional time and flexibility in completing induction tasks. The team works together to provide an individual approach to support the candidate. "The ILP is what guides the whole progress" and both the candidates and the

mentors go through each step together to provide just-in-time support and often involves more frequent meetings and observations. The Human Resources team and credential analyst work with the program coordinator to ensure that the institution’s *Process for Candidates to Obtain Necessary Competencies* is followed, and that additional one-on-one support and advice is provided when needed.

<b>Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	<b>Consistently</b>
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	<b>Consistently</b>
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	<b>Consistently</b>
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	<b>Consistently</b>
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	<b>Consistently</b>
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	<b>Consistently</b>
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	<b>Consistently</b>
For each <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 3: Met**

### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

CSD Fremont ensures candidates have significant experience with diverse student populations and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards. The review of training slides from professional developments revealed that since 2020 there has been significant professional development for CSD teachers with an emphasis on diversity and equity instruction with a goal of having a deeper understanding of their students and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning. The participating teachers work with a range of students including those with disabilities including cognitive delays, autism, communication disorders, social emotional needs, behavioral concerns, and other learning challenges. Teachers are provided with professional development in implementing alternative curriculum for students that are included into classrooms with general education Deaf students. The induction leadership team, teachers and staff view this as “our responsibility and a social justice issue to create an optimal learning environment that equitably serves students from all kinds of backgrounds”.

During the professional developments at the start of the year, teachers practice using sample student profiles and then their assigned students’ profiles to determine: What might they be looking for when they enter your classroom? What might they need? How can you create a classroom environment that is safe and affirming for each of them? Unique professional development strategies including affinity spaces for BIPOC group discussions during staff development days were created to encourage educators and staff “to have that space to be their authentic selves to provide essential information and feedback to the school.” These trainings are designed based on the staff and student demographics as well as the school’s bilingual education/philosophy. Review of survey responses as well as interviews with principals and teachers reveal that they still seek additional professional development in this area and whenever possible that the CORE team continue to seek ways that BIPOC curriculum be delivered by instructors with lived experience. Additional culturally responsive classroom resources can be accessed by teachers.

The Induction coordinator begins working with the director of instruction and human resources in mid-August to obtain a list of new hires and then contact those eligible for Induction regarding the enrollment process so that all matches are made within 30 days of enrollment in the program. Review of the mentor match lists show that mentors are matched with participating teachers with similar credentials. Interviews with teachers confirm they were well matched and that a system is in place for mentor reassignment when a teacher might feel “it’s not a good fit”. Beginning teachers who choose to participate in the Induction program attend a beginning of the year meeting which provides an overview of the program, an Induction handbook, meeting schedule, program expectations, mentor expectations and more. The mentor contacts the participating teacher to set up their weekly meetings. Mentors must be knowledgeable about beginning teacher development, understanding and using state-adopted academic content standards for student state-adopted curriculum frameworks, and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), and the Continuum of Teaching Practice (CTP). In addition, they must possess effective interpersonal and communication skills

and a willingness to work collaboratively and have a commitment to personal professional growth.

Mentor professional development is provided in a variety of ways and is facilitated by the induction coordinator, literacy coach/teacher specialist, or program director. All mentors attend these biweekly one-hour sessions. Meetings most often are organized in a book club format including the following titles: Instructional Coaching, Mentoring Matters and the Art of Coaching, Art of Coaching Teams. Mentors report these sessions include group discussions, Professional Learning Community-style readings, case studies & scenarios, and “crafting our coaching skills”. While mentors receive informal feedback from peers and the program coordinator during these sessions, systems for formative feedback and evaluation, including observations, by their direct supervisor including observations are not in place. This is also reflected in the finding on Teacher Induction program standard 6. The mentors complete a mid-year self-evaluation, and the teachers complete a mid-year effectiveness survey which is reviewed by the Induction coordinator and program director. Program leadership reports “the agendas are also revised a bit to target general concerns (if any) seen in the mid-year survey”.

<b>Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	<b>Consistently</b>
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	<b>Consistently</b>
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	<b>Consistently</b>
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

#### **Finding on Common Standard 4: Met with Concerns**

##### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

CSD develops and implements an improvement process that includes administering formal surveys twice a year to participating teachers, in addition to the annual data system survey. Mentors and administrators receive a survey at the end of the year. Review of the survey data presented revealed that participation was limited. While leadership reported that the results were reviewed regularly, limited evidence of analysis and sharing of findings was found.

In interviews with the leadership team and mentors, this lack of documentation might be the result of what they describe as their general practice that “we frequently just revise and modify in-the-moment, in meetings based on whatever feedback we may be discussing at the time”. Teachers, administrators, and mentors shared repeatedly that everyone at CDE “has an open-door policy” and that they are “always responsive to our needs and requests”. Additionally, in speaking with leadership and staff, the unique nature of meetings conducted in ASL, “does not always lend itself to taking notes or recording minutes” in the moment.

Some program changes that were shared in interviews that were a result of anecdotal or formal feedback were the streamlining of ILP tasks, creation of ASL ILP modules, and implementing explicit color-coding of ILP sections in the portal for easier navigation. Principals noted that changes in the professional development sequencing have occurred more recently based on administrator and participating teacher requests. Topics like IEP management, HR Policies, and diversity topics are now scheduled when they are most needed, at the start of the year. Administrators expressed appreciation that more training in BIPOC topics were included this year. CDE could benefit from implementing systems for effective data collection, analysis, and record keeping to memorialize their work. Designing regularly scheduled opportunities to share data, get feedback, and brainstorm solutions with internal and external P-12 colleagues from the greater educational community could assist the institution to improve their programs and services.

**Rationale for the Finding**

There was insufficient evidence to confirm that multiple sources of data, including feedback from key constituencies about the quality of the preparation, are consistently used for continuous improvement of the teacher induction program.

<b>Common Standard 5: Program Impact</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	<b>Consistently</b>
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 5: Met**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard.**

The institution ensures that candidates regularly collaborate with their assigned mentor to identify strengths and areas for growth based on the CSTP. With the support of mentors, candidates complete cycles of inquiry related to their growth areas in order to ensure candidates are effectively educating all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Candidates also collaborate with expert educators in order to seek resources, discuss best practices, and learn from the experiences of their colleagues. The ILP gathers evidence of candidate growth, knowledge and skills and serves as the assessment tool to indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards. Candidate assessment includes candidates ranking themselves on all 38 elements on the CSTP Continuum of Teaching Practice twice per year and submitting a survey at the end of Year 2 documenting their growth toward mastery on the elements over time.

The induction program evaluates their impact on teaching and learning and candidate competence through their administrator end-of-year survey, documented professional growth on the ILP, and identifying measurable student outcomes during the IIP process. In addition, each Induction candidate provides a video at their colloquium demonstrating how the program has impacted their teaching practice and student learning in their classroom. Site administrators shared during interviews that culminating videos have a positive impact on peer-to-peer sharing of effective practice, and teachers have become critical thinkers through inquiry-based reflection with their mentors. Additionally, one of their teachers earned a leadership position at a university after their induction experience at CSD.