Report of the Revisit to
Santa Clara County Office of Education
March 3-4, 2025

Overview of the Report

This agenda report presents the findings of the accreditation revisit team to **Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE)** that was conducted on March 3-4, 2025. This item includes the stipulations determined based on the February 2024 site visit report, the March 2025 revisit team findings, and the current recommendation. 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** is made for the institution.

Background

Santa Clara County Office of Education hosted an accreditation site visit on February 4-7, 2024. The report of that visit was presented to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) at its March 2024 meeting. The COA accepted the site visit team's recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** for the institution and its credential programs.

The stipulations issued by the COA were as follows:

1. That the institution provide quarterly reports and host a seventh-year focused revisit.

For the Common standards:

2. Provide evidence that 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. (Common Standard 3c)
3. Provide evidence that site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. (Common Standard 3g)
4. Provide evidence that 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. (Common Standard 4a)
5. Provide evidence that both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services. (Common Standard 4c)

For the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Extensive Support Needs, and Early Childhood Special Education programs:

6. Provide evidence that the program's organizational structure supports a logical and integrated progression for candidates including preparing candidates in case management practices (IEP preparation). (Program Standard 1)
7. Provide evidence that the minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance is 5 hours per week. (Program Standard 3)
8. Provide evidence that appropriate information is accessible to guide candidates' meeting all program requirements. (Program Standard 4)
9. Provide evidence that before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, district-employed supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan (IDP) consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear credential program. (Program Standard 6)

For the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs programs:

10. Provide evidence that each candidate receives clear and accurate information about the nature of the pedagogical tasks within the Commission-approved teaching performance assessment model selected by the program. The program provides multiple formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the TPA tasks/activities. (Program Standard 5)

For the Teacher Induction program:

11. Provide evidence that prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear Credential, the induction program sponsor verifies that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements, and that the program has documented the basis on which the recommendation for the clear credential is made. The program sponsor's verification must be based on a review of observed and documented evidence, collaboratively assembled by the candidate, the mentor and/or other colleagues, according to the program's design. The Induction program's recommendation verification process must include a defensible process of reviewing documentation. (Program Standard 5)
12. Provide evidence that induction program leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work. (Program Standard 6)

Quarterly Reports

As part of the March 2024 COA accreditation decision, the institution was required to submit quarterly reports documenting actions taken and/or progress made to address each stipulation. Quarterly reports were presented at the June 6, 2024, October 31, 2024, and February 27, 2025 COA meetings. At each meeting, the COA acted to accept the institution's reports as demonstrating compliance toward meeting the requirements of the stipulations.

The Accreditation Revisit Team Recommendation

The March 2025 accreditation revisit focused on the stipulations from the March 2024 accreditation recommendation. Based on the evidence provided through the quarterly reports, document review, and interviews conducted during the revisit, the team recommends that the COA remove all stipulations and that Santa Clara County Office of Education's accreditation status be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Revisit Report

Institution: **Santa Clara County Office of Education**

Dates of Revisit: **March 25-27, 2024**

Accreditation Revisit Recommendation: **Accreditation**

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of relevant institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site revisit as well as interviews with relevant constituent groups. Reviewers 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.

Overall Recommendation:
After reviewing the documentation and interviews with all relevant constituencies the team recommends removal of all stipulations and an accreditation status of **Accreditation**.

The team recommendation is based on the evidence on the following stipulations:

Stipulation	2025 Revisit Team Recommendation
1. That the institution provide quarterly reports and host a seventh-year focused revisit.	**Remove**
2. Provide evidence that 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. (CS3c)	**Remove**
3. Provide evidence that site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. (CS3g)	**Remove**
4. Provide evidence that 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. (CS4a)	**Remove**
5. Provide evidence that both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data	**Remove**

Stipulation	2025 Revisit Team Recommendation
reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services. (CS4c)	
6. Provide evidence that the program's organizational structure supports a logical and integrated progression for candidates including preparing candidates in case management practices (IEP preparation). (MMSN, ESN, ECSE PS 1)	**Remove**
7. Provide evidence that the minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance is 5 hours per week. (MMSN, ESN, ECSE PS 3)	**Remove**
8. Provide evidence that appropriate information is accessible to guide candidates' meeting all program requirements. (MMSN, ESN, ECSE PS 4)	**Remove**
9. Provide evidence that before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, district-employed supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan (IDP) consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear credential program. (MMSN, ESN, ECSE PS 6)	**Remove**
10. Provide evidence that each candidate receives clear and accurate information about the nature of the pedagogical tasks within the Commission-approved teaching performance assessment model selected by the program. The program provides multiple formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the TPA tasks/activities. (MMSN, ESN, PS 5)	**Remove**
11. Provide evidence that prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear Credential, the induction program sponsor verifies that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements, and that the program has documented the basis on which the recommendation for the clear credential is made. The program sponsor's verification must be based on a review of observed and documented evidence, collaboratively assembled by the candidate, the mentor and/or other colleagues, according to the program's design. The Induction program's recommendation verification process must include a defensible process of reviewing documentation. (Teacher Induction PS 5)	**Remove**

Stipulation	2025 Revisit Team Recommendation
12. Provide evidence that induction program leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work. (Teacher Induction PS 6)	**Remove**

Accreditation Team

Team Lead and Common Standards:
Aleeta Powers
Los Angeles Unified School District

Programs Reviewers:

Jenny Chiappe
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Staff to the Visit:
Miranda Gutierrez
Rosemary Wrenn

Raina Arellano
Ventura County Office of Education

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
Quarterly Reports to Address Stipulations
Assessment Materials
Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
3rd Quarter Report with COA Comments
Roles and Responsibilities
Completed DSP MOU & Administrator Agreements
DSP Support and Supervision log template
Candidate Professional Development Materials
Partner HR & Administrator Communications
DSP Assignment Tracking Worksheet

Interviews Conducted

Constituents	TOTAL
Candidates	11
Completers	14
Employers/Site Administrators	10
Institutional Administration	2
Program Coordinators	4
Faculty	19
TPA Coordinator	1
Coaches (Induction)	9
Field Supervisors-Program	7
District Support Providers	7
Credential Analysts and Staff	3
Advisory Board	14
Program Advisers	3
TOTAL	**104**

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.

Findings of the Revisit Team

The revisit team analyzed actions taken by Santa Clara County Office of Education to address the stipulations. Below is a summary of the findings of the revisit team.

Stipulation 1:

That the institution provide quarterly reports and host a seventh-year focused revisit.
Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE) provided quarterly reports to the COA on June 6, 2024, October 31, 2024, February 27, 2025, and hosted a revisit on March 3, 4, and 5 2025.

Recommendation: Remove Stipulation

Stipulations Related to the Common Standards:

Stipulation 2:

Provide evidence that 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. (Common Standard 3c)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:

The Second Quarterly report states that, "New practices will foster collaboration with districts and Educator Preparation Programs (EPP), deepen the understanding of a district support provider's (DSP) role and responsibilities, and allow EPP to provide feedback to the DSPs and district partners." SCCOE provided signed copies of the revised Memoranda of Understanding, each of which includes specific language outlining the DSP roles and responsibilities. Responsibilities for the partner agency and the SCCOE EPP are also outlined. Included are the baseline criteria for eligibility and hiring of DSPs as well as who will be responsible for tracking and reporting each phase of the process from hiring to tracking completion of DSP requirements.

Based on documents provided, the revised training for DSPs includes these roles and responsibilities, processes and procedures so that there is transparency in the process for all partners. SCCOE communicates with site administrators working with the program. These administrators receive communications and sign an agreement that confirms their responsibilities as well as those of the DSP and the SCCOE EPP. The MOU also describes the agreement for placement of teachers in appropriate classrooms. When administrators have questions the coordinator calls them to have a discussion. Interviews with site administrators confirmed there is collaboration between SCCOE and school sites for the selection of DSPs.

Recommendation: Remove

Stipulation 3:
Provide evidence that site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. (Common Standard 3g)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
Program staff noted in their additional evidence document that, "DSPs receive comprehensive training through orientations and convenings". DSPs are also required to participate in intersegmental training. The evidence provided included links to communications to DSPs, PowerPoints and recordings of sessions and the table of contents for the intersegmental training, which is provided through an outside contract. In addition, DSPs received an orientation to the supervisory role, program expectations, documentation of activities and an overview of what is expected of the candidates.

Evidence for one DSP Convening Meeting described the evaluation process for DSPs. In these materials they explained the multiple phase evaluation process. It is described as occurring in multiple phases, beginning with nomination by the site administrator selection based on 'their competence, performance, and expertise' as well as experience followed by selection once alignment with the criteria is confirmed by SCCOE EPP. The evidence shows that DSP selection is followed by on-going evaluation based on candidate feedback via mid-year surveys 'which provide feedback about the support they are receiving to ensure it aligns with their needs and expectations', which is used to 'provide targeted support to both the DSP and the candidate'. During interviews DSPs noted that they had just received an email from the coordinator the week before sharing the results of the surveys. The DSP letter template includes data from the surveys as well as recognition of the critical role that DSPs have in supporting the teacher candidates.

Recommendation: Remove

Stipulation 4:
Provide evidence that 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. (Common Standard 4a)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
The SCCOE has adopted the six step Problem/Action/Results Statements (PARS) process (provided in the Second Quarterly Report) to guide their comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs. To aid in the process, they have developed a School-Year Cycle document, "to capture how the unit and each program captures, analyzes, disseminates, and utilizes data". The 2024-25 School-Year Cycle extends through the entire year and indicates the data to be collected/analyzed and by whom for each program. For each of the stipulations addressed in the report, a continuous

improvement implication is noted. Each stipulation also includes new actions designed to fill identified gaps and improve the program.

During interviews, program leadership, faculty, and the advisory board all gave explicit examples of implementation of the cycle, describing what happened at each step of the process and adding examples of areas where they were still implementing additional steps and gathering data. During interviews multiple advisory board members and faculty representatives indicated that they felt valued and were impressed by the way that data is now analyzed more 'frequently and systematically' and then used for significant changes to the program that show results for the candidates. DSPs and coaches also cited data that was shared with them as part of the cycle of looking at ways to improve practice.

Recommendation: Remove

Stipulation 5:
Provide evidence that both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services. (Common Standard 4c)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
In the Third Quarter Report, SCCOE provided graphic organizers 'for the feedback loops in place to collect, analyze, and act on data from completers, candidates, and site supervisors.' SCCOE is using the PARS process described in the Stipulation 4 response as a foundation to guide the comprehensive continuous improvement process that they began following a leadership change. The plan creates an infrastructure for systematically collecting, analyzing and using candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations in order to improve programs and their services. SCCOE has created a School Year Cycle planning document showing "how the unit and each program captures, analyzes, disseminates and utilizes data to improve". The level of implementation of first semester actions described in the plan is an indication of SCCOE's dedication to following the process. One example is the way that the faculty talked about reviewing survey data and anecdotal feedback regarding support in preparation for the teaching performance assessment (TPA) and for being confident in completing the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process. They talked about changes to curriculum and implementing additional supports. Results were clear as candidates in the interviews described how they felt that they had been well prepared. One candidate shared how the instructors would highlight strategies as being important for the TPA. Others described the IEP symposium where they learned to humanize the process and understand the meaning for each form and why it was important for them as well as the students. Several in the group chimed in with how amazing the training was and how they now feel like they know not only what to do, but why.

Recommendation: Remove

For the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN), Extensive Support Needs (ESN), and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) programs:

Stipulation 6:
Provide evidence that the program's organizational structure supports a logical and integrated progression for candidates including preparing candidates in case management practices (IEP preparation). (Program Standard 1)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
As indicated in the Third Quarter Report, the SCCOE program included data from candidates' feedback on developing an IEP. The Third Quarter Report shows that candidates perceived their courses reflected the requirements of the education specialist programs and data are continually collected. The IEP Symposium is required for all interns. In addition, the program implemented IEP Quickbytes to provide additional opportunities to learn about case management practices. The SCCOE program has now implemented feedback surveys to the symposium. The EPP will continue to collaborate with faculty to address integration of IEP processes in coursework.

Interviews revealed the faculty has created a mandatory workshop for candidates to learn about IEPs. In addition, faculty and coaches have highlighted the importance of pragmatics and translating theory into practice. Candidates indicated in interviews the assignments and coursework are explicit in teaching how to create SMART goals and practicing these components multiple times across the program. There are also IEP boot camp follow ups for the candidates to drop in and ask their questions. Current candidates shared the structured breakdown of the IEP symposium and candidates felt they were adequately prepared to write an IEP.

Recommendation: Remove

Stipulation 7:
Provide evidence that the minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance is 5 hours per week. (Program Standard 3)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
In the SCCOE EPP Second Quarterly Report the program showed evidence of revision of the system for providing information regarding the required five hours per week of support and implementing measures to track the hours. DSPs are notified of their role through the required asynchronous orientation, the newly revised DSP Roles and Responsibilities document and DSP Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Both interns and DSPs are provided with a calendar which outlines joint meetings and activities. The Third Quarterly Report notes that a Canvas course has been created that "provides the DSPs an overview of the instructional practices the interns are required to engage in; provides the DSPs the coaching tools used in the program;

and improves their understanding of their role". Both interns and DSPs also complete an online log to track DSP support hours.

In order to enact a transparent process site administrators and HR personnel working with the program are also notified of the Roles and Responsibilities for the DSPs, including the five hours of support via email information letters and MOUs. Data from candidate surveys indicate that they feel that they are connected with their DSPs who are knowledgeable and responsive. Few candidates indicate that they receive less than five hours of support.

The program is looking for ways to better document the variety of support services candidates are receiving. The candidates indicated that the hours are tracked on a google form that they are given. During interviews, one candidate enthusiastically described it, sharing that, "The template is so easy to use, it has a description of what you can include and what you can't. There are spaces to describe the fieldwork and who supported you and a box to put the number of hours in. When you enter the hours the total you have left is automatically updated at the top of the form."

Recommendation: Remove

Stipulation 8:
Provide evidence that appropriate information is accessible to guide candidates' meeting all program requirements. (Program Standard 4)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
SCCOE is continuing some previous practices but has also added additional support systems. As noted in the SCCOE EPP Second Quarterly Report to Address the stipulations, "The new practices will offer a concrete process for candidates to follow as they move through the program. It will offer the coaches tools to provide uniform information and preparation for candidates…" There is information posted regarding how to enroll in the program(s), program requirements and basic information on the programs, with advisors listed to contact for more information. Once enrolled in the program, candidates are given access to a Google Orientation Folder with pdf information on information they need to navigate program systems. They receive an Orientation Summary Action Items document which includes directions to go to the document describing their program pathway, the handbook for their program and advisement information regarding how to navigate technology such as Canvas, Zoom and Google as well as information on payments, requirements to be an intern and test dates. There is a separate handbook for each of the MMSN, ESN and ECSE programs that contain, among other information, a graphic overview showing what is required in each phase of the program followed by details on each.

There is a staff person assigned as the program coordinator for advisement, questions and concerns. Candidate tracking documents assist in allowing quick access to see where each candidate is in the process of meeting their requirements. Coaches and Faculty now receive

training that includes information on the pathway including examinations (CSET, RICA, CalTPA) and additional requirements such as US Constitution and CPR. Information on these requirements is shared with candidates beginning with the earliest advisement sessions and is then supported throughout the program. (See Stipulation 10 response for information related to support for the TPA). Interviews confirmed candidates receive information at orientation regarding the CalTPA. The Canvas courses also support candidates with a checklist of program requirements. Based on interviews, the candidates are aware of the program requirements. Candidates also receive a monthly checklist on Canvas and coaches check in with the candidates to ensure progress or questions.

Recommendation: Remove

Stipulation 9:
Provide evidence that before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, district-employed supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan (IDP) consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear credential program. (Program Standard 6)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
Before exiting the preliminary program candidates, district-employed supervisors and program supervisors collaborate on an Individual Development Plan (IDP). As indicated in the Third Quarter Report the SCCOE Education Preparation Programs (EPP) have "planned to strengthen the collaboration between the DSP, the EPP coach, and the intern by making the expectations clear for triad meetings, as well as the creation of initial and final IDP documents." The interviews with the DSP and coaches highlighted the importance of self- reflection for the intern and making goals that are meaningful to the intern. The program provided the training materials that are used to introduce the IDP including the timeline and expectations for completion and the responsibility to attend triad meetings. Additionally, signed copies of the DSP Letter of Understanding, which includes completion of the IDP were available. DSP advisement hours are included in several communications as well as on the website, offering support for questions and concerns the DSP might experience, including those related to the IDP. As one coach indicated, "We have three triad meetings a year, at the beginning of the year, for goal development and at the end of the year. Working together makes the process stronger."

Recommendation: Remove

For the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs programs:

Stipulation 10:
Provide evidence that each candidate receives clear and accurate information about the nature of the pedagogical tasks within the Commission-approved teaching performance assessment model selected by the program. The program provides multiple formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the TPA tasks/activities. (Program Standard 5)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
Based on the Third Quarter Report, the SCCOE program updated the orientation and coaching materials for CalTPA. TPA training has been provided to faculty including identifying their course and formative feedback to support candidates through the CalTPA. The TPA course was also updated to have access to resources online.

Interviews with TPA coordinator and coaches revealed that coaches are receiving support once a month from the TPA coordinator. The program has worked with faculty and staff to incorporate elements of the TPA into coursework. Faculty and coaches are intentional and connect the TPA elements that are in the courses. Training is systematized and planned at four time points a year. In addition, the TPA coordinator shared that all coaches host an orientation for candidates at the beginning of the year and the TPA coordinator supports the coaches and candidates at this time. The coordinator indicates all candidates are given the same information at the same time. This is confirmed with interviews with the intern coaches (program support). In addition, candidates highlighted that the TPA tidbits are helpful to keep candidates on track to submit the CalTPA.

Recommendation: Remove

For the Teacher Induction program:

Stipulation 11:
Provide evidence that prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear Credential, the induction program sponsor verifies that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements, and that the program has documented the basis on which the recommendation for the clear credential is made. The program sponsor's verification must be based on a review of observed and documented evidence, collaboratively assembled by the candidate, the mentor and/or other colleagues, according to the program's design. The Induction program's recommendation verification process must include a defensible process of reviewing documentation. (Program Standard 5)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
With evidence provided in Quarterly Reports 2 and 3 and interviews with the advisor, credential analyst, and program coordinator, reviewers confirm there is a clear process by which the induction program sponsor verifies the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements prior to recommendation for the clear credential.

Candidate requirements are reviewed and status determined during the teacher induction program (TIP) portfolio review. The first check is a candidate self-assessment upon completion of requirements. The coach and candidate then meet, and the coach provides a final review and reflection which is submitted to the program coordinator. The program coordinator reviews the checklist including all of the assignments/tasks associated with the TIP portfolio to ensure its completion. The TIP advisor or program coordinator reviews the candidate's additional requirements to ensure all are met and the coordinator then provides a wet signature to recommend the candidate. The advisor then enters the information into the program's Learning Management System and communicates with the candidate the status and next steps for the clear credential.

Recommendation: Remove

Stipulation 12:
Provide evidence that induction program leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work. (Program Standard 6)

Revisit Reviewer Findings and Recommendation:
Evidence from Second and Third Quarterly Reports and interviews with coaches, program coordinator and coaching consultant, show structures are in place for induction program leaders to provide formative feedback to mentors on their work. Current practices include review of and feedback on GoReact coaches' annotations and TIP portfolio review. There is a plan in place to provide coaches a Coach Evaluation Summary letter in May, but the program has not yet had the opportunity to implement this practice.

The institution uses GoReact as a platform for candidates to upload evidence and reflection of their practice as it aligns to CSTPs. Coaches then annotate and comment on the candidates' reflections. Weekly, the program coordinator reviews all candidate and mentor comments and provides feedback to mentors who may need support or adjustments in providing annotations, follow up with the coach as necessary.

Based on documentation and interviews with the program coordinator and coaches, reviewers confirmed that during the TIP portfolio review, the "Coordinator provides [formative] feedback to the candidate and coach." The program coordinator emphasized that the opportunity to review candidate's work and coach's reflection, "keeps [the focus on] cultivating individuals and ensuring we are supporting them in the field of education to ensure they stay in the field because our kids need it."

The program currently solicits candidate feedback about time with their mentor at mid and end of year. The program will provide this feedback, along with areas of strength and growth opportunities via a TIP Coach Evaluation Summary letter to all Induction Coaches in May. This letter mirrors the one sent to the DSPs.

The Second and Third Quarterly Reports provide evidence that structures are in place to provide opportunities for formative feedback to new coaches and are optional for veteran mentors. Plans for implementation in the future include possible expansion of 1:1 to Coaching Sessions, Coaching Goals and Self-Assessments, and Canvas Course for Coach Development.

These reports state, "To augment the formative feedback that EPP provides to coaches on their work:" they will provide "1:1 meetings between all coaches and the coaching consultant to set goals for the year." Evidence in quarterly reports show a communication sent to all mentors via Canvas announcements about the structure and requirements for sessions stating that six 1-hour sessions are required for all new coaches, induction coaches and coaches for interns not taking the TPA. However, because this form of feedback is optional for coaches, there were inconsistencies about this practice from the different constituent interviews. Interviews with induction coaches, program coordinator, and coaching consultant highlighted that although the 1:1 sessions are offered to all, they are required for new coaches and optional for veterans. Some veteran coaches reported they signed up for 1:1 sessions with the coach consultant and found them to be beneficial. One veteran mentor shared that she feels "very supported" during these sessions and enjoyed them so much that she scheduled 12 sessions for the year.

The Second and Third Quarterly Reports state, "Coaches will identify one or two coaching goals based on the coaching tools they use, and upload two short clips of their coaching conversations targeting those goals per semester" and that the Canvas Course for Coach Development "is monitored weekly by both coaching consultant and program coordinator used by the coaching consultant to provide ongoing formative feedback to induction coaches." In current practices, this appears to be optional for veteran coaches and required for new coaches.

Recommendation: Remove