

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
Anaheim Elementary School District**

**Professional Services Division
January 2019**

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Anaheim Elementary 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 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 | 5 | 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: Anaheim Elementary School District

Dates of Visit: November 5-7, 2018

2017-18 Accreditation

Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

| |
|---|
| Previous History of Accreditation Status |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <i>Although Anaheim Elementary School District has operated a Commission approved educator preparation program since 2003, 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 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, faculty, candidates, graduates, 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:

Program Standards

All program standards were Met for the Teacher Induction program with the exception of *Program Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System* which was **Met with Concerns**.

Common Standards

All Common Standards were **Met** for the Teacher Induction program.

Overall Recommendation

The overall recommendation for the Anaheim Elementary School District is **Accreditation with Stipulations**, based upon the findings of all Common Standards Met, and one program standard as Met with Concerns. The evidence from the visit verified the district is implementing a teacher induction program not yet aligned to current program standards, in that all candidates are required to complete a series of identical tasks and forms.

Recommended Stipulations:

1. That on or before January 2020, the program provide evidence of full implementation of the 2015 Induction Program Standards. Specifically, the program must provide evidence of a structure that is fully individualized based on the needs of each candidate and as otherwise outlined in Program Standard 3.

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 satisfactory completion of all requirements:

Clear Teacher Induction

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institutions response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Anaheim Elementary School District be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Anaheim Elementary 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 Leader: | Barbara Howard Riverside County Office of Education |
| Common Standards: | Lauri Massari Westside Union School District |
| Programs Cluster: | Christopher J. Persky Fontana Unified School District |
| Staff to the Visit: | Gay Roby Commission on Teacher Credentialing |

Documents Reviewed

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Program Standards Review Documents | Common Standards Review Documents |
| Program Standards Review Feedback | Common Standards Review Feedback |
| Program Standards Addendum | Survey Data from local assessments |
| Program Summary 2018-19 | Completer Survey Results |

Interviews Conducted

| Stakeholders | TOTAL |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Candidates | 40 |
| Completers | 11 |
| Employers | 11 |
| Institutional Administration | 6 |
| Program Leadership | 3 |
| Professional Development Staff | 4 |
| Mentors | 26 |
| Credential Analysts and Staff | 3 |
| Advisory Board Members | 10 |
| Institutions of Higher Education | 2 |
| TOTAL | 116 |

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

The Anaheim Elementary School District (AESD) is a public-school district serving the city of Anaheim in southern California. It oversees 23 schools with an enrollment of approximately 17,000 PreK-6 students, making it the second largest elementary school district in the state. AESD is a feeder district to Anaheim Union High School District.

In 2016, three schools in the Anaheim Elementary School District were awarded the prestigious Gold Ribbon by the California Department of Education, selected for their rigorous academic standards, innovative methods and successful strategies in the classroom. These schools join a list of 14 AESD California Distinguished Schools and three Title I Academic Achieving Schools.

AESD serves a diverse population in its 23 schools. More than 90% of the district's students are designated as English Language learners with 88% unduplicated students.

Education Unit

The Teacher Induction Program is housed in the Human Resources Department of the district. Of the 23 school sites 18 of them have induction candidates on staff this year. In its third year of positive growth, the program has 43 participants, up from four in 2010-2011.

Table 1
Program Review Status

| Program Name | Number of Program Completers (2017-18) | Number of Candidates Enrolled (2018-19) |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Teacher Induction | 20 | 43 |

The Visit

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

Program Reports Teacher Induction Program

Program Design

The Teacher Induction Program's mission is to ensure that new teachers receive the highest form of support and mentoring to develop the skills critical to teaching success. The program continuously emphasizes and encourages new teachers to reflect on their practice throughout their teaching career. One completer stated she would not have made it through her first two years of teaching without the support of the coordinator and her mentor.

The program features three-deep leadership from the Human Resources department that includes the program coordinator, program director, and the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources. Together, they make executive decisions related to program layout, review survey data and make subsequent changes, host Advisory Board meetings, and communicate with all district personnel. Human Resource leaders mentioned that induction was the heart and soul of retaining teachers throughout the district. Induction is a priority throughout the district and fostering the development of beginning teachers is a fundamental goal of the district.

Mentors are classroom teachers, resource specialists, teachers on special assignment—Teacher Development or Teachers on Special Assignment—Instruction. They are recruited through distribution of flyers districtwide and require the recommendation of their site administrators. After mentors have been selected, they attend an all-day training before being assigned a candidate. Mentors reported their individual candidate assignments are aligned with their particular grade level or content specialty and the induction coordinator also holds individual meetings to discuss particular goals each mentor would like to accomplish throughout each year. Mentors stated that serving in the role as a mentor was very fulfilling work because they get to watch their colleagues strengthen their individual skills as educators. Mentors verbalized the support that they received from the coordinator as timely, effective, and meaningful.

Anaheim Elementary School District's (AESD) Teacher Induction Program began implementation to new program standards during the last two years. Mandatory professional development has been shifted to self-selected and optional. In addition, candidates now have opportunity to pick two California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) goals for their inquiry, perhaps from the same standard, which is a change from previous years. Candidates are then surveyed on their chosen CSTP goals and specific district-level professional development is driven by those results. In contrast, candidates are still required to complete the exact same steps related to their individual learning plan (ILP) goals for completion of the program. Through the review of candidate portfolios, it was confirmed that all candidates are required to do the same forms for program completion. Candidates noted that they may do the twenty-six steps to the ILP in a different order, but all steps must be completed. All candidates attend mandatory monthly Induction meetings which focus on the district's four learning cycles and collaboration. It is unclear how individualized these meetings are or if those accomplished in the learning cycle

processes are excused from these meetings. As additional programmatic changes are made to individualize a candidate's induction experience, AESD is encouraged to consider meeting possibilities that further enhance individualization of candidate needs.

Mentors assemble monthly throughout the school year to collaborate and participate in skill building activities that relate to the skills of cognitive coaching, restorative circles, role-playing scenarios, observations and reflective conversations. Mentors enjoy these monthly meetings and have stated that the opportunity to acquire additional mentoring skills will further help their abilities to challenge, consult, and coach the candidates that they work with on a weekly basis.

A variety of feedback allows all stakeholders to participate in the evaluation of program effectiveness. The Advisory Board reviews data, looks for gaps in support levels, and suggests improvements to the program to better meet the diverse needs of their beginning teachers. In addition, all professional development leaders are given feedback based on survey results in order to make changes in their presentations/content if needed. One professional development leader noted that if the feedback to a particular training is ineffective, they do not repeat the training.

During the two-year Teacher Induction Program, new teachers have eight opportunities to receive one-on-one advice and assistance from the program coordinator to discuss strengths and challenges related to their time in the induction program and check progress towards completion. Candidates overwhelmingly note that the 1:1 support that they receive from the coordinator is helpful and appreciated.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates complete two cycles of inquiry per school year based on different CSTP standards. These cycles of inquiry require candidates to follow the metacognitive "plan, teach, reflect, apply" cycle. Before beginning these cycles of inquiry, candidates meet in triad meetings with their mentor and site administrator to review the specific CSTP standards they will address throughout the year. As candidates make their way through the various learning cycles required by the program, a candidate competency chart and final reflection is completed before candidates move on to the next phase of the inquiry process.

The main delivery structure of the AESD Induction Program is the weekly hour-long meetings between candidates and their mentors, where candidates receive "just-in-time support" and engage in professional dialogue regarding their inquiries and growth goals related to the CSTP standards. During interviews, program completers and current candidates stated that their favorite part of the program is the support received from mentors on a regular basis. In addition, survey data overwhelmingly suggests that candidates highly value the support from their individual mentors and that the cycles of inquiry lead to a deeper understanding of their instructional practice related to the CSTP standards.

In addition to the weekly mentor support, candidates have the option of attending various professional development opportunities that relate to their individual inquiry focus. These meetings allow candidates to gain additional insight into their particular CSTP focus goals and to collaborate with peers on a variety of educational topics related to technology, classroom management, and lesson plan design, as well as exchange innovative and purposeful ideas. Candidates then bring in this newly acquired knowledge into their teaching practice and collect student work samples, participate in weekly reflection, and modify goals as needed.

Assessment of Candidates

As a final activity for the year two candidates, they participate in a credential review showcase panel and an assessment of their competency. The candidate presents his/her ILP to a mixed panel of district representatives. Candidates discuss their ILP in detail, focusing on the CSTP elements chosen, resources that contributed to their individualized growth, impact on student achievement, triad meeting feedback, and the overall outcome of the inquiry. This activity was recently changed due to feedback received on its rigidity and uniform requirements; it is now more candidate-driven and specific to each candidate's experience. Candidates noted that this opportunity to share knowledge and growth towards ILP goals have truly helped them become more reflective professionals.

Once the panel reviews the scoring form and a discussion takes place, successful candidates are recommended for their clear credentials. Credential technicians attend the showcase as well and work with candidates to complete the clear credential application immediately upon completion of the showcase. The credential technician then applies online for the credential on behalf of the candidates. If there are deficiencies in any area, the candidate meets with the induction coordinator to write a plan detailing steps needed for program completion.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Teacher Induction program except for the following:

Standard 3 Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System – Met with Concerns

The Anaheim Elementary School District's Teacher Induction program requires candidates to complete a series of identical tasks and complete identical forms, instead of a course of study that is designed to provide each candidate with a mentoring-focused program tailored to his or her unique needs as required by the Commission- adopted program standards. Although the AESD Teacher Induction Program has made additional modifications to meet the Induction standards, the requirement of monthly meeting attendance for all candidates to experience the same material, and of the submission of additional documents beyond the ILP, does not align to current standards. By altering these mandatory components, the program can then use them on an as-needed basis and be better aligned to the program standards.

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 | | |

| Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Components | Consistently | Inconsistently | Not Evidenced |
| <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>Brief summary of information applicable to the standard</p> <p>All stakeholders provided the highest accolades for the program. The district’s superintendent and cabinet level leadership stated their shared belief that offering a high-quality induction program is a valuable strategy in recruiting and retaining the best new teachers. The superintendent indicated induction is a valuable program, stating that a district can invest in supporting and developing teachers when they are new or spend additional dollars later in remediation. He further indicated that dollars spent on induction are crucial to the success of the students as well. Program staff confirmed that sufficient resources and support are allocated for the effective operation of the program, and business office leaders confirmed the high priority of allocating resources for the purpose of induction, with the budget provided as evidence of this.</p> <p>Candidates indicated a high level of satisfaction with their mentor match and with the system of support they receive in their first two years. All stakeholder groups interviewed expressed confidence in and appreciation of the program leadership, attributing much of the program’s success to their dedication and skills. The program leaders are proactive in their support, seemingly always available, and receptive to ideas on improving the induction experience.</p> | | | |

| Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Components | Consistently | Inconsistently | Not Evidenced |
| Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success. | | | |
| <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 | | |
| <p>Brief summary of information applicable to the standard</p> <p>Recruitment and support are highly developed constructs of the program. Credential technicians are well versed in teacher credentialing and induction eligibility requirements. Being housed within the HR department, credential advisement is readily accessible to program personnel and candidates. Candidates report that program personnel are highly accessible for initial and ongoing guidance of program requirements, which are well articulated on the Induction program webpage. Upon hire, candidates receive notice of the program, which also serves to inform the program coordinator when a candidate is entering the program. Candidates report the initial contact and support by the program coordinator as being exceptionally welcoming, timely, and informative. The program provides an orientation to formally initiate candidates to the induction process and pair the candidate with an appropriately matched mentor. Later, candidates are familiarized with site-based coaches and district contacts, maximizing opportunities for candidate exposure to a variety of supports. Per their Memorandum of Understanding, candidates are</p> | | | |

required to attend four advice and assistance meetings in each year of induction. Candidates are required to meet monthly to review program expectations, practice scenarios, and provide input to the program regarding needs. During these meetings, candidates are able to clarify program expectations and updates. Candidates expressed overwhelming satisfaction with the meaningful, reliable communication of the Induction program to all stakeholders.

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 experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards. | X | | |
| <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 | | |

| Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Components | Consistently | Inconsistently | Not Evidenced |
| <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 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. | X | | |
| Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice | Met | | |
| <p>Brief summary of information applicable to the standard</p> <p>Stakeholders unanimously report a climate of collaboration within the district and its community partners in support of induction. As evidenced in stakeholder interviews, the district fosters a thriving relationship with induction stakeholders that was described by one administrator as positively impacting the entire district with the reflective practices being cultivated in induction. Candidates participate in four learning cycle inquiry experiences, with an Individual Learning Plan in each induction year. Within the inquiry process, candidates focus on CSTP-centered goals which include strategies to address the needs of the district’s diverse learners. Candidates engage in reflective conversations with mentors and collect evidence within a portfolio to be shared at the spring triad and year two showcase panel. As reported in Program Standard 3, a prescribed series of assignments and associated documentation required within the learning cycles currently limits the Individual Learning Plan’s intended impact as the candidate’s single roadmap through induction. In the program’s ongoing transition to a mentor-focused system, mentors reported that support has shifted toward meaningful coaching, which mentors attribute to the program’s initial minimization of paperwork. Mentors expressed that trainings designed to build the skills mentors must acquire to facilitate each candidate’s growth within the ILP would also be beneficial.</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 employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation | X | | |
| Finding on Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement | Met | | |
| <p>Brief summary of information applicable to the standard</p> <p>The program uses results from local surveys of stakeholders (candidates, mentors, and site administrators) and results received from the CTC’s completer survey to gather feedback from participants regarding their outcomes and experiences in induction and to make program improvements. As documented in advisory meeting minutes, survey data is regularly shared and discussed with advisory members, who represent a diverse cadre of educators and community members, program participants and college/university members, and to offer unique perspective for program changes. District leadership described the advisory board as high functioning in their contributions to the program and active participation in induction events, such as the colloquium and credential showcase panel review. Advisory board members cited multiple examples of specific suggestions made by the board which have been implemented by the program, including the recent development of a professional development menu of options, a practice lauded by the candidates as being beneficial in helping target ILP goals. Allowing candidates “voice and choice” in their professional learning was named by mentors and candidates as a program strength. The three-deep program leadership meet regularly to discuss formal and informal feedback received and make changes when indicated. Numerous stakeholders provided examples of their responsiveness to suggestions and dedication to continuous improvement.</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 | | |
| <p>Brief summary of information applicable to the standard</p> <p>The AESD Induction program ensures its candidates are prepared to educate and effectively support all students in meeting state-adopted academic standards through their completion of an articulated individualized learning process as evidenced in ILP documentation and confirmed in interviews with candidates and principals. Though rare, if there are deficiencies in any area, the candidate meets with the induction coordinator to write a plan detailing steps needed for program completion.</p> <p>The unit assesses program impact on the candidate’s growth in teaching and learning throughout the year. They utilize a multi-faceted approach that involves observations, surveys, and feedback data. Interviews with the program’s advisory committee evidenced a strong use of data analysis as a tool for identifying needed program improvement.</p> <p>During interviews, candidates described the impact of their induction experience as career-saving, invaluable, and extremely supportive. Completer survey data now collected by the CTC indicates that candidates feel a strong sense of professional growth and student success as a result of their induction experience. Candidates repeatedly commented on the value they found in the reflective nature of the program. Administrators expressed that they felt themselves to be partners with the induction program and that the program strongly supported both site and district initiatives, helping teachers to integrate into the educational community of AESD.</p> | | | |

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Anaheim Elementary School District Teacher Induction Program is deeply embedded in the community's culture and maintains a high priority in the district superintendent's vision. All stakeholders interviewed indicated that the program staff delivers an exemplary program and is very responsive to all questions and concerns. Communication processes are well entrenched within district systems, so that candidates are experiencing a well-integrated induction experience. According to those interviewed, the program is highly responsive and relevant to the needs of the individual candidates.

Candidates and mentors collaborate weekly to provide both just-in-time support and guidance in completion of the required program documents. Mentors are trained both before and during their mentor experience, continually strengthening their mentoring skills. Site principals expressed a great appreciation for the program, finding it to be effective in the positive development of the district's new teachers and serving as a key contributor to retaining teachers in the district.

Program leadership is very responsive to data and formative feedback. They are supported by an active advisory committee who is continually engaged in program improvement. The program has made program design changes, designed to meet the 2016 Teacher Induction Standards through the use of technology blended with face-to-face mentoring and offering choice in professional development. However, further progress towards alignment of the Induction standards is needed, specifically in the area of reducing the number of required documents and meetings, as well as a deeper integration of the inquiry process /ILP into the mentoring structure. Program leadership and the advisory board are scheduled to address these ideas in the near future.