

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Provisional Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Gateway High School

Division of Accreditation, Standards, and Workforce Investment

April 2026

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the provisional accreditation visit conducted at **Gateway High School**. 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.

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 | Met |
| 2) Candidate Recruitment and Support | Met |
| 3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice | Met |
| 4) Continuous Improvement | Met |
| 5) Program Impact | Met |

Program Standards

| Programs | Total Program Standards | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-----|-------------------|---------|
| Teacher Induction | 6 | 6 | 0 | 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
Provisional Site Visit Team Report**

Institution: Gateway High School

Dates of Visit: February 23-25, 2026

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the provisional 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 Program Standards for the Teacher Induction Program were determined to be **met**.

Common Standards

The Common Standards were determined to be **met**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found that all standards for the Teacher Induction program were met and that all Common Standards were met, the team recommends **Accreditation**.

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.
- Gateway High School be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Stacey Tisor
San Mateo County Office of Education

Programs Reviewers:

Janeth Barajas
Kern County Superintendent of School

Common Standards:

Christina Mendez
Los Angeles Unified School District

Staff to the Visit:

Kiyomi Meeker
Rosemary Wrenn
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Accreditation Website
Candidate Files

Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)
Program Completion Transcript
Precondition Responses
Accreditation Data Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

| Constituencies | TOTAL |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Candidates | 18 |
| Completers | 13 |
| Employers | 7 |
| Institutional Administration | 2 |
| Program Coordinators | 3 |
| Support Providers | 3 |
| Mentors | 12 |
| Advisory Council Members | 7 |
| Content Coaches | 3 |
| Credential Team | 2 |
| TOTAL | 70 |

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 Gateway Induction Program (Gateway IP) housed at Gateway High School, currently serves two public charter schools within their own network and five additional partner public charter schools within San Francisco, Oakland, and Hayward.

The chart below lists the five partner charter schools and two Gateway charter schools that participate in the Gateway IP including grade level and enrollment:

| School/Location | Grade Levels | Student Enrollment |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| San Francisco | | |
| New School | K-8 | 444 |
| Creative Arts Charter School | K-8 | 429 |
| Gateway Middle School | 6-8 | 218 |
| Gateway High School | 9-12 | 475 |
| City Arts & Leadership | 9-12 | 407 |
| Oakland | | |
| Envision | 6-12 | 223 |
| Hayward | | |
| Impact Academy | 6-12 | 760 |

The Gateway IP is dedicated to improving public education by preparing reflective, equity-centered practitioners. Gateway High School sees teachers as agents of transformative change in schools and Gateway Induction's approach to educator preparation and professional learning incorporates five principles: teachers as reflective practitioners, agency and growth mindset, equity-focused teaching and learning, collaborative learning, and inquiry-based, job-embedded learning and growth. During its first two years of operation, Gateway IP intentionally kept the program small and only served seven teachers within the Gateway High School. Recently, Gateway IP established purposeful partnerships with charter schools with similar goals and expanded its program to serve more teachers.

Gateway High School and the other schools participating in the Gateway IP operate in dense urban corridors where schools sit in close proximity yet serve communities shaped by markedly different neighborhood histories, housing patterns, and economic conditions. With locations throughout the Bay Area including San Francisco, Oakland, Hayward, each of the partner schools serve student populations that reflect significant cultural and linguistic diversity with students speaking over 25 different home languages. Across all participating schools a substantial percentage of children qualify for free or reduced-price meals.

The Gateway IP provides a two-year, job-embedded professional learning experience for teachers who hold a Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, or Education Specialist Teaching Credential and are seeking a Clear Teaching Credential. The program views teachers as professionals who refine their practice through disciplined analysis of instruction and careful

examination of student outcomes and strengthens instructional practice through sustained mentoring, classroom-based inquiry, and structured reflection aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

Each candidate engages in an individualized Individual Learning Plan process that builds on prior preparation and connects directly to daily classroom responsibilities. Mentors provide personalized support through observation, co-planning, analysis of student work, and focused professional dialogue. Mentor and candidate partnerships are grounded in trust and shared responsibility for student learning.

With attention to equitable access and measurable impact, candidates and mentors examine instructional decisions, patterns of participation, classroom culture, and student performance data. Through evidence-based inquiry and sustained professional dialogue, the program supports teachers in strengthening practice so that students across San Francisco, Oakland, and Hayward experience rigorous, inclusive, and culturally responsive instruction.

Education Unit

Gateway IP is supported by a Director, Credentials Analyst, New Teacher Support Manager, and Gateway's Chief of Schools.

In a typical year, approximately 20-30 candidates are enrolled in Gateway IP. As a new program, Gateway IP does not yet have a steady average of program completers. In each of the first and second years of operation, three candidates completed the program. In the third year of implementation of the program, with the addition of new partner schools, the number of program completers increased to 23. The program is now in its fourth year of operation and has served a total of 71 candidates over the past 3.5 years, with 29 candidates completing the program to date.

Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data

| Program Name | Number of Program Completers (2024-25) | Number of Candidates Enrolled (2025-26) |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Teacher Induction | 23 | 27 |

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.

Provisional Site Visit in Stage V of Initial Institutional Approval

During Stage V of the initial institutional approval (IIA) process, a new institution hosts a Provisional Site Visit (PSV). The site visit team is composed of program leaders for that type of program as well as experienced Board of Institutional Review members. Because this PSV is based on a routine sixth year accreditation site visit, the team makes decisions on all Common and applicable Program Standards as well as an accreditation recommendation and any stipulations, if appropriate.

The institution and its Commission-approved programs, in this case the **Teacher Induction** program, has operated for three and a half years at **Gateway High School**.

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 Gateway Teacher Induction Program (Gateway IP) serves public charter schools in San Francisco, Oakland, and Hayward, that enroll almost 3,000 students.

The Gateway IP leadership team consists of the Chief of Schools and Programs, induction program director, credential analyst, and two lead mentors: one is a full-time teacher and induction mentor, and the other is a full-time instructional coach and induction mentor.

The induction program director meets with the mentors, school district leaders and program leaders to ensure that the mission and vision is aligned with the program experience as

confirmed by program documents and interviews. The program director meets weekly with her direct supervisor, the Chief of Schools to inform him about program needs and data.

Interviews with site administrators confirmed that communication between candidates and administrators is initiated at the triad meeting, after which administration maintains ongoing contact with program leadership through monthly check-ins and as-needed communication regarding site or candidate needs.

The Induction Advisory Council is made up of university partners, mentors, candidates, partnering districts and administration and meets two times per year. During interviews, advisory council members confirmed they provide feedback through surveys and meet monthly to offer guidance, direction and support. Members reported feedback is considered and implemented in a timely manner. A member shared, "I appreciate the closing of the loop in our meetings. They share what happens after they take the feedback and use it to make changes."

Documents reviewed and interviews confirmed that mentors and teacher candidates communicate regularly through monthly workshops, weekly office hours, fall and spring surveys, and email support as needed. Each mentor and teacher candidate participates in individual check-ins and support with program leadership throughout the year. Additional touchpoints include an Induction Orientation at the start of the program and ongoing support toward meeting credential requirements.

The Gateway IP is designed to strengthen teacher performance through mentor-supported reflection, high-quality professional development, and job-embedded inquiry. Interviews with all constituents confirmed the design of the program was built with a strong mission and vision that is woven throughout. The Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is comprised of three milestones. Program leadership and mentors shared in interviews that the program is truly designed as an individualized support system for each candidate. Several interviewees noted that the Gateway IP supports all community members' desire to have a positive impact on the education community and is "not about checking the box."

Each candidate engages in an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) process that builds on prior preparation and connects directly to daily classroom responsibilities. Mentors provide personalized support through observation, co-planning, analysis of student work, and focused professional dialogue. One candidate shared, "Through the goal setting I was able to make meaningful changes to the curriculum. As a new teacher I was able to focus on what is meaningful and how I can use it to differentiate. Having the same coach both years in the same subject was helpful." Another candidate stated that she gets everything she needs from her mentor to stay on track.

Mentors are selected through a collaborative process in which program leaders, school administrators, and experienced mentors work alongside the induction program director and credential analyst to identify strong candidates. Prospective mentors submit a formal application each year, and selection is based on their responses to application questions,

professional recommendations, and demonstrated experience and strengths relative to program needs. Interviews confirm that mentors must apply for the position and meet all criteria each year to continue providing mentorship for the program.

To ensure ongoing quality, teacher candidates provide feedback on mentor effectiveness twice per year through fall and spring surveys. New mentors are supported through a structured onboarding process that pairs them with an experienced mentor for guidance and orientation, and they participate in periodic check-ins with the induction program director for informal feedback and continued support. Additionally, mentors meet monthly to collaborate with and provide feedback to each other.

Document review and interviews with mentors confirmed that mentors participate in a variety of ongoing training and professional development annually. As part of their monthly training, mentors receive guidance on coaching strategies that focus on asking reflective questions, using evidence-based conversations, and supporting teacher independence. Mentors reported they engage in training to build their practice through sharing videos and documents in order to allow coaches to collaborate, give each other feedback as part of their mentor training, and are notified of mentor training that they may be interested in outside of what the program offers.

The Gateway IP gathers feedback from teacher candidates, mentors, and other program partners to continuously strengthen the program. Feedback is collected throughout the year, through an orientation feedback survey, mid- and end-of-year surveys for both mentors and candidates, individual and informal check-ins, weekly office hours, and monthly mentor workshops. In 2025-26, exit interviews will also be added as a formal feedback tool. One coach shared that mentors are given the opportunity to share feedback about the program. “One of the changes is the streamlining of the program. There’s more alignment with what is happening during the school year and what teachers need. There has been a shift to make the program more manageable, so it reflects what you are already doing.” Mentors noted that their feedback led to change in the program, observing, “Mentors said the ILPs were disconnected, so they fixed the gap. The documents were edited for clarity and organization to make it easier for candidates and mentors to navigate.” Another mentor shared that the timing of an inquiry was moved in order to provide more “just in time” support when candidates needed it.

Program leaders use feedback to make ongoing improvements, which are then communicated to stakeholders through updates and direct outreach. The program’s responsiveness was echoed by one advisory member, who stated, “This program is thoughtful about making the work meaningful and aligned and is responsive in how it supports mentors within the program.”

Additionally, the induction program director shares information with site administrators both in person and via email as needed. Together, these practices ensure that partner input is not only gathered but actively used to inform and improve the program. Due to the size of the program, administrators confirmed in interviews that they can reach out to program leaders any time. In interviews, site administrators shared that there were frequent invitations and opportunities to give feedback during the development and implementation of the program.

Over the last two years the program leadership has used informal feedback shared by mentors to make changes to the program. The consistent focus of program leadership is to ensure a connection between the program mission and vision and the candidate experience in the program through the modifications on the ILPs and the activities within the ILP such as the triad meeting. Program leadership stated, “We spent a lot of time trying to make clear goals and a throughline.”

Expanding partnerships with other districts represents a significant change since the program's inception. As the program has grown, program leadership has consistently ensured that new partners align with the program's mission and vision, reinforced through clear and intentional communication from the outset of each partnership. Interviews with partnering administrators, mentors, and candidates confirmed that the mission and vision of the program are well understood, and that stakeholders are able to identify a clear throughline between the program's goals and their experience in the program.

Course of Study (Mentor System)

Mentor and teacher candidate assignments are made by the induction program director within the first 30 days of a teacher candidate's enrollment in the program. Before finalizing assignments, the induction program director seeks input from partner school administrators and leadership to ensure the best possible match. Mentors and teacher candidates are paired based on credentials held, grade level, and/or subject area. Whenever possible, mentors are matched with candidates at their same school site to provide consistent support and a shared teaching and learning community context.

Beginning in the spring of the prior school year, partner schools work in collaboration with the program to begin the coach selection process. The credential analyst tracks new hires eligible for induction. The induction director and credential analyst begin preliminary matches based on credential type and school site.

Interviews confirmed that mentors are matched with candidates based on credentials and begin work with their candidates right after their orientation meeting. Mentors provide regular, job-embedded mentoring and support to candidates, as evidenced by mentor interviews and weekly collaborative logs.

In collaboration with their assigned mentor, candidates progress through three milestones of the ILP over the course of the program, each designed to support goal setting, professional reflection, and evidence of growth.

The ILP serves as the foundational document guiding each teacher candidate's professional growth throughout the induction program. The process begins in the fall, when candidates and mentors co-assess current teaching practice using the CSTP, and a review of their individual development plan (IDP), from their preliminary program. Additionally, candidates are supported by four grounding observations conducted by the mentor. From this collaborative assessment, candidates identify one to two professional growth goals, which are then discussed

in a triad meeting with the candidate, mentor, and site administrator to ensure alignment with school priorities and identify supports for continued development.

Building on this foundation, candidates then examine their own professional identity and its connection to culturally responsive, equity-centered, and anti-racist teaching practices. The ILP culminates in a candidate-led inquiry project in which candidates draw on their established goals and identity work to select a relevant CSTP standard, develop actionable next steps, and collect and analyze evidence of growth. A final reflection closes the process, with candidates identifying key takeaways and next steps for applying their learning to their ongoing practice.

Document review and interviews with candidates and mentors confirmed that ILP goals, as well as action steps, are established based on the CSTP. Goals are fluid and as candidates develop as educators, they have the option to reflect on and revise their goals as needed. Candidates, mentors and district partners consistently stated the program is designed to provide highly individualized support for each candidate.

As evidence of their work and progress, candidates complete the three milestones that include reflection on the progress they are making. In addition, weekly meetings with mentors as verified by the Learner Focused Conversation Logs, capture the support(s) provided for the candidate as they move through the program. A candidate shared, "I love how the model is infused with equity and culturally responsive teaching all the things to make high quality education possible."

Candidates meet with their mentors one-on-one weekly. Beginning with the 2025-26 year, candidates participate in quarterly check-ins with the induction program director and lead mentors. The induction program director holds weekly office hours for candidates to ask questions and check in on their progress. During interviews candidates expressed that they are very happy with the support that is provided by their mentor. Candidates shared, "I got great support from my mentor. I think I improved the most by far when I was in the program."

Mentors share and reflect on candidate progress with the induction program director and Lead Mentors during monthly mentor workshops. The induction program director reviews each candidate's Milestone 1 and Milestone 2 submissions and provides feedback to both candidates and mentors, while mentors assess and provide feedback for the Milestone 3 inquiry project. Document review and interviews confirmed that candidate progress is monitored through milestone submissions, and that mentors engaged with candidates on a weekly basis, providing consistent feedback and guidance throughout the program. One candidate shared, "Having dedicated time for reflection with my mentor, especially at the beginning of the year after returning to teaching, was invaluable. The guidance and input I received made a significant difference — it was truly night and day from where I started, and I am grateful for the support the program provided."

Gateway IP supports teacher candidates in preparing for their clear credential through a range of professional learning opportunities and hands-on employment experiences. At the core of this support is the weekly mentor-mentee meeting structure, which includes teacher observation and debrief cycles that provide candidates with consistent, job-embedded

feedback on their practice. Candidates also progress through three structured milestones in the ILP. In addition to milestone work, candidates and mentors participate in monthly mentor workshops and an Introduction to Coaching Essentials workshop designed to strengthen the mentoring relationship and support professional growth.

Throughout interviews it was very clear that each candidate's experience is highly individualized in this program. Candidates shared that they are provided with opportunities to observe other teachers, sometimes outside of their school if necessary, have mentors step in and model strategies, and participate in presentations where they learn from other candidates in the program. One candidate shared in an interview, "They allow me to pick what areas I should focus on ILP and plan and provide resources to support me with that."

Each candidate in collaboration with their mentor is able to choose how candidates will get access to the professional learning they need based on their CSTP reflections and their individual needs as a teacher. Interviews confirmed that candidates know they can ask for support that they need from their mentor or from program staff. One candidate shared, "This was the first time I genuinely felt like I was being professionally developed as an English teacher and the first time I could see all the work I was doing, evidence of my growth and the knowledge I bring to the room."

Assessment of Candidates

The program monitors candidate performance and progress. Candidates receive written feedback on their Individual Learning Plan (ILP) via each of three milestones based on a review of their submitted documentation, confirmation that they have clear and ongoing information about their growth, and areas for continued development. Candidates confirmed in interviews that they were given feedback on their ILP submissions and then they discussed the feedback with their mentors at their weekly meetings.

During interviews, mentors shared that in their monthly meetings, mentors meet with program leaders to give updates on the progress of their candidates.

Candidates who are not making successful progress, or need additional time have access to individualized one-on-one support. Candidates easily access this support by requesting an appointment through an email appointment link, ensuring that targeted assistance is accessible and responsive to each candidate's needs. The small size of the program allows for mentors and candidates to reach out to district leadership at any time if they need assistance. During the interview an example of this was shared about a candidate who needed to extend her program. The leadership and mentors worked together to create a plan for the candidate. One candidate shared, "when we had questions, responses were timely."

Teacher candidates learn about program assessment and evaluation expectations from the start of the program. During the orientation meeting, candidates are introduced to how they will be assessed throughout the program and receive an induction calendar outlining key dates and milestones. As candidates progress, they receive ongoing feedback through their milestone submissions. A mentor shared, "We help the teacher by facilitating their thinking. By using tools

to record and data to support the reflective practice. The inquiry cycle is natural, and it can be used in the future because it can be something they continue using.”

Gateway Induction Program uses feedback data to drive continuous program improvement. As improvements are identified and implemented, they are communicated back to stakeholders through regular updates to ensure transparency and shared awareness. The Induction Advisory Council meets at least twice a year, in the fall and spring, to review program updates and provide recommendations that help shape ongoing refinements. Additionally, the induction program director maintains open communication with school administrators, sharing relevant program information in person and via email as needed. Together, these practices ensure that feedback is not only collected but actively used to strengthen the program and keep all partners informed.

Document reviews and interviews confirm the thorough process for recommending candidates for a clear credential. As the candidate prepares to exit induction, the induction program director reviews and updates each candidate’s induction transcript to mark areas of completion and identify any requirements that have not been satisfied. Once all requirements are met, the induction program director recommends the candidate for the clear credential.

The verification process also includes a review of program documentation in which candidates must provide evidence of mastery toward the CSTP through a digital portfolio submitted to the induction program director and induction mentors for feedback. To ensure objectivity, mentors do not review the portfolios of their own mentees. Reviewers then submit a final rubric evaluation of each candidate's documentation to the induction program director.

Following the review process, candidates are notified by the credential analyst of either their program completion or the need for remediation. Candidates who require remediation are automatically given additional time to reflect on, revise, and resubmit their work for further review, ensuring that all candidates have a fair opportunity to meet program requirements before receiving their clear credential recommendation. Interviews confirmed that the credentialing team meets regularly with the program leadership to review the progress of each candidate.

Findings on Standards

After review of all available information including interviews with candidates, program completers, program personnel, mentors, coaches, and other constituencies, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Gateway High School Teacher Induction Program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Gateway Induction Program currently serves 27 candidates across seven charter schools in the San Francisco Bay Area, each serving a diverse student population. Program and school leaders indicated that partnerships are intentionally formed with schools that share a common educational philosophy. The program is small by design, which allows it to be personalized and responsive to all constituents.

Gateway's vision is to develop reflective practitioners who are committed to anti-racist teaching. This vision is intentionally embedded throughout the program and is clearly reflected in the structure of the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP). The ILP has three milestones: Milestone One emphasizes goal setting, grounded in the CSTP, and the triad meeting. Milestone Two centers on reflection around the teacher's identity and core values. This milestone also includes suggested readings and tools around implementing anti-racist strategies, which help inform the candidate's inquiry. Milestone three focuses on inquiry and reflection and asks the teacher to reflect back on the self-assessment of the CSTP to determine a focus area. During interviews, candidates shared that induction did not feel like a check box and found that they could focus and reflect on their practice.

The critically reflective design of the Gateway IP is intentional. Program leadership regularly solicits input from all constituent groups through formal surveys and structured check-ins. Additionally, in interviews, candidates and mentors noted that leadership remains highly accessible and responsive outside of formal feedback structures. Interview data indicated that concerns and suggestions are addressed promptly, reinforcing a culture of continuous improvement and collaboration.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

| Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation | Team Finding |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure: | <i>No response needed</i> |
| 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. | Consistently |
| The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |
| Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |

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

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The Gateway Induction Program (Gateway IP) is committed to strengthening public education by preparing reflective, equity-centered practitioners. This vision serves as the foundation of the program and informs all aspects of its design. As one school leader noted during interviews, the program’s vision has been central since the start of the program, and both the structure of the program and its coaching model were intentionally developed to align with the vision.

The vision led to the development of the Gateway IP program model, which offers personalized, one-on-one mentoring focused on anti-racist teaching and teacher identity. The small size allows for tailored support and meaningful relationships between mentors and teachers. Both site administrators and program leaders discussed the importance of remaining small and partnering with schools that have a similar vision. The program’s small size enables tailored support and fosters meaningful, sustained relationships between mentors and candidates. Anti-racist practice and teacher identity are embedded throughout the ILP, particularly in Milestone Two, where candidates articulate their professional values and reflect on their identities as teachers. Advisory council members identified the program’s explicit emphasis on anti-racist practice as a key strength and a foundational design element. Candidates further emphasized that the program’s reflective structure allows them to slow down and focus intentionally on their instructional practice, which leads to improved student outcomes.

School leaders shared during interviews that they make a deliberate effort to recruit and retain a diverse workforce. These efforts include partnerships with local universities and residency programs. As staff diversity has increased, employee referrals have further contributed to creating a diverse workforce.

When interviewed, program leaders, site administrators, advisory council members, and mentors described a rigorous mentor selection process. Mentors are recommended by site administrators based on established criteria, including possession of a clear credential, demonstrating effective teaching practice, and knowledge of working with a diverse student population. Selected mentors complete an annual application and are matched with candidates based on individual needs and credential areas.

While finding time to schedule meetings can be challenging, one candidate described the mentoring experience as invaluable, highlighting the mentor’s flexibility, expertise, and commitment to identifying appropriate resources and support.

Throughout the induction process, mentors guide candidates in developing and completing the ILP, which includes three milestones aligned to the CSTP. Each milestone provides opportunities for candidates to demonstrate growth and reflect on their professional practice towards meeting the CSTP. Upon completion of all program requirements, candidates compile a digital portfolio of the three milestones and submit it to the induction program director for review. The portfolio is evaluated by a mentor other than the candidate’s assigned mentor, and the feedback is submitted to the program director. The induction program director confirms that all requirements are met and submits a completed and signed Form 41-Induction to the credential analyst. The credential analyst will verify that all requirements for a clear credential have been satisfied, then will submit an online recommendation to the Commission for a Clear Credential.

| Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support | Team Finding |
|--|---------------------------|
| 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. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |
| Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Program leadership described intentional outreach and strong community partnerships that support identification of eligible teachers. They stated, “We are very engaged in the community in San Francisco. This is indicative of our recruitment of people throughout our programs. We have good connections with teacher prep programs in our area.” Partnerships are developed

when “their vision and mission are in alignment with ours,” supporting both program coherence and candidate access. These recruitment practices support the development of a diverse candidate and mentor pool reflective of the communities served and help ensure that candidates enter the program with appropriate support structures in place.

Eligibility and admission processes begin each Spring when partner schools submit anticipated induction needs. During interviews, program leadership explained partner schools provide a list of all new teachers eligible for induction and begin the mentor matching process. Credential verification is completed through secure search procedures to confirm eligibility. Early mentor matching ensures candidates begin induction with support in place at the start of the school year. Candidates confirmed timely onboarding, with one candidate sharing, “Within a week I got into induction and had a mentor.” When mentor transitions occur, the program responds quickly to maintain continuity of support. One candidate reported, “I notified [program leadership of my mentor needs] three days later they had a mentor for me. [Leadership] got on it right on top of it.”

Program expectations are communicated through orientation sessions, program handbooks, mentor guidance, milestone calendars, and cohort reminders. Candidates described mentors as a consistent source of guidance, with one candidate explaining, “I am informed about requirements by my mentor. I get everything through the mentor. I don’t worry if I’m going to fall behind or miss anything.” Mentors and candidates collaboratively develop schedules and pacing plans that support timely completion. One candidate shared, “My mentor and I have a calendar. We chart our dates and when things need to be completed or adjusted to ensure that I can complete the program in a timely way.”

Leadership monitors candidate progress regularly and communicates with mentors and candidates to ensure requirements are completed. Candidates described proactive outreach when support was needed. One candidate reported, “They noticed I hadn’t submitted something and reached out. They offered solutions.” The program maintains a clearly defined process to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies, ensuring that candidates receive timely guidance and intervention aligned with program expectations.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice | Team Finding |
| 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. | Consistently |

| Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice | Team Finding |
|--|---------------------|
| 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. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |
| Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. | Consistently |
| The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates. | Consistently |
| Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. | Consistently |
| All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The Gateway IP offers a high-quality course of study grounded in current research on effective practice, including culturally responsive teaching and equity-centered instruction. Program leadership described the model as “deep in culturally responsiveness” and “steeped in research, Culturally Responsive Teaching, and Zaretta Hammond’s work.” Professional learning is closely integrated with field-based inquiry cycles and ILP goals, creating a cohesive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies aligned to the CSTP.

Candidates confirmed the relevance of this work, sharing that “The literature they choose is pretty fitting. Topics like culturally responsive teaching and the brain,” and “I have felt seen by the tasks that they assign.”

Mentors are selected jointly with program staff and site administrators based on credential alignment, eligibility requirements, and demonstrated capacity to provide effective support. Site-based supervisors are appropriately credentialed and experienced educators who provide knowledgeable guidance to candidates. Mentors participate in initial and ongoing training in supervision and mentoring, including mentoring for equity, adult learning theory, collaborative inquiry, and reflective coaching practices. One mentor described preparation focused on “Mentoring for equity, reflection on own practice and how to listen well.” Ongoing mentor development includes structured opportunities for reflection and evaluation of mentoring practice. During interviews, mentors highlighted the use of video recordings to provide each other feedback on mentoring sessions.

Candidates reported timely mentor assignment and consistent communication, noting they were, “Assigned a new mentor really quick. Fantastic communication.” Through ILP inquiry cycles and classroom-based practice, candidates experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and implement research-based strategies designed to improve teaching and student learning.

The program effectively implements and evaluates clinical practice through structured mentoring, milestone feedback, and triad meetings involving the candidate, mentor, and site administrator. Triad meetings support alignment between program expectations and site priorities and allow participants to collaboratively review candidate progress. One administrator explained that triads allow participants to understand what the candidate is working on and brainstorm ideas as a group. Candidates described consistent formative feedback and individualized support through the ILP process, sharing that “Milestone 3 is goal focus. 90% of feedback comes from my mentor.” Mentors also described accessible program leadership that is very responsive.

| Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement | Team Finding |
|--|---------------------|
| 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. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |
| 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. | Consistently |

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement | Team Finding |
| 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. | Consistently |

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

During interviews, all constituent groups reported that they have opportunities to provide feedback to the program through both formally and informally. The Gateway IP formally collects feedback through mid-year surveys, end-of-year surveys, and administrator surveys.

In addition to these surveys, program leaders facilitate quarterly check-ins with candidates. During interviews, candidates expressed appreciation for these meetings, noting that they provide an opportunity to discuss their progress, successes, challenges, and experiences with their mentors. Both candidates and program leaders indicated that the quarterly check-ins help identify areas of need as well as highlight successes. When first-year candidates were asked to describe a program improvement, several referenced challenges with the online platform and noted that the program responded by implementing solutions to improve the submission process.

Mentors reported, during interviews, that they met monthly to provide feedback on their work and to reflect on their experiences within the program. They also shared that they have direct access to the program lead when support is needed.

Advisory members stated that program data is reviewed at each meeting and that they are routinely asked to provide input on program improvement. One advisory member shared that they were asked for ways to strengthen the connection between the preliminary program and the induction program. Another noted the group’s ongoing efforts to ensure the program is streamlined, relevant, and responsive to teachers’ needs.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Common Standard 5: Program Impact | Team Finding |
| 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. | Consistently |

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Common Standard 5: Program Impact | Team Finding |
| 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. | Consistently |

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

Throughout interviews and other program artifacts, reviewers found that the Gateway IP collects and analyzes multiple measures of effectiveness, including completion data, demographic information for mentors and candidates, milestone submissions, and midyear and end-of-year surveys. Program leadership described monitoring “completion data, demographic information of mentors and candidates, how partners are doing in the program and how the program is making partnerships strong.” These data sources are reviewed to evaluate candidate growth and program effectiveness and are used to inform ongoing program refinement and improvement.

Program assessments indicate that candidates meet Commission-adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards. The ILP, embedded within Milestones 1, 2, and 3, serves as the primary assessment of candidate growth aligned to the CSTP. Through structured inquiry cycles, candidates analyze student learning data, reflect on instructional practice, and implement targeted instructional adjustments. The ILP process provides documented evidence that candidates demonstrate competencies required of beginning teachers while supporting all students in meeting academic standards. Candidates described the impact of this process on their instructional practice. One candidate explained, “Easy to tell it is working because I used a preassessment and post it was clear to see that induction had an uptick in my student performance.”

Candidates described increased instructional clarity and classroom effectiveness because of participation in induction. One candidate shared, “It shows every day when my students show up to school and know what we are supposed to be doing, routines and protocols I can attribute to Gateway.” Mentors corroborated evidence of candidate growth and instructional improvement, noting that “Shifts they make are revealed during those coaching conversations,” and “I see it in student data. I see it through equitable outcomes.” Administrators confirmed that the program strengthens instructional decision-making and data use, explaining that induction “...pushes our new teachers to look at every child and data [we] dig deeper to meet the needs of that student.”

Across constituent groups, consistent evidence demonstrates that program assessments verify candidate competence and that the program has a positive impact on candidate learning,

instructional practice, and student achievement, including for diverse student populations served in California schools.