

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Newark Unified School District

**Professional Services Division
May 2018**

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Newark Unified School District. 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 Major Stipulations** is made for the institution.

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

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	X		
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support		X	
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice		X	
4) Continuous Improvement		X	
5) Program Impact		X	

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction	6	3	2	1

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: Newark Unified School District

Dates of Visit: April 16-18, 2018

2017-18 Accreditation

Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

<i>Although Newark Unified School District has operated a Commission approved educator preparation program since 2004, induction programs were not incorporated into the accreditation system until 2011. Therefore, the 2018 accreditation visit is the first accreditation site visit for this institution.</i>

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Major 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, program partners, mentors and candidates. The team felt that it 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:

Program Standards

Program standards 2, 3, and 5 are **Met** for the Newark Unified School District Induction Program. Program Standard 6 was **Not Met** and Program Standards 1 and 4 were **Met with Concerns**.

Common Standards

Common Standard 1 was found to be **Met**. Common Standard 2, 3, 4 and 5 were found to be **Met with Concerns**. Documentation and interviews confirm that the Newark Unified School District Induction Program demonstrated inconsistencies in the program's ability to ensure quality of program services.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of the program documents and interviews with program stakeholders. As a result, the team found Common Standard 1 is **Met**, Common Standards 2, 3, 4 and 5 **Met with Concerns** and Program Standards 1 and 4 are **Met with Concerns**, Program Standards 2, 3 and 5 are **Met** and Program Standard 6 is **Not Met**. The team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**. Further, the team recommends that a revisit be held within one year of COA action.

Stipulations

Below are the recommended stipulations for Newark Unified School District:

- 1) NUSD must fully transition to the new Teacher Induction standards. In doing so they must provide evidence that
 - the program is grounded in individualization and growth for each candidate rather than the completion of documents and assignments.
 - a consistent and robust mentoring system is in place and provides “just-in time” support for candidates
 - the knowledge/experiences from a candidate’s preliminary program is being considered during the development of the candidate’s ILP
- 2) Newark Unified School District must provide evidence that any Common Standard and Program Standard less than fully met has been addressed.
- 3) NUSD must provide evidence of a cohesive mentoring structure across all institutions served.
- 4) NUSD must provide evidence that a system is in place to regularly collect data from multiple sources, analyze it, share it with all stakeholder groups and use the data to inform the effectiveness of the program and make modifications. This must include:
 - a. Feedback from all relevant stakeholders, including K-12 and higher education partners, candidates, mentors, and completers
 - b. A means for mentors and candidates of sharing feedback that protects their anonymity
 - c. Feedback about the quality of the candidate/mentor matches to ensure they are productive and positive
- 5) NUSD must provide evidence that it has a clear process in place for determining the impact of the program on the teaching and learning of both candidates and students.
- 6) That within one year Newark Unified School District will host a revisit.

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

Staff recommends that:

- The institutions response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Newark Unified School District be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Newark Unified School District continue 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:	Julie McNealy Orange Unified School District
Common Standards:	Cate Rockstad Stockton Unified School District
Programs Cluster:	Lauri Massari Westside Union School District
Staff to the Visit:	Lynette Roby Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Report	Program Resource Guide
Program Assessment Feedback	Program transition Plan
Candidate Files	Support Provider Application Packet
Mentor Activity Logs	Support Provider Self-Assessment Reflection
East Bay Induction Consortium Website	Benchmark Documents
Administrator Surveys	Program Summary
Candidate Portfolios	Electronic Candidate Files
ECO Documentation	

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	60
Completers	15
Employers	13
Institutional Administration	4
Program Coordinators	5
Mentors/mentors	31
Credential Analyst	1
IHE Partners	4
TOTAL	133

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

Newark Unified School District (NUSD) is located in the city of Newark, California, a Northern California city of over 40,000 people which is located 35 miles southeast of San Francisco, 25 miles south of Oakland and 20 miles north of San Jose. On July 1, 1964 Newark Unified School District was officially joined with Newark High School to create the new Newark Unified School District. The district serves approximately 6,000 students and is currently comprised of eight elementary schools that include a TK program, one junior high school, one comprehensive high school, one continuation high school, and one independent study school, as well as preschool and adult education programs. NUSD reports a diverse enrollment of 54% Hispanic, 14% White, 13% Asian, 8% Filipino, 2% Pacific Islander, 4% African American and 4% two or more ethnicities and 1% not reporting.

Education Unit

Newark Unified School District is the sponsor and Lead Educational Agency (LEA) for the East Bay Induction Consortium (EBIC) serving public school districts such as San Francisco Unified School District and Hayward Unified School District as well as 19 private schools and 10 charter schools. Since 2014 Newark Unified School District has offered an induction program to teachers seeking to clear preliminary multiple subject/single subject credentials, preliminary education specialist credentials and education specialist Level I candidates. The induction program is designed to be

completed in two years. Newark USD also offers a one year Early Completion Option. Overseeing the day-to-day operations of the induction program is a leadership team comprised of the Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, the program director, the Coordinator for Private and Charter Schools, and an administrative secretary

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2016-17)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2017-18)
Teacher Induction	90	61

The Visit

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

Program Reports Teacher Induction

Program Design

Newark Unified School District (NUSD) is the sponsor and Lead Educational Agency for the East Bay Induction Consortium (EBIC). This consortium consists of public school districts, charter schools, and private schools. The program incorporates a sequenced structure of extended professional development that seeks to prepare candidates to meet the academic learning needs of all P- 12 students and retain high quality teachers.

The NUSD Induction Leadership Team is composed of the Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, the program director, the Coordinator for Private and Charter Schools, and the administrative secretary. The program director, with assistance of the program coordinator, manages the administrative components of the program such as admission, advisement, participant support and assessment, mentor recruiting and preparation, stakeholder collaborations, and program evaluation.

Candidates include General Education, Education Specialist and Level I candidates. Each candidate is paired with a part time mentor, matched by site and credential whenever possible. The mentor pool also includes retirees. Principals assist in the process of mentor recruitment and some candidates are permitted to select their own mentor.

The program design includes support and assistance to each candidate, collaborative experiences with colleagues and resource personnel, and an inquiry-based formative assessment system that is built upon the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs).

To gather program input, the program regularly surveys candidates at the conclusion of each seminar, with questions directly related to the seminar topic or quality of presentation content. Evidence of program support-related feedback systems offered to mentors, site administrators, or institution of higher education members was not found. Additionally, candidates were unable to articulate the process for requesting a mentor change and several candidates expressed concern that to do so might potentially impact the prospect of re-election.

There is minimal evidence of the program's practice of sharing program data. One principal recalled that survey data comparing district and state data had been shared by the program coordinator at an advisory board meeting. Advisory Board members were not able to cite an example of how their input resulted in programmatic change.

Overall, institutions of higher education (IHE) partners and program coordinators were particularly complementary and appreciative of the program leadership's timely responsiveness to email inquiries, and their willingness to assist with program completion questions, especially regarding clearing the Level I candidate credentials.

The NUSD induction program is in the early stages of transition to the 2016 Induction Program Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs with current practices largely grounded in the 2009 Induction Program Standards. Because the program has

not transitioned to the new standards, concerns surfaced regarding program standards 1, 4, and 6.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The current program design is based upon the Formative Assessment for California Teachers (FACT) system and has at its foundation an inquiry based process for candidates to work toward a CSTP correlated goal. The candidate-mentor professional relationship, in addition to regularly scheduled seminars facilitated by the program director and the program coordinator, comprise the support mechanism for the induction experience. These foundational components require candidates, in collaboration with their mentors, to document the completion of inquiry-based assignments in a candidate portfolio. Mentors and candidates meet a minimum of one hour per week to collaborate around the FACT documents and related activities. Candidates expressed sincere respect and appreciation for their mentor. One candidate stated that, “It is so great to know there is one person I can call on.”

Evidence that the program has added an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) component as initial steps to transition to the current induction program standards is apparent. However, used in tandem with the existing FACT system and its associated paperwork, significant barriers in the implementation of an ILP surfaced, as evidenced in several stakeholder interviews. Evidence of an ILP goal setting process crafted around the candidate’s unique background, experience, and/or skills developed in the preliminary program was not apparent. Further, multiple stakeholder groups expressed concerns that the “just in time” needs of each candidate are rendered secondary or non-existent by virtue of the amount of support needed in completion of the quantity of documentation required for induction completion. Documentation and stakeholder interviews confirmed the implementation of the ILP did not supplant the existing program requirements, but was added as an additional program completion requirement.

Stakeholders did applaud the addition of the Triad meeting, where candidates are provided the opportunity to receive site administrator input regarding goal setting. Candidates, mentors, and site administrators described the Triad as a helpful process in keeping the candidate’s goal in alignment with evaluation expectations. One principal viewed the Triad experience as a step forward in alleviating the amount of work a candidate must complete if site goals and induction goals can be integrated via the Triad experience.

Assessment of Candidates

The successful completion of portfolio assignments, as determined by reviewers and subsequently approved by the program director and coordinator, currently serves as evidence that a candidate has completed the requirements of induction. However, evidence correlating portfolio completion to candidate growth, development, or competency was not apparent in documentation and in stakeholder interviews.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with program stakeholders, the team determined that three program standards are fully met for the Newark Unified School District Teacher Induction and the following standards are less than fully met:

Standard 1-- Program Purpose

Met with Concerns

Evidence was found indicating that a formative assessment system is in place, however no evidence was found that supports candidates building on the knowledge and skills gained during the preliminary preparation program and the program support for candidates using a robust mentoring program as intended in the new program standards.

Standard 4 -- Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors

Met with Concerns

No evidence was found from interviews and document review reflecting that “just in time” supports were being provided to candidates. Support was focused on completion of the assignments and documents in a formative assessment system. The ongoing support for mentors including reflection on their mentoring practices to promote candidate growth and effectiveness was not evident.

Standard 6 -- Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services

Not Met

After a document review and interviews with stakeholders there is no convincing evidence that the induction program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates. Program assessment of mentors is lacking specific feedback that is based on the mentoring support rather than document completion, including a clear procedure for mentor reassignment if necessary. The program currently does not solicit feedback and assess the perceived effectiveness of support provided to candidates in implementing their individual learning plan.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	X		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. 	X		
Finding on Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met		
<p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision Newark Unified School District Program is research based ensuring the implementation of California’s adopted content standards and curricular frameworks. The LEA provides sufficient resources for the effective operation of the program. Efforts to recruit, hire and retain faculty that represent and support the diversity of California schools was evident. Program leadership involves multiple stakeholders in the coordination of the program. A clear process for monitoring program requirements is adhered to prior to recommendation of the credential by the education unit.</p>			

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success. 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 		X	
Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met with Concerns		
<p>Rationale After a review of program documents and stakeholder interviews, inconsistencies surfaced among program participants from NUSD and their partnering districts. Candidates expressed concerns in programmatic support to promote growth and effectiveness in attaining competence and performance expectations. Inconsistencies also exist in program advisement and candidate support for those who need additional assistance to meet competencies.</p>			

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical 		X	

experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice. 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California's 	X		

adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.			
Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met With Concerns		
<p>Rationale</p> <p>It appears in the NUSD Program Resource Guide, portfolio reviews, and was corroborated by candidate interviews that the program is continuing to utilize all previous formative assessment documents. While candidates indicated that some “assignments” promoted their reflection they also expressed how the preponderance of required documentation hindered their ability to focus on their overall growth, effectiveness and development of competencies. There were also inconsistencies which should not exist under new program guidelines among general education and education specialists candidates regarding the work required for completion of the program. Additionally, there is no convincing evidence that the induction program regularly evaluates the quality of services provided by mentors. Assignment of mentors is inconsistent across all programs and partnering districts. Some candidates indicated having to identify their own mentor.</p>			

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data. 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 stakeholders such as 		X	

employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation			
Finding on Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Met With Concerns		
<p>Rationale It was identified in interviews that the process utilized by the program to gather candidate and stakeholder feedback does not ensure a comprehensive and authentic reflection of the support they receive that promotes their overall growth and development. The data collected by the program is focused on professional development and does not reflect a systematized process for collecting data from multiple sources across all programs.</p>			

Common Standard 5: Program Impact			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 		X	
Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Met With Concerns		
<p>Rationale Although an ILP is being implemented by the program, there is little support that the program is grounded in individualization and growth for each candidate rather than the completion of documents and assignments. The Program has implemented an ILP that is used in tandem with the existing FACT system focusing on completion of documents and assignments not the individualized growth of candidates.</p> <p>There is no formalized process in place to ensure that the program is having a positive impact on teaching and learning in schools.</p>			

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Newark Unified School District (NUSD) has a long history of providing support to their new teachers. Since the inception of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program's in 1997 NUSD has provided a system of support that is grounded in a structured formative assessment system and committed to supporting the growth and development of novice teachers. The focus and dedication of program leadership to the induction model was evident throughout the document review and interviews of program stakeholders.

The strengths of the program lay in the leadership's long standing relationships with program partners and in the dedication of mentors to provide guidance and support to their candidates in order to assist them with completing program requirements. During stakeholder interviews principles, mentors and program partners all spoke highly of the dedication and availability of program leadership and in the willingness of the mentors to assist candidates with their induction program requirements.

The areas for growth are based on the challenges of program leadership to fully transition to the 2016 Induction Program Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs. During stakeholder interviews candidates expressed concerns regarding weekly meeting time with their mentors having to be focused around "completing assignments" due to the structure of the formative assessment system, rather than on their immediate classroom needs. Additionally, year 1 education specialist candidates expressed concerns regarding having to complete additional "assignments" that were above and beyond the requirements of their general education colleagues in the program. Overall, candidates expressed confusion as to the connections between the required assignments and their individualized needs as novice teachers.