

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

**Professional Services Division
May 2019**

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Saddleback Valley 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 Stipulations** is made for the institution.

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

Common Standards

	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 Standards	6	4	2	

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: Saddleback Valley USD
Dates of Visit: April 1-3, 2019
2018-2019 Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

<i>Although Saddleback Valley 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 2019 accreditation site 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, advisory board members, candidates, completers, support providers and program leadership. 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 for the Teacher Induction Credential Program have been found to be **Met** with the exception of Program Standards 2 and 4 which were **Met with Concerns**.

Common Standards

All Common Standards were found to be **Met** with the exception of Common Standard 3 which was found to be **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found that standards were Met with the exception of Program Standards 2 and 4 and that all Common Standards were met, with the exception of Common Standard 3, the team recommends **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends that within one year of this action, the institution submit written documentation addressing the following stipulations:

1. That the program eliminate all required professional development and extraneous documentation from the program that does not directly reflect the needs of the candidate and the candidate's growth through the ILP process.
2. That the program develop and implement a clearly defined, formal process for identifying, selecting and verifying support providers/mentors needs to be put into place.

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 Saddleback Valley Unified School District's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Saddleback Valley Unified School District be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Saddleback Valley 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 Leader:

Melissa Beattie

Tracy Unified School District

Common Standards:

Catherine Fong

Bellflower Unified School District

Programs Standards Cluster:

Jaymie Baiza

Riverside County Office of Education

Staff to the Visit

Lynette Roby

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Documentation
Common Standards Addendum
Assessment List
Accreditation Website
Candidate Files
Cohort Slide Decks
Job Descriptions

Field Experience Materials
Program Review Documentation
Program Review Addendum
Candidate Handbook
Survey Data
Evaluation Forms

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	70
Completers	22
Employers/Administrators	15
Program Director	1
Assistant Superintendents	2
Advisory Board Members	18
Support Providers	51
Credential Analyst	1
Program Leadership	4
TOTAL	184

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

Saddleback Valley Unified School District (SVUSD) is a TK-12 school district located in southern Orange County, California. SVUSD is comprised of 37 schools: 26 elementary schools, four intermediate schools and four comprehensive high schools.

Education Unit

The Saddleback Valley Unified School District sponsors a two-year, individualized, job-embedded system of mentoring, support and professional learning that begins in the teacher’s first year of teaching. The program is focused on the key components of individualized learning and mentoring. On July 1, 2018, the Induction program changed from a single program specialist administering the program to a team based model with an induction administrator and four induction specialists.

**Table 1
Program Review Status**

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2017-18)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2018-19)
Teacher Induction	26	77

The Visit

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

:

**Program Reports
Teacher Induction**

Program Design

The Saddleback Valley Unified School District (SVUSD) operates a two-year induction program that serves a total of 77 general education and special education candidates. The Induction Administrator along with four support provider specialists are responsible for the coordination and oversight of the program. The induction team is responsible for reporting to the advisory board to help guide the facilitation of the program.

Teacher induction candidates begin the program in October. Upon enrollment, the Induction Administrator reaches out to site principals to identify support providers (also known as mentors) for candidates. Candidates attend orientation where they begin to develop their

Individual Learning Plan (ILP) goals with their support provider and self-assess their skills on the continuum of teaching practice to determine the area of focus in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Support providers then observe the candidate and provide input on the development of their ILP.

The program currently requires additional professional development training outside of and in addition to the ILP. Candidates are required to participate in a context for teaching module and provide evidence of classroom management strategies and routines in the prescribed “evidence slide deck”. Candidates are also required to attend six cohort meetings which include professional development in specific areas like classroom management and technology tools. These meetings also provide additional support in the program components, give time for candidates to ask questions regarding the program, and to meet with their support providers. Additionally, candidates are still required to complete a total of 24 hours of professional development as generalists and 30 hours of professional development for Education Specialists. It should be noted that following the presentation of the mid-visit report during the accreditation site visit, the Program Administrator conferred with the advisory board and upon their advisement, removed the requirement of 24-30 hours of logged professional development, effective immediately.

The program is led by a Program Administrator who is a full time principal at an elementary school. He works with a team of four support provider specialists comprising the SVUSD induction program leadership. This team of five provides program leadership, serves as full time site coaches and/or teachers and helps to design and implement the induction program components. The make-up of this team provides candidates and support providers the ability to get immediate support when needed from program leadership. The induction leadership team provides direct support to support providers, providing training in cognitive coaching, program expectations, and other just-in-time trainings. Candidates and support providers interviewed articulated they felt fully supported because there is access to program leadership that is highly responsive. The assistant superintendent also provides clear support and guidance of the program and is very supportive of the induction leadership team. She stated that “They each bring a different perspective based on the strengths they have.” Throughout the interviews stakeholders articulated the responsiveness of the leadership team and felt strong support from the program. Stakeholders also articulated that site administrators play a pivotal role in providing feedback and support to support providers and candidates as a result of the communication and collaboration of the district.

Interviews with program and district leadership confirm there are various lines of communication within the program and within the institution. For example, the induction leadership team meet with the advisory board three times a year to ensure the program is aligned to the needs of the candidates and support provider. Through interviews with the program leadership team and support providers it is evident that the program provides ongoing training and support to support providers in cognitive coaching and the program components. Additionally, program leadership meets individually with each candidate to discuss progress

and growth towards their professional growth goals. Year one candidates meet twice individually and year two candidates meet once.

SVUSD's mentoring program is designed to provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate growth in the CSTP through a mentoring and coaching relationship based on the research and theory of cognitive coaching. Candidates develop their ILP with the support of their support provider by using the teaching continuum to reflect on their teaching practice and identify areas for growth. Support providers also do an initial observation to determine the goals developed in the ILP. Through the triad meeting with the support provider and candidate, the site administrator also provides feedback on the ILP after goals have been developed with the support provider and candidate. The program leaders also individually meet with each candidate to review the progress of the ILP using the mid-year review checklist. Interviews with support providers and candidates confirmed that the ILP process is individualized, based on the candidates' personal needs. Throughout the program, candidates meet with their support providers and receive support through the cognitive coaching frames. Administrators who were interviewed articulated that they see growth in the reflective process of candidates, and that they are "seeing modifications of practice based on mentors' cognitive coaching support."

During interviews, candidates expressed that they have a positive, supportive relationship with their support providers. Candidates indicated that their support providers facilitated a system of support, provided just in time training, and supported the growth and development of their teaching practice. Based on interviews with support providers, site administrators, and the induction program administrator, principals recommend support providers to the program and the program verifies the support provider-candidate pairings. Qualifications and experience of support providers was provided through documentation submitted in the program review; however, through interviews with support providers and administrators there was no evidence of qualifications and the application process being in use. Although site administrators shared that there is no formal list of expectations for support providers, they made it clear that they recommend support providers based on the experience of the prospective support provider, the grade/content area, on being a good fit for the candidate as well as the willingness and growth mindset to support a candidate. The superintendent also articulated that the district values "high-quality mentors" and recognizes the importance of the Induction program and the need for "just-in-time support" for new teachers.

Support providers attend an initial mentor training in September that provides guidance and clear expectations for the mentoring experience, including the program components and elements of cognitive coaching. Support providers also attend orientation with their candidates to further define their role. Throughout the year, support providers attend cohort meetings that provide ongoing support in the development of the ILP with their candidates. Support providers also have the opportunity to choose from four trainings that focus on cognitive coaching and coaching for empathy. Additionally, support providers attend up to six cohort meetings with their candidates.

The SVUSD induction program collaborates with its advisory board to help guide and reflect upon the program activities. The advisory board consists of stakeholders which include but are not limited to past participating teachers, support providers, principals, university liaisons, district administrators, and the program specialists. Interviews with the advisory board confirmed that they make program recommendations and have seen changes implemented based on their feedback. The UC Irvine representative spoke about the authenticity of the program and the cohesion that she sees in the induction program that she does not see in other programs she supports.

The program assesses the quality of services provided by support providers to candidates by analyzing feedback provided by candidates at the end of each cohort meeting, the candidate's monthly reflection log, and the mid-year and end-of-year review. Candidates and support providers provide feedback after every cohort meeting. Support providers indicated during interviews that candidates regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the mentoring support through the monthly reflection logs. Interviews from candidates indicate that they felt supported by support providers with just-in-time support and the facilitation of growth and development. Year two candidates indicated that since the change in administration occurred following their first year, there has been an increase of site administration support aligned to induction. Site administrators also indicated that they receive more timely communication from the induction program which aids in their support of support providers. It is evident through interviews that program leaders are more responsive to candidate, and support provider needs.

In addition to administrative changes, the program has made programmatic changes as it transitions from the FACT module. Interviews confirmed that while there is less required paperwork there continues to be additional requirements outside of the ILP process. The induction program continues to require candidates to attend mandatory professional development sessions and log 24-30 hours of professional development. Following the mid-visit report presented during the second day of the site visit, the program administrator conferred with the advisory board and upon their advisement, removed the requirement of 24-30 hours of logged professional development, effective immediately.

Candidates and support providers also shared that there is a greater focus on the goals being individualized through the ILP process. Through interviews, both candidates and support providers confirmed that the ILP is personalized to the candidates' goals and needs.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The ILP document provided by the program consists of goal setting, continuum of teaching practice, initial observation, professional development, learning cycles, and end of year reflection.

Based on communication with local institutions of higher education (IHE's), candidates begin their ILP by self-assessing their skills on the continuum of teaching practices to determine the area of their CSTP focus and share their results with their support provider. Support providers conduct an initial observation to support the candidate in identifying CSTP areas for growth. Candidates choose two areas of focus to develop within their ILP. These areas become the

basis for developing individualized ILP goals. Once the candidates have developed their ILP, they participate in a triad meeting with their support provider and site administrator. As evidenced in interviews with site administrators, the induction administrator, support providers, and candidates, the site administrators review a candidate's chosen goals and provide feedback.

Through cohort meetings, candidates and their support providers determine the type of learning cycle that will support the candidate's growth in the ILP. During the six required induction cohort meetings, candidates collaborate with their support providers on their ILPs, receive program specific professional development training and receive support from the induction team with immediate feedback on any of their questions. Candidates expressed their appreciation for the ability to ask questions and get immediate support from program leadership. Cohort meetings also support candidates in determining a learning cycle focus to support their inquiry; for example, a book study, classroom observation, coaching cycle, or lesson study. Throughout this process, support providers support their candidates using cognitive coaching and coaching for empathy skills. Additionally, program leaders meet with candidates individually twice a year to monitor the progress of their ILP.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates provide evidence of their growth at multiple points during induction. Candidates and support providers confirmed through interviews that the Induction leaders regularly monitor progress of each candidate.

Candidates create goals based on the CSTP to measure their growth throughout the year and their progress is monitored twice yearly during check-in's with the program leaders. Year two candidates continue on the growth continuum, meet once a year with program leaders and attend a year-end celebratory colloquium where, in front of a panel, they present evidence of their growth.

The program monitors the progress of each candidate in their determined learning and professional growth goal through:

- Weekly support provided by support providers
- Monthly cohort meetings with support providers and program specialists
- Mid-year and year-end review one-on-one meetings with program leaders
- Ongoing feedback/comments from program leaders on program documents through Google documents and classroom

The program monitors progress throughout the year and meets with the candidate at a mid-year review to provide additional support and clarification as needed. Program requirements are as follows:

- ILP
- ILP Support

- Evidence Slides
- Professional Learning Hours
- CSTP (summative assessment)
- Conversation Log from Support Provider
- Participating Teacher Monthly Reflection Log

According to the documentation submitted, both a program specialist and a designated lead support provider will review all paperwork submitted for each candidate. “If paperwork is in order, a transcript is issued to the candidate that certifies the completion of the year.” Conversely, “If paperwork is not in order then the candidate is given feedback and further guidance on the areas that need to be addressed and/or completed.” The program specialist and lead support provider then sign a transcript of completion for each candidate, signifying he/she has met the program standards and will receive credit for the year.

Candidates then complete the application for clear credential recommendation. Along with the candidate, the program administrator and the human resources director sign the form, which is then submitted to the credential analyst who verifies and submits the candidate’s name for the appropriate credential.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, support providers, administrators, program leadership, and the advisory board, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Saddleback Valley Unified School District Teacher Induction Credential Program with the exception of the following:

Program Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design – Met With Concerns

The program has made changes that demonstrate implementation of a robust mentoring system, but continues to maintain some elements of required professional development including task based assignments.

Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors – Met With Concerns

During interviews candidates spoke highly of the quality of their relationship with their support providers. The superintendent and the assistant superintendent articulated clearly that the district values a strong mentoring system. Documentation indicates that there is an application in place for the selection of support providers, however this was not corroborated during interviews. Based on interviews with support providers, site administrators, and the induction program administrator, it was clear that principals recommend support providers to the program and the program verifies the support provide-candidate pairings. However, the qualifications and the application process was not evidenced or verified through interviews with support providers and site administrators. A more clearly defined, formal process for identifying, selecting and verifying support providers needs to be put into place.

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		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard (required for all findings)

SVUSD’s Induction Program prepares educators by implementing a process wherein candidates develop a personalized ILP goal drawn from California’s K-12 adopted standards and curricular frameworks. Program faculty and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and decision making, as indicated by interview results. Candidates reported consistently offering feedback and seeing changes implemented immediately. Sufficient resources are allocated for the effective operation of the program, as affirmed through interviews. The assistant superintendent reported that when it became clear the number of new teachers would be twice what they initially expected, they revised the budget and hired two additional support provider specialists to accommodate the unexpected growth. SVUSD’s program design puts candidate needs at the center and focuses on the development of candidate practice as it relates to teaching and learning. Candidates are offered a variety of monthly professional development (PD) specific to preparing educators for California public schools and related to their self-chosen ILP goals. Recruitment and faculty development support hiring and retention of faculty who represent diversity as evidenced across stakeholder interview findings. Interviews with district administrators indicated program leaders and support providers effectively support candidates’ abilities to assess and implement research-based strategies. The program systematically ensures recommended candidates have met all requirements by having multiple stakeholders sign off on completion documents.

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.			
• The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	X		
• 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		
• Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	X		
• Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is	X		

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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			
Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard (required for all findings)

SVUSD only recruits candidates who hold appropriate preliminary credentials, providing them with the support, advice, and assistance needed to ensure their successful entry and completion of the credential program. They recruit candidates through their public website and candidate orientation meetings. Candidates are also provided information about the program through the Human Resources department when they are hired. Interviews with the Assistant Superintendents of Human Resources and Educational Services verified that the district actively looks for candidates that reflect the student population through their posts on EdJoin and at job fairs. Through the district’s relationships with California State University Fullerton and the University of Irvine, the district actively recruits teacher candidates. The credential analyst begins the identification process when candidates are hired by the district and completes a form that is submitted to the Induction program administrator.

The program administrator and the four support provider specialists, known as program leadership, then pair the candidate with a support provider based on site administrator recommendations. Once candidates are enrolled in and have begun the program, program leadership regularly reviews feedback from the cohort meetings to provide any additional support as needed. Through interviews, candidates verified that they felt supported by the program and received additional support as needed. Candidates and support providers shared in interviews that they felt opportunities existed to collaborate during cohort meetings and to get immediate, helpful support and feedback from program leadership.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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	

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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		
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 adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the 	X		

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
range of students identified in the program standards.			
Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns		
<p>Brief summary of information applicable to the standard (required for all findings) SVUSD’s Induction program is a job-embedded experience driven by the personalized goals of candidates’ ILPs along with required professional development training. Support providers, program leadership and Induction cohort meetings provide support for candidates. Candidates expressed that the individualized learning opportunities provided through the ILP process strongly supported their individualized growth. When asked about support, candidates continually responded with, “I love my mentor,” and expressed how beneficial their support provider relationship is to their teaching practice.</p> <p>Current candidates, program completers, and support providers expressed that they have experienced positive shifts in the program since the new induction program standards were implemented. This includes less paperwork and more of a focus on the individualized learning process. However, candidates shared there were numerous required documents (this was also evidenced in the materials provided through program submission), 24-30 hours of documented professional development, and the ILP, including a strong focus on classroom management at the start of the year. The program’s “planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences” do not reflect the intent of the standards, because candidates are required to attend professional development sessions during the cohort meetings, participate in two observations of colleagues, and engaged in 24 hours of required PD for generalists and 30 hours of PD for Ed. Specialists. The required training for education specialists includes training in the Woodcock-Johnson, SEIS, and how to write IEPs. There appears to be a focus on document and activity completion in addition to the mentor focused program. It should be noted, following the mid-visit report, the program administrator conferred with the advisory board and upon their advisement, removed the requirement of 24-30 hours of logged professional development, effective immediately.</p> <p>Rationale: The program has made changes that demonstrate implementation of a robust mentoring system, but continues to maintain some elements of required professional development, a classroom management context for teaching module, and required technology tool implementation.</p>			
Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process	X		

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.			
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		
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data.	X		
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		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard (required for all findings)

SVUSD’s approach to continuous improvement includes ongoing collection and study of data from all stakeholder groups. These multiple measures are used to assess and provide specific data on the effectiveness of the program, course of study, job-embedded application and candidate competence. Identification of program effectiveness includes formal surveys administered to candidates and support providers, informal feedback from all stakeholders, candidate ILP growth, and Google slide deck evidence artifacts. Stakeholder interviews indicated how regular examination and analysis of the data collected has informed and supported many improvements to program components. The advisory board and support providers shared that survey and professional development evaluation data is looked at and as a result changes are made to the program. The team routinely studies the data and adjusts as needed. In interviews, candidates shared that they appreciated that the ILP is “individualized and are things we need to learn as teachers.” Interviews with candidates, support providers, and program leadership verified that data-driven decisions provided systematic improvements to the program. Candidates cited multiple specific examples of how they felt they were heard and that their feedback was valued and acted upon.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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		
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 student.	X		
Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Met		

The SVUSD Induction Program ensures its candidates are prepared to apply the knowledge and skills to support all students in meeting the TK-12 state adopted academic standards through their successful completion of individualized growth activities within a carefully articulated, collaborative mentoring system. The program design supports trained support providers and professional learning experiences through cohort meetings to support candidates as they develop and demonstrate effective competencies to support the full range of learners. District support providers and site administrators report that evidence from support provider observations and colloquium presentations affirmed the impact the induction experience had on

helping candidates support students in meeting adopted standards. Survey data provided by the program shows a concerted effort to educate and support all students. Both current candidates and program completers cited examples of ways in which program experiences, particularly support from their support providers, helped them grow in their ability to support all students. Interviews with program leadership, advisory board members, support providers, and candidates, and an examination of evidence, including ILPs and other assessment data, affirmed that a wide variety of assessments are used to provide feedback. Candidate interviews provided many testimonials that support providers had provided lasting impact. One support provider shared, "It's completely different this year. Streamlined, personalized, and useful. My new teacher is growing so much! Her questions have changed, her practice has changed. We are having real, organic conversations."

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

SVUSD has new system of leadership this year that is a highlight of the program. The program is now led by a full-time elementary principal and a team of four teacher-leaders who serve as site instructional coaches and/or classroom teachers. Candidates, administrators, and support providers spoke to the accessibility and improved communication as a result of this leadership change. This new leadership team receives active support from the Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, as well as the Superintendent who articulated the district's commitment to building the capacity of teachers through the induction program and appropriate allocation of resources.

SVUSD's induction program provides a strong mentoring experience for candidates. Candidates feel fully supported by their support providers and the program. The robust mentoring system is a product of the consistent and on-going training and support provided to the support providers, which includes cognitive coaching and coaching for empathy components. It is evident that SVUSD is committed to selecting the most qualified support providers for its candidates. This commitment will be strengthened once the program develops and implements a more formal process for identifying, selecting and verifying support providers.

The program also provides a full professional development system, which at the time of the visit, required mandatory professional development hours. The program leadership has already taken steps to remediate this requirement to better align to the standards. SVUSD's robust mentoring system, use of the ILP and clear system of support helps to ensure candidates' growth in the CSTPs.