

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy**

Professional Services Division

June 2020

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy**. 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**

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

Program Standards

Programs	Total 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: Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy

Site Visit Dates: April 20-22, 2020

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
Date: April 2011 Aspire Berkley Maynard	Accreditation

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, mentors, candidates, completers, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit’s operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All General and Teacher Induction Preconditions have been determined to be met.

Program Standards

Teacher Induction Program Standards 1, 2, and 4 are Met; Program Standards 3 and 5 are Met with Concerns; and Program Standard 6 is Not Met.

Common Standards

Common Standards 2 and 3 are Met; Common Standard 5 is Met with Concern; and Common Standards 1 and 4 are Not Met.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of Aspire Berkley Maynard Teacher Induction program documents, program data, interviews with program and institutional leadership, site administration, mentors, candidates, and completers. Based on the findings from this review, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

Within one year of this report, Aspire Berkley Maynard must

1. Provide evidence that the unit actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.
2. Provide evidence that the institution retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences.
3. Provide evidence 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.
4. Provide evidence that the education unit implements a credential recommendation process that ensures only candidates who have met all credential requirements are recommended for a credential. Include evidence:
 - a. Of procedures that, prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear credential, the Induction program sponsor verifies that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements, and that the program has documented the basis on which the recommendation for the clear credential is made.
 - b. That the unit monitors the credential recommendation process.
5. Provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive continuous improvement process inclusive of
 - a. The unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness and make appropriate modifications based on findings.
 - b. The systematic collection, analysis, and use of candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations.
 - c. The collection of feedback from all key stakeholders about the quality of the program.
 - d. How the program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates.
 - e. How the program provides formative feedback to mentors on their work, including establishment of collaborative relationships
6. Provide evidence documenting the process through which the program ensures that all candidates know and demonstrate the knowledge and skills required by the standards prior to recommendation for a credential.
7. Provide evidence that the unit and its Commission-approved programs demonstrate that they have a positive impact on teaching and learning in California's schools.
8. Provide evidence that the mentor assists candidates to connect with and become part of the larger professional learning community within the profession.
9. Provide quarterly written documentation to the team lead and Commission consultant documenting all actions to remove the stipulations noted above.

10. Host a revisit with the team lead and Commission consultant to collect evidence of actions to address the stipulations noted above.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements

Teacher Induction

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy may be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Aspire Berkley Maynard Academy 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:

Melissa Meetze-Hall, Ed.D.
Center for Teacher Innovation

Common Standards:

Valerie Saylor
Bakersfield City School District

Programs Reviewers:

Shelly Groom
Visalia Unified School District

Staff to the Visit:

Miranda Gutierrez
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards submission
Program Review submission
Common Standards addendum
Program Review addendum
Course of Study
Candidate advisement materials
Accreditation website
Mentor qualifications
Candidate files- Action Plan, ILP

Assessment materials
Candidate handbook
Survey data and results
Hiring plan
Performance expectation materials
Precondition responses
Professional development surveys
Training materials

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	20
Completers	5
Site Administration	4
Institutional Administration	6
Program Director	1
Mentors	9
Professional Development Providers	5
Credential analysts and staff	2
Advisory board members	2
Institution of Higher Education Partners	3
TOTAL	57

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

Aspire Berkley Maynard is the program sponsor on behalf of the Aspire Public Schools which is a non-profit organization that operates charter schools throughout California. Aspire Public Schools operates in three regions throughout the state, including the Bay Area, Central Valley, and Los Angeles. The mission is to build and operate small, high-quality charter schools in low-income neighborhoods in order to: increase academic performance of underserved students; develop effective educators; share successful practices with other forward-thinking educators; and catalyze change in public schools. Across the geographic regions of the Bay Area, Central Valley, and Los Angeles, Aspire Public Schools operates 40 TK-12 schools, serving nearly 15,000 students.

Education Unit

The Aspire Teacher Induction Program is a two-year teacher induction program which supports new teachers within the California Aspire Public Schools. This program is led by the director of new teacher development and is supported by the director of credential services and teacher induction. The program currently serves 89 first year candidates and 78 second year candidates across three geographic regions. Program leadership is housed in the home office in Oakland California.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2018-19)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2019-20)
Teacher Induction	78	89 (Year 1) 78 (Year 2)

The Visit

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols with the exception that this visit was conducted remotely using video technology to conduct all interviews and team meetings.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Teacher Induction

Program Design

Aspire Berkley Maynard (Aspire) is the program sponsor of the Aspire Teacher Induction Program (ATIP) which serves teachers from their schools across three regions: the Bay Area, the Los Angeles Area, and the Central Valley. ATIP provides a centralized system of support to all areas supporting a cohesive and aligned program for all participating teachers and mentors. The director of new teacher development, housed under the Aspire Education Team, is the point person and lead for induction. The induction leadership team is composed of both the director of new teacher development and the teacher induction program manager. The team has a working relationship with the residency program liaison from University of the Pacific (UOP). Although the UOP residency program produces 60% of the preliminary credential holders for Aspire, there was no evidence of regular and systematic collaboration between the two entities in respect to induction collaboration. While interviews revealed that ATIP and UOP residency programs share mentors and the university provides each resident an Individual Development Plan (IDP) upon completion, the same interviews confirmed that the UOP representatives knew little about the design or systems of Aspire's induction program. One university supervisor shared that it was "based on inquiry and reflection". Looking forward, the UOP representatives expressed that they were eager to participate in the newly formed Aspire Induction Program Advisory which is scheduled to meet in May.

ATIP is a two-year job embedded program that offers a sequence of activities that are based on action research cycles and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The program has been designed to ensure participating teachers (PT) are supported using an individualized approach. The system is based on an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP).

Since 2018 the ATIP has been redesigned to ensure that PTs across all geographical areas experience a systematic yet individualized program that supports their instructional needs. Participating teachers display growth through a series of inquiry action research cycles and reflection opportunities that are all guided by a qualified mentor. Other areas that have been redesigned include the following:

1. The program has moved from being regionally managed to being managed centrally through the home office team in the Bay Area with the goal that all PTs are being held to the same guidelines, standards and expectations.

2. The induction program moved from using the Aspire Student Learning Framework to using the CSTP as the basis for self-assessment and the development of the ILP. All participating teachers' ILP goals are aligned to the CSTP.
3. All PTs work through an ILP process which includes an initial self-assessment, ILP goals setting and reflection, collaborative mentor meetings, and a series of inquiry action research cycles which include evidence gathering and reflection.
4. All mentors receive the same training.
5. There has been the addition of a triad meeting to provide an opportunity for the mentor, PTs, and site administrator to discuss ILP goals and school instructional priorities.

One of the strengths of ATIP is the guidance and support provided to PTs through the program's mentoring design. Participating teachers were unanimous in identifying the importance of their mentor. One candidate reported, "My mentor helped me develop an authentic goal for my ILP. As a coach, she also knows when to challenge me and when to pull back." All mentors meet well-defined criteria, are strategically matched to job-alike participating teachers, and receive training in coaching and observation techniques. Although mentor training was redesigned this year, there are plans in place for continued training. Each cohort of mentors is scheduled to meet six times per school year. Mentor seminars focus on developing skills as instructional coaches and as well as working collaboratively with cohort members to problem-solve mentoring challenges. Mentor seminar curriculum and resources are provided consistently across all geographic areas.

While interviews provided positive anecdotal evidence about candidate satisfaction with their mentor, there was no evidence that mentors receive guidance or feedback from the program to improve their mentoring skills. A survey of mentor effectiveness had been administered to candidates, but the data collected had not been used to assist with mentor development.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The ATIP's course of study is a blend of individualized mentoring, completion of three action research cycles, and individualized professional development activities as developed in the ILP.

The ILP is comprised of mentor supported components beginning with an initial self-assessment around the CSTP, goal setting using the SMART goal model, and Inquiry Action Plans which include evidence gathering and reflection on growth. Mentors and participating teachers document their time together through weekly collaborative logs where mentors provide "just in time" support as well as more long-term collaborative planning.

ATIP, the Aspire Education Team, and individual school sites provide various professional learning opportunities throughout the year that support the development of novice teachers. Activities include, but are not limited to, observation of colleagues, book studies, and formal professional development on special populations. According to interview groups, mentors play

a key role in guiding candidates to these in-house resources and training opportunities to ensure growth in their ILP goals. Interviews revealed ample evidence that mentors help candidates see the impact of collaborating with their site-based professional learning communities. Conversely, there was little evidence that candidates were encouraged to select resources from the larger education community.

Assessment of Candidates

According to the handbook, candidate assessment should progress in the following manner:

- a. Candidate inquiry evidence is reviewed by a dyad of mentors using an evidence rubric; candidates must receive a passing score on this review to demonstrate completion. Candidates who complete all activities and demonstrate competency are recommended for a Clear credential.
- b. The director of new teacher development enters the participating teacher's (Year 2 or ECO) pass score in Helios using the Induction Matching Wizard. Credential Services is then notified of the Y2/ECO score and the credential analyst then initiates the online recommendation for a Clear credential.

Although there is a process for candidate assessment, during the site visit, reviewers found that the program does not consistently verify satisfactory 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, completers, mentors, employers, and professional development providers, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Teacher Induction except for the following:

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

Although the mentoring process supports each candidate's consistent practice of reflection on the effectiveness of instruction, there is little evidence that the mentor assists candidates in connecting with and becoming part of the larger professional learning community within the profession.

Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation—Met with Concerns

Prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear credential, the Induction program sponsor must verify that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements. Although required activities are reviewed, the program provided no evidence that the credential recommendation process ensures only candidates who have met all credential requirements are recommended for a credential.

Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services–Not Met

Interviews across all geographic areas indicated that a system for providing feedback to mentors was not yet operational. While the recruitment of mentors included an application process, a clearly established system of feedback to mentors has not been implemented. There was no consistent evidence to show how the program assesses and responds to the data gathered around the quality of services provided.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Not Evidenced
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.	Not Evidenced
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	Consistently
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	Inconsistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Not Evidenced

Finding on Common Standard 1: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

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. Documents and interviews confirmed that the unit leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of the preparation program; however, the unit does not monitor the credential recommendation process. Reviewers found recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.

In contrast to the confirmations above, reviewers could not confirm that the institution involves faculty and instructional personnel in the collaboration and decision making for the educator preparation program. Through document review and interviews conducted during the site visit, reviewers found no evidence that the faculty and instructional personnel, such as program mentors or advisory board members systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, colleges and university units, and the broader educational community toward improving educator preparation. While qualified persons are hired based on employment criteria, a lack of systematic evaluation processes create an inconsistent application of retention processes or data for those who provide field-based clinical experience.

With recent changes in program leadership (Summer 2019) there have been initial steps in forming an advisory board to address program coordination and enact data-based decision making for the educator preparation program. The composition of the advisory board and areas of focus are not yet clear, given that there are no minutes or agendas to date.

The inclusion of relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and governance of the program is a recent development for the ATIP. While newly established, reviewers were unable to find evidence of "ongoing" or active involvement. Two interviewed stakeholders expressed optimism about their increased role in the organization, coordination, and decision making for the induction program.

Rationale for the Finding

Aspire's collaboration is limited to their residency partner, University of the Pacific. Beyond that, reviewers found no evidence that:

- a. The institution involves faculty, instructional personnel and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making.
- b. The faculty and instructional personnel, systematically collaborate with the broader educational community.

- c. The unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.
- d. The advisory board has met to provide decision making for the program.
- e. Retention of mentors is based on qualifications, given that mentors are not assessed once assigned.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Admittance to the ATIP is based on employment with Aspire and a valid California Preliminary credential. Upon admittance to the program the candidates participate in a process to evaluate areas of strength and growth based on the CSTP. A trained mentor is assigned to each candidate with input from program leadership and site administration. The mentor provides advice and assistance and helps the candidate develop the ILP. Candidates have access to a program website, program staff and the assigned mentor for advice and assistance throughout the program. The director of new teacher development holds weekly office hours to assist candidates with individual questions or concerns at the program level. Candidates spoke of individual advice and assistance in interviews with one candidate saying, “...the program is set up to serve me in my areas of need.”

Aspire has a recruitment plan that includes diversifying the hiring of teachers and having interviewers reflect on possible bias before conducting interviews. The director of talent states

“Our goal is to hire 60% people of color. We have been meeting our goal. That doesn’t quite reflect our students, but we are on our way.” The induction program is designed to provide individualized support, primarily through mentoring and cycles of inquiry, to retain diverse teachers in the profession.

Two checkpoints each year occur during the program to evaluate candidate progress on ILP goals, growth in the CSTP through inquiry cycle evidence and possible need for extra support. Candidates receive a rubric score after each checkpoint. If extra support is needed, the mentor is notified and an individual plan for the candidate is designed. Extra support triggers an additional check/recheck using the program rubric to ensure the candidate is able to meet program standards. An associate superintendent shared, “We all have regular touchpoints with the program; if someone is not on track we know that well ahead of time and can help.”

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	Consistently
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	Consistently
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Inconsistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Aspire’s induction candidates participate in an individualized program based on credential and assignment. The induction experience is guided by the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) which is designed based on areas of strength and growth in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) with input from the candidate, the mentor and the site administrator. The ILP includes cycles of inquiry guided by the mentor to ensure growth in the CSTP. Candidates experience job embedded professional development as all induction activities are connected to their classroom where candidates interact with a wide range of diverse students including students with special needs and students who are English language learners. Candidates affirmed that they choose case study students during inquiry cycles to deepen their practice around understanding diversity and meeting the needs of all students. Cycles of inquiry, including observation by the mentor are connected to researched based strategies for best practices in the classroom while instructing students using California’s adopted curriculum and frameworks. Candidates state they value observation and feedback from mentors. A first year candidate shared, “Based on my mentor’s observations, I’m growing in implementing routines and procedures.”

Mentors are selected using a formalized criteria including teaching experience and teaching effectiveness. Mentors are matched with candidates based on corresponding credentials, teaching experience in the credential area, and location. Mentors receive ongoing training and support as they mentor candidates throughout the school year. Reviewers did not find a system to evaluate mentors. Mentors were unable to explain how they receive feedback on the effectiveness of their mentoring. The director of new teacher development shared there is a plan being developed to provide specific feedback to mentors but it has not been implemented. The program has collected data from candidates regarding their satisfaction with their mentors.

Candidate progress toward growth in the CSTP is evaluated throughout the program as inquiry evidence is collected. Candidates must meet standards as outlined in the program rubric. If the standard is not met, extra support is provided to the mentor and the candidate to meet the standard which requires an additional submission and review of candidate evidence. One

candidate explained, “I like that I can look at a statement with my mentor that says ‘a teacher will’ and then we can see if I am doing the things that teachers will do to meet the standard.”

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Not Evidenced
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.	Inconsistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Inconsistently
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.	Not Evidenced

Finding on Common Standard 4: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Reviewers find no comprehensive continuous improvement cycle at the unit or program levels. Some data collection efforts were evident such as surveys from program candidates and completers and feedback from mentors. Additionally, mentors in one regional meeting were presented with aggregate data to analyze from candidates regarding their satisfaction with mentors. While these various pieces of data were collected, the unit did not provide evidence of a system to regularly analyze data to identify program effectiveness and make modifications. During interviews, constituent groups could not articulate a system to analyze data, who participates in data analysis or how analysis of data is used to modify the program or improve unit effectiveness. Reviewers recognize Aspire’s plan to implement an advisory board made up of various stakeholders who will analyze data and provide feedback to the unit; however, there is no evidence this board has started to meet at the time of the site visit.

Candidates stated in interviews that they were not confident that their survey results were used to improve the program. Site administrator interviews indicated that they thought a new survey for them was being developed, but they currently have no formalized way to provide feedback to the program. Because administrators often speak with the director of new teacher development informally, they feel she is aware of the needs of site administrators.

Rationale for the Finding

A comprehensive continuous improvement cycle at both unit and program levels was not evidenced during the site visit. No evidence was presented around how data is systematically analyzed and used to make modifications.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Inconsistently
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.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The institution provides induction activities that allow candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate P-12 students through the creation of a detailed ILP. As part of the induction program, the ILP is collaboratively developed with guidance by the mentor and site administrator and includes goal setting, specific action research, and measurable outcomes. Candidates self-assess using the CSTPs at multiple points during the induction process. Furthermore, candidate’s induction goals incorporate the state adopted academic standards and elements of the CSTPs. Additional opportunities for thoughtful engagement and reflection on best practices in teaching occur as candidates are observed by their mentors, observe veteran teachers, lesson-plan and reflect with their mentors. The ILP includes a measurable outcome for each area of action research conducted by the candidate.

While the candidate and mentor engage in the induction activities as outlined above, the program does not consistently ensure (via assessment or evaluate) these processes. The monitoring system provides oversight for the completion of induction “assignments” within a learning management system (LMS). However, the program does not collect impact or growth data. Furthermore, while the mentor and candidate may examine the impact of teacher practices, the unit does not yet include this in a program assessment plan.

Rationale for the Finding

By virtue of the fact the program does not collect the assessment or impact data, the unit is thereby not able to evaluate and demonstrate whether they have a positive impact on candidate learning, competence, and teaching and learning for California’s students.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The ATIP provides a sequenced structure of support for new teachers. The strengths of the program include skilled mentors who understand their roles in supporting new teachers and provide both just in time mentoring and assistance with the attainment of the ILP goals. Aspire further supports induction efforts by providing resources for the assignment of the program leader and a professional learning advisory team. An additional strength of the program is the interconnectedness of the induction work with other site or district initiatives. This connection provides candidates with a meaningful experience that both supports them in the profession and the students in their classrooms.

A commendable strength of the program is the candidate satisfaction with their mentors. During the site visit, candidate and completer interviews (in addition to a review of documents) indicate that mentors and candidates are meeting not only an hour a week, but the candidates highly value the interactions with their mentors. Furthermore, the candidates value the type of feedback, modeling (teaching-in), and support provided by their mentors. Additional support that was valued includes: emotional support, bite size and actionable feedback on their practice, and use of lesson videos.

Transitions to program-wide consistencies have taken place during the 2019-2020 school year. Whereas previously the three geographic regions had operated somewhat independently, with inconsistencies evident in induction documentation, the 2019-2020 program year has brought more centralized oversight to the program. For example, the ILPs had previously varied by region; the mentor training and ILP are now consistent across the regions. This includes the reintroduction of the California Standards for the teaching Profession (CSTP), a shift from the previous use of the Aspire Student Learning Framework. This transition has enabled the Ed Team to focus on meeting the California Teacher Induction program standards.

The positive transitions outlined above focus on the teacher induction program standards; to date, there has been less progress toward Common Standards. One example is the nascent Advisory Board. Plans have been developed to convene the group, members have been identified, but it has yet to meet. Interviews with those in program and regional leadership indicated that this group will begin work late this spring. As expressed in leadership interviews, the Board will address data and decision making, summarize the institution's operations, its strengths, and any areas of weakness.