

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at

**Ventura County Office of Education
Professional Services Division
March 2023**

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Ventura County Office of Education**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation** is made for the institution.

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

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met
4) Continuous Improvement	Met
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Clear Administrative Services Credential	5	5	0	0
Teacher Induction	6	6	0	0
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairment	4	4	0	0
Adult Education Credential	13	13	0	0
Career/Technical Education Credential	18	18	0	0
Special Subject Credential	23	23	0	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Documentation and Evidence
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: Ventura County Office of Education

Dates of Visit: January 22, 2023 – January 24, 2023

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
<u>May 2015</u>	Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the 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 recommendation of **Accreditation** for the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All preconditions were found to be aligned.

Program Standards

All Program Standards were found to be met.

Common Standards

All Common Standards were found to be met.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found all Preconditions were aligned and all Program and Common Standards were met, the team recommends **Accreditation**.

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

- Teacher Induction
- Clear Administrative Services Credential

- Added Authorization Education Specialist: Orthopedic Impairment
- Designated Subjects: Adult Education
- Designated Subjects: Career/Technical Education Credential
- Designated Subjects: Special Subjects

In addition, staff recommends that:

- Ventura County Office of Education’s response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Ventura County Office of Education be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Ventura County Office of Education continues 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:

Constance Best
Davis Joint Unified School District

Programs Reviewers:

Keri Morgan
San Diego County Office of Education

Common Standards:

Jessica Brown
Vallejo Unified School District

Nilsa Thorsos
National University

Michael Gomez
Saddleback Valley Unified School District

Staff to the Visit:

Michele Williams-George
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Tammy Patten
Sacramento County Office of Education

Documents Reviewed

Preconditions Responses
Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Professional Development Materials
Candidate Advisement Materials
VCOE Accreditation Website
Institution’s Public-facing website
Faculty Vitae
Meeting Agendas and Minutes

Candidate Files
Assessment Materials
Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Performance Assessment Materials
Progress Monitoring Documents
Education Data Partnership website
Rubrics
Program Google Documents
Accreditation Data Dashboard
Learning Management System

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	38
Completers	34
Employers	23
Institutional Administration	19
Program Coordinators	2
Technology Coordinator	1
Support Staff	6
Support Providers/Mentors	19
Field Supervisors – District	9
Instructors/Faculty	10
Credential Analysts	2
Advisory Board Members	17
Educational Partners	5
TOTAL	186

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

Ventura County Office of Education (VCOE) is located in southern California, nine miles due east of the coastal town of Oxnard. The county office resides in Camarillo, California which is a business and residential community in the coastal plain between the beach and mountains. VCOE serves a county population of approximately 844,000, is governed by an elected County Superintendent of Schools and a five-member County Board of Education. VCOE purposely connects with the surrounding community in a variety of ways. The office publishes an annual Education Report to the Community to share enrollment and assessment data, highlight student-centered events and resources across the county, and present articles such as *Giving Students the Gift of Two Languages* and *What is inclusion?*. It has joined with the Secret Service to improve the safety of students, staff, and the community near its schools. Additionally, in March of 2021, VCOE began an annual equity conference which is open to the families and the community, not just educators. VCOE also works with a variety of local businesses to sponsor student competitions in robotics, science, mock trial, and cultural arts as well as events showcasing innovative teaching and teachers. In 2022, 12 districts within VCOE were selected for the California Distinguished Schools Award.

Education Unit

VCOE serves as the program sponsor for Commission-approved educator professional preparation programs including six programs offered through two pathways - hybrid and online only. These programs include a teacher induction program (TIP), a clear administrative services (CASC) program, a designated subjects program (DS) which includes adult education (AE), career technical education (CTE), and special subjects (SS) credentials as well as an Education Specialist Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairment (OI) credential. All educator preparation programs are housed in Educator Support and Effectiveness (ESE) and serve three VCOE schools, 21 local educational agencies (LEA), 13 charter schools within Ventura County, and several charter entities throughout the state via online services. The COVID pandemic has impacted the balance of participation in each credential pathway with over 90% of candidates in a hybrid pathway from 2018 - 2020 to 100% in an online only pathway for 2020-21 evolving to a relative balance of participants in both pathways for each program currently. Of the total program completers from 2021-22, 55.6% completed in a hybrid model and 44.4% completed an online model.

Table 1: shows the current demographic configuration of Ventura County Office of Education, Educator Support and Effectiveness' (VCOE ESE) educator preparation programs from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing's (CTC) Accreditation Data Dashboard (ADD). It contains the percentage of each race/ethnicity category for each program. It does not include data for the Special Subjects program because the total enrollment of that program is less than 10. The table shows all programs except CTE are heavily female however, the CTE program is somewhat balanced between men and women. The racial/ethnicity makeup of the candidate population, on average, is just above 50% White with Hispanic/Latinx being the next largest category at 29% of the candidate population, followed by Black/African American which are approximately 6%

of the candidate population. These percentages generally reflect county demographics identified in the most recent United States Census

Table 1: VCOE ESE Demographic Percentages

	TIP	CASC	OI	AE	CTE
American Indian/Alaska Native	.6	0	0	0	1.6
Asian	4	3.2	0	10	4.9
Black/African American	2.9	7.2	8.7	0	9.8
Hispanic/Latinx	32.3	28.3	26.1	30	29
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	3.1	0	0	0	0
White	57.4	51.9	47.8	50	49.6
Two or more races	6.5	4.8	8.7	10	13
Declined to state	5.2	4.8	8.7	0	13.8
Female	80.8	76	78.3	80	43.4
Male	18.2	21.4	21.7	20	54.6
Nonbinary	.3	1.8	0	0	1
Declined to state	1.5	3.5	0	0	1

Table 2: Enrolled and Completer Data shows the total number of program completers from the last academic year and current candidates.

Table 2: Enrolled and Completer Data

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2021-22)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2022-23)
Clear Administrative Services Credential	35	103
Teacher Induction	230	585
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairment	6	28
Adult Education Credential	4	3
Career/Technical Education Credential	130	109
Special Subject Credential	3	0

The Visit

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team and institutional constituents were interviewed primarily via technology; however, some were conducted as phone interviews. The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After a review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all preconditions have been found to be aligned for Ventura County Office of Education.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Teacher Induction Program

Program Design

According to the organizational chart and confirmed in leadership and staff interviews, the teacher induction program (TIP) is led by one of the two induction program directors, who oversees teacher induction and advising aspects of the program, and a coordinator who is responsible for day-to-day operations. Candidates meeting specific criteria may apply for the Early Completion Option (ECO) which allows experienced teachers to complete the Induction program in one year.

As identified in documents, the TIP centers around action research based on evidence collection and ongoing self-assessment to demonstrate candidate growth. Multiple constituents confirmed interviews that support provided by mentors, district coordinators, and professional development providers (PDPs) is strongly based in sound practices. According to interviews, mentors foster the growth of candidates using data-driven feedback, learning focused conversations, as well as individualized and “just in time” support provided through guided reflection and feedback. CTC completer surveys showed 90.1% of candidates reported their mentors had a “very helpful” or “helpful” impact on their teaching practices that support student learning. Candidate growth is also promoted through ongoing self-assessment using the Continuum of Teaching Practice, and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

Documentation and interviews with program administrators confirmed each district receiving induction services recruits, identifies, and assigns a mentor to each candidate within the first 30 days of the participant’s enrollment in the program. In interviews, unit and program leadership as well as site administrators relayed that they match mentors to the candidates, considering candidate and student needs, credentials held, and grade level and/or subject area. Mentoring matches are documented by ESE administrators. According to CTC program completer surveys, 82.2% of candidates report they were well matched with their mentors.

The team confirmed through interviews, mentors receive access to resources to begin supporting candidates based on individual needs. TIP documents track individualized support coordinated and/or provided by mentors. Candidates shared that in addition to formalized support, they also receive “just in time” support based on their individual needs. ESE staff monitors candidate support through candidate and mentor surveys, check-ins, emails, mentor logs, and documented conversations in the Canvas faculty journal. In interviews, one candidate reported the “relationship with their mentor was important” and another stated the mentor “challenged me to expand my vision of teaching.” This echoes the high mentor ratings in program completer surveys.

Program documentation clearly outlined the process for hiring and assigning qualified mentors and for providing guidance and clear expectations for the mentoring experience. All mentors complete the mentor application process which clearly defines mentor expectations. The documentation also showed qualifications for mentors are aligned to program standards and that the program provides in-depth, research-driven, and differentiated mentor training. First and second year mentors are trained using *Mentoring Matters* by Lipton and Wellman as a foundation. Third and fourth year mentors are trained using *Shifting States of Mind* for advanced training. A series of Canvas modules guide mentors in their work with their candidates. In addition to differentiated training, mentors set their own goals each year and receive feedback on those goals. At the end of each module, mentors meet with their PDPs in a live group session to reflect on those goals and their mentoring practice. Modules guide mentors in the goal-setting process and tools and resources to support candidate growth. These sessions also provide an opportunity to network with other mentors about best practices in support of candidate growth and reflection. Mentors reported feeling well-supported by the program and well-resourced including optional professional development, to enrich the mentoring experience for candidates. They also noted TIP leadership communicates effectively and keeps them informed about candidate progress.

A program strength identified in several interviews was the input drawn from several sources and constituents. All TIP candidates and mentors complete check-ins in Canvas from which staff analyze all data, triangulate comments from candidates, mentors, PDPs, and respond as needed. In addition to survey data, reflective logs are collected from each mentor and reviewed by staff to document support hours and activities. Other constituents who provide input include VCOE's Superintendent's Council, county-wide Personnel Administrators' Network (CPAN), and Educational Services Associate Superintendents and Curriculum Directors. Constituents including candidates, mentors, and employers all reported the program is highly responsive to inquiry and input. District consultants commented that they felt their voices were heard and implementation was near immediate. Data analysis is also part of the program's continuous improvement process using this constituent input as well as instructor input, mentor and candidate surveys, check-ins, end-of-year survey data, Mentor logs, Individual Learning Plan (ILP) submissions, and information from Canvas modules. Evidence of the quality of induction services was clear from multiple interviews and CTC Completer data, which showed that 97.2% of candidates feel prepared to support all students in learning.

Based on interviews and data from ongoing program improvement, several program modifications have been made in the past few years. A few examples include:

- Implemented a hybrid model combining face-to-face and online support
- Revised ILP calibration training and updated ILP rubric for more holistic scoring
- Began providing feedback to mentors on their goal-setting plan and to candidates on their initial goal. candidates reported in interviews that feedback on the ILP was, "Clear, well-structured, and timely."

- Hired two part-time consultants (one for the CalTPA and RICA, one for the EdTPA) to assist candidates in their preliminary requirements
- Additional resources to support virtual teaching practices

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Mentors and candidates are guided in their collaborative work by the ILP which is designed to develop teaching practices and support student learning through the Continuum of Teaching Practice (CTP) Self-Assessment which is aligned to the CSTPs. Goal setting on the ILP is driven by the CTP Self-Assessment, the preliminary program Individual Development Plan (IDP), and input from the Site Administrator. The ILP process consists of the Plan, Teach, Reflect, Apply research-based cycle of inquiry and is revisited and revised periodically. Interviews with employers, clearly identified separation between the professional growth documented on the ILP and employee evaluation.

Interviews and program tracking documents confirmed mentors and candidates adhere to the 60-day requirement for developing the ILP goal. Mentoring begins with a learning-focused conversation involving the candidate's IDP, an understanding of the teaching context, and student learning needs. Next, the candidate, mentor and site administrator meet to discuss how to integrate site and district initiatives, and finally, candidates self-assess on the CTP to identify their CSTP-based goal for the year. Candidates then create an action research plan which includes the components of the Plan, Teach, Reflect, Apply cycle. Mentors conduct formal observation twice per year to gather evidence and provide feedback and candidates complete a reflection summarizing the inquiry process, identifying teaching outcomes, and demonstrating student impact as a result of the ILP. The effectiveness of this process was demonstrated when, on the 2021-2022 CTC Completer Survey, 88.5% of candidates reported that the ILP supported their development as a professional educator.

As an additional means of support, candidates have the option to join either a traditional induction pathway or the "Educators Thriving" pathway. Documents described the Educators Thriving pathway as incorporating professional learning focused on personal wellness and goal setting and how those components support effective teaching in addition to traditional induction tasks and supports. In interviews, candidates expressed very positive experiences with this pathway and the support it provides. One candidate stated, "Educators Thriving is a progressive response to challenges in our field" and another commented, "Educators Thriving helped me get my joy of teaching back."

In both the traditional and Educators Thriving pathways, candidates collaborate with their mentors to plan their own professional learning related to their ILP goal. As part of the triad meeting, site administrators and mentors guide the candidate in identifying both program and district professional learning resources to support their ILP. This includes optional professional learning opportunities linked within the Canvas modules.

Assessment of Candidates

As their summative assessment, candidates submit their final ILP documenting both their growth on the CSTP and their impact on student learning. ILP scorers include district coordinators, program instructors, and program staff. ILPs are returned with feedback and, for those who may need to resubmit, next steps. All formative and summative assessments are documented and maintained in Canvas.

TIP administrators use Canvas to document and monitor candidates' progress toward meeting credential requirements. After verifying candidates have met all program and credential requirements, a credential analyst (academic advisor) notifies each candidate through email and/or Canvas that they are eligible to apply for their clear credential through the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and then monitors the recommendation process.

Findings on Standards

After review of all available information including interviews with candidates, completers, administrators, mentors, employers, and other constituents, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the teacher induction program.

Clear Administrative Services Induction

Program Design

According to the organizational chart and confirmed in interviews, the Clear Administrative Services Induction Credential (CASC) program is led by one of the two induction program directors, who oversees administrator induction and advising aspects of the program, and a coordinator who is responsible for day-to-day operations.

Interviews with program constituents and leadership revealed a very strong and vibrant collaborative culture in the CASC program and ESE in total. Lead mentors play a pivotal role connecting the work of coaches and candidates with program leadership. Lead mentors described multiple debriefing sessions where they strategically review program feedback, calibrate assessment rubrics, and where they plan program changes. One mentor stated, "We learn from each other... and we have a strong sense of continuous improvement." As Lead mentors build the capacity of their respective coaches, they maintain focus on the core aspects of the program, while being mindful of the demands on new administrators in the program.

According to interviews with program and site leadership, most coaches are selected by a collaborative effort between the district liaison and the CASC coordinator. When a candidate self-selects a coach, that coach is vetted by the CASC program and district liaison. Lead mentors and the program coordinator shared that lead mentors were strategically selected and assigned to support areas of the county based on their expertise in content/experience or geographical location. For example, a lead mentor with charter experience was brought into a particular support system to ensure coaches/candidates were supported by someone who understands the charter experience.

A clear division of roles and responsibilities within the program is well documented and corroborated by program staff and participants. This was reflected in interviews where a high level of satisfaction with communication, expectations, and program activities throughout the year was echoed by several groups. Program information is structured and laid out in Canvas which enables candidates and coaches to receive ongoing updates regarding program information and completion. The CASC program ensures lead mentors are qualified and meet CTC program standards, which is clearly documented in the application and screening process. Additionally, specific roles and responsibilities are detailed and included in the application and on-boarding process.

As described in documentation, lead mentors hold regular collaborative sessions with candidates and coaches and attend professional learning sessions with them. In interviews, one lead mentor commented, “We are there with the candidates and provide opportunities for questions and answer feedback. We are learning alongside them and it makes me feel more comfortable supporting them.” Another lead mentor shared, “This is not about 50 coaches trying to get a hold of the director, they work with us [as lead mentors]. It is a closer relationship, and it is that kind of relationship and support that we offer that really pays off.”

Candidates document their growth and competency in the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) through a Personalized Learning Plan (PLP) in four distinct segments (Plan, Do, Study, Act) grounded in action research. These projects are job-embedded and aligned with individual district priorities, site goals, and individual development steps. Both current candidates and program completers shared that their projects start with understanding their current administrative responsibilities and connecting projects that they would focus on even if they were not in an induction program. Candidates discussed the absolute relevance and application of their work which made the experiences meaningful. One candidate shared that the project was, “very targeted, easy to jump into, and something I was already planning on doing... it was not obscure busy work.” This was echoed in the Accreditation Data Dashboard where over 90% of program completers rated the program as Effective/Very Effective responding to the question, “How effective was your clear induction preparation program at developing the skills and tools you needed to become an educational leader?”.

Candidates shared that their personalized learning projects are broken into smaller portions to ensure clarity, meaningfulness, alignment, and manageability over the course of the year. The Canvas platform provided exemplars, video explanations, rubrics, and pacing plans to guide the project work. There are also multiple opportunities for on-going self-assessment using the Descriptions of Practice (DOP) and the CPSEL.

The documented, dedicated weekly time with coaches ensures candidates are constantly checking in with the project as well as having their immediate mentoring needs met. Many candidates and completers noted in interviews that coaches were very responsive when candidates sent text messages where they had an immediate need or just needed someone to actively listen. Strong relationships and trust were obvious when both coaches and candidates

shared about hot topics, challenges, sticking points, and next steps. Lead mentors and coaches spend time getting to know the candidates' context and district. One lead mentor shared, "We are familiar with cultures and student demographics, which is really helpful. So, the candidate understood that I get the circumstances that they work in. It helps candidates and coaches feel more comfortable." According to the most recent Accreditation Data Dashboard, program completers overwhelmingly said their coaches were *excellent and valuable role models* (89.2%), *experienced and effective* (83.8%), and *understood current educational theory* (81.1%).

According to training documents and program leadership, coaches are provided with extensive, research-driven training with ongoing feedback and collaboration with coaching colleagues and lead mentors. Candidates are paired with a lead mentor as a collaborative partner who provides individualized consultation and feedback and helps coaches navigate resources provided on the coaches' Canvas page. Lead mentors expressed their commitment to growing strong coaches who invest in the growth and development of candidates. One mentor expressed, "We act as a mentor to the coach to assist and provide support."

Documents and interviews showed the CASC program benefits from ESE's participation in multiple county-wide communication systems. These meetings include network partnerships such as VCOE's Superintendent's Council and the county's Personnel Administrators' Network (PAN), meetings of associate superintendents and curriculum directors' groups, as well as one-on-one meetings with the Associate Superintendent of Educational Services. This level of community connection allows for multi-dimensional feedback and input regarding the positive impact of all credential programs. Documents and interviews confirmed CASC program's internal feedback mechanisms include both qualitative and quantitative data from a variety of sources. This includes but is not limited to program survey data, coach logs, PLP submissions, meeting reflections, candidate self-assessments, bi-weekly, cross-program, collaborative meetings, and modules in Canvas all to gather ground level feedback. Program leadership regularly reviews and reflects on both the high level and ground level feedback to make informed decisions and improvement for the program. ESE's strong collaborative and inclusive leadership structures allow for cross-program integration and continuous improvement. Interviews clearly demonstrated the strong sense of collaboration and responsiveness across the CASC program.

Based on interviews and data from ongoing program improvement, several program modifications have been made in the past few years. A few examples include:

- Offered three separate Leaders' E-Networking events per year instead of one leadership conference. Sessions included opportunities to network with school and district leaders on topics of interest suggested by candidates
- Revised PLP rubric to be more concise and focused (Plan Rubric, Do Rubric, Study Rubric, Act Rubric)
- Revised Canvas PLP modules to be more easily navigated, with clear steps on how to complete the PLP Inquiry.
- Shifted program entirely to a virtual platform.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Coaches and candidates are guided in their work by the PLP which is designed to further leadership practices and support student learning. In support of the effectiveness of this practice, one coach shared, “This work is not above, beyond, or off to the side. This is truly job embedded. They (candidates) work on a goal for themselves to help them grow, at the end they get growth.” Documents and interviews confirmed coaching is individualized and based on each candidate’s assessed strengths and areas for growth, with a focus on impacting leadership practice. In the development of the PLP, candidates and coaches assess candidate practice through the Descriptions of Practice (DOP) Self-Assessment connected to the CPSELs and periodically revisit and revise the document. Interviews with employers, clearly identified separation between the professional growth documented on the PLP and employee evaluation.

The PLP serves as the blueprint for the candidate’s induction experience. The inquiry project is broken into several distinct segments and candidates work collaboratively with the coach and lead mentor to develop a project that focuses on job-embedded topics relevant to their work. According to program documents, lead mentors provide formative feedback throughout the year and assess the PLP at multiple junctures using clearly defined rubrics. As identified in the DOP, candidates have opportunities for self-assessment in relation to the CPSELs.

Assessment of Candidates

Documents showed that candidates are summatively assessed for competency through their final PLP which documents their growth on the CPSELs. All PLPs are holistically scored by lead mentors who are trained, and their use of program rubrics calibrated for consistency. Candidates receive formative feedback throughout the year as their PLPs are submitted at various junctures and are allowed to re-submit based on lead mentor feedback. Candidates’ formative progress and summative assessments are documented and maintained in Canvas. In interviews, candidates concurred with the statement that the program, “reached out to us all the time, letting us know what is due and when, and giving us feedback” which was all accessible in Canvas.

CASC administrators use Canvas to document and monitor candidates’ progress toward meeting credential requirements. After verifying candidates have met all program and credential requirements, a credential analyst (academic advisor) notifies candidates through email and/or Canvas that they are eligible for their clear credential and that VCOE will be recommending them through the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Once a recommendation is made, credential analysts continue to monitor the recommendation process until a credential is awarded. According to the Accreditation Data Dashboard, VCOE has recommended 243 clear administrative services credentials over the past five years.

Findings on Standards

After review of all available information including interviews with candidates, program completers, program personnel, coaches, lead mentors, and other constituencies, the team

determined that all program standards are **met** for the Clear Administrative Services Credential program.

**Designated Subjects Credential: Adult Education
Designated Subject Credential, Career Technical Education
Designated Subject Credential, Special Subject Credential**

Program Design

According to the organizational chart and confirmed in interviews with program leadership, the Designated Subjects Credential (DSC) program which encompasses the Adult Education Credential (AEC), the Career Technical Education (CTE) Credential, and the Special Subjects Credential (SSC), is led by one of the two induction program directors, who oversees the induction and advising aspects of the program, and a coordinator who is responsible for day-to-day operations. In interviews, these two administrators agreed that because the DSC programs are all housed in the ESE department, program decisions can be made quickly and efficiently in support of candidates, support providers, and field-based supervisors allowing these groups to receive a strong and impactful program experience. It was evident through interviews that the newly appointed director and the DSC coordinator have developed a thorough understanding of the many facets of the DSC programs, including building supportive relationships with staff.

Program data from each individual program as well as aggregated data is regularly shared, assessed, and acted upon as part of ongoing ESE staff meetings. The ESE Executive Director and DSC administrators meet with the district leadership to share program highlights, identify data patterns and trends as well as program feedback. This communication was consistent across DSC programs, as evidenced through interviews with program partners and constituents who described the program as, “very responsive to any requests.” DSC program leadership maintains a document listing all modifications for each program. This document, along with interview responses from program personnel, verified data and rationale for changes as well as what modifications were made to each program and the overall DSC program structure from that data analysis. One interviewee commented, “Anytime I have a meeting, I walk away feeling good about what we discussed.” Modifications to instructor office hours and the Systems of Support website were based on data from ongoing program and unit evaluation and were verified both on the DSC modifications document and in interview statements. In interviews, candidates expressed appreciation for the modifications and agreed that “Instructor office hours are very supportive and helpful with feedback.” In other interviews, support providers and field-based supervisors across programs agreed that the System of Support website is the “the best system we have had with email and website in one center.” They also clarified that emails and newsletters contained information and links back to the System of Support website providing ready access to program documents, resources, and other needed information. In interviews, personnel from each program agreed with the comment, “Program data is not a surprise because of the ongoing communication throughout the courses, and we work so anecdotally throughout the year that we are implementing immediately, there is no waiting to get data from program administration.”

According to candidates, completers, and program documentation, district agreement documents and welcome email communications from each DSC program provide information regarding assignments for candidates and field-based supervisors and support provider matches. Candidates receive ongoing updates through Canvas while support providers and field-based supervisors receive ongoing updates via the System of Support website. According to support providers and field-based supervisors across programs, they also receive supportive surveys asking how they are feeling about their work and if they need more support. All candidates and support providers complete check-ins from which staff analyze all data, triangulate comments from candidates, support providers, PDPs, and respond as needed. In addition to survey data, logs are collected from support providers and observations and evaluations are collected from field-based supervisors. These documents are reviewed by staff to document support hours and activities. In interviews, program administrators from each DSC program agreed that they can access Canvas to monitor comments and feedback between candidates and instructors in order to act as a, “go between” if needed. Program administrators also review course content based on mid-and end-of-course survey data to keep materials and resources updated and relevant which “allows the program to meet the candidate needs.”

Samples of candidates’ evidence-based portfolios (Portfolio A and B) from each program showed self-assessment, goal setting, inquiry, and reflection based on the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) and California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) in the context of their program and their employment. Samples also showed the overall formative assessment process includes analyzing and reflecting on practices based on the TPEs and the CSTPs, relevant program standards, and the application of instructional practices aligned with adult learning pedagogy related to their instructional area. The process is designed to ensure classroom practices meet the academic learning needs of all students. Program candidates agreed with a peer’s comment that they, “...found the program helpful to learn about different teaching and learning styles. I was struggling to break down activities for the different levels in my own class and going into workshops or checking in to get more resources and feedback helped me succeed where I once struggled.”

Constituent groups of all DSC programs reported frequent opportunities to provide input through course surveys, beginning- and end-of-year surveys, and individual informal communication with the coordinator of the programs. Candidates and support providers from all programs shared they have the option to participate in check-ins on Canvas to receive additional support and provide input. One support provider shared the example of requesting and receiving immediate support in advising candidates with the range and process for obtaining additional credentials for which they might qualify.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Evidence in Canvas and course syllabi showed the structure of all three DSC programs is the same. Although the content differs, each credential program has the same structure and processes. The programs consist of a series of three online courses (Course 1A, 1B, and 2), all of which incorporate discussions, interactive activities, formative assessments, two teaching performance portfolios and a culminating reflective activity. Each program also includes virtual support sessions, practicum experiences, and in-depth field experiences which are both self-directed and supported. The following chart shows the differing content of these courses for each program:

	Adult Education	Career Technical Education	ROTC/Special Subjects
Course 1A	Orientation, History & Foundations Creating Community Strategies & Resources Equity & Diversity Adult Learning Theory Planning and Instructional Practices	Orientation & Foundations Creating Community Classroom Management Equity & Diversity Designing a Positive Environment Learning Theory Curriculum Planning Planning and Instructional Practices	Orientation & Foundations Creating Community Classroom Management Equity & Diversity Designing a Positive Environment Learning Theory Curriculum Planning Planning and Instructional Practices
Course 1B	Planning & Assessment; Special Populations; English Learners; Educational Technology	Planning & Assessment; Special Populations; English Learners; Educational Technology	Planning & Assessment; Special Populations; English Learners; Educational Technology
Course 2	Developing as a Professional Educator	Developing as a Professional Educator	Developing as a Professional Educator

The course matrices and syllabi of each program demonstrate evidence of activities that provide the Introduction (I), Practice (P), and Assessment (A) of candidate competencies. One candidate stated, “The program itself is professional development. All of it, the coursework, the resources, the support.” According to the matrices and syllabi, coursework is integrated, reinforced, and supported in all programs by field-based supervisors and support providers. Interviews confirmed this interaction of coursework with field-based and support provider intent. One CTE candidate expressed, “I experience a lot of integration between what we are learning in the courses and with my support provider and field-based supervisor, this is where the magic happens for me. I get to see the connection between what I am learning and then what I created.” This sentiment was echoed by candidates from the other DSC programs. Support providers and field-based supervisors provide supervision and guidance drawing upon their knowledge and skills specific to the individual program and based on the candidates’

needs and questions. Interviews across programs produced many positive comments about the quality of the support provider and field-based supervisor feedback. Representative comments include, “I love my support provider. We communicate every week. I text and email her daily.”; “Having someone accessible to me was very important and definitely appreciated.”; “My field supervisor and my support provider were the same person. She was one year away from retirement, and she poured all of her knowledge onto me, which was incredibly helpful. She gave me specific and actionable feedback. Her observations were great. She videotaped me and then we went over the footage so I could hear my tone of voice and delivery.”

One criterion for enrollment in a DSC credential program requires each candidate to be employed in a teaching position requiring the relevant credential. This employment constitutes the fieldwork or clinical experience in each program. Fieldwork or clinical experience provides candidates with an intensive job-embedded experience specific to the relevant credential and the ability to immediately implement reflection and learning from the program courses as well as feedback from the support provider and field-based supervisor.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates in each of the DSC programs receive an individual program advisement session and a group orientation for their chosen program. Each candidate’s requirements are identified by the unit’s credential analysts (academic advisors), who review candidate transcripts and employment histories before developing cohesive individualized, program-specific plans. This process was evidenced through the public VCOE Designated Subjects website and the submitted description of the credential recommendation process ensuring appropriate recommendation. Candidates from any DSC program may make individual appointments with academic advisors at any time to discuss unique circumstances.

Based on multiple interviews and document reviews, once a candidate is active in a DSC program, ongoing assessment is the same for each program and takes the form of multiple coursework assignments with instructor review as well as field-based supervisor observations documented in portfolio assignments. Successful progress through each program was evidenced through the course structure in Canvas and is consistent across programs. Assignments earn a 1 or 2 on the scoring rubric to move forward through the self-paced coursework. Feedback is structured to support a candidate with a 0 or a 1 to earn a passing score. During an interview, one instructor shared that they strive to provide, “... specific feedback regarding what they are doing well and what they have missed.” According to both candidates and staff, all submissions are returned with scores and feedback and provide next steps for those who need to resubmit the assignment. Formative and summative assessments for each program are documented and maintained in Canvas. The program scoring guide, which is the same across programs, includes who is responsible for scoring different assignments as well as an internal comment section which allows program staff to share ideas, create cohesiveness, and build calibration among all DSC reviewers.

Findings on Standards:

After review of all available information including interviews with candidates, completers, staff, faculty, mentors, support providers, and other constituents, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Designated Subjects Credential: Adult Education Designated Subject Credential, Career Technical Education Designated Subject Credential, Special Subject Credential.

Education Specialist Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairment

Program Design

According to the organizational chart and confirmed in interviews, the Orthopedic Impairment Added Authorization Credential (OIAA) program is led by one of the two induction program directors, who oversees the induction and advising aspects of the program, and a coordinator who is responsible for day-to-day operations. Documents and interviews confirmed the OIAA program uses an inquiry-based model that is built upon the CSTPs and embodies the continuous improvement cycle of plan, teach, reflect, and apply. The program consists of a series of three online courses and virtual support sessions, combined with clinical practice experiences, and in-depth self-directed and supported field experiences which authorizes the credential holder to be assigned students with orthopedic impairments. The program is 75 hours in total, including 30 hours of coursework and 45 hours of fieldwork and clinical practice. The three courses are organized based on specific themes or topics. Course A: Characteristics of Orthopedic Impairments; Course B: Specialized HealthCare and Supports for Students with Orthopedic Impairments and Course C: Assessment, Communication, Educational Access, and Adaptation for Students with Orthopedic Impairments. Candidates complete the three courses and clinical practice in their own classrooms or in an arranged setting in which students identified as having orthopedic impairments are served. During interviews, candidates and completers shared that connecting the portfolio's case studies to their current caseload was very useful for them as teacher practitioners and allowed them to apply the knowledge and skills into daily practices.

During interviews, multiple constituent groups verified program communication is both continuous and consistent. Programmatic communication begins when new candidates receive a welcome email from their instructor/field-based supervisor and continues with ongoing updates regarding program information and progress monitoring. All candidates receive individual advice concerning their specific program needs and participate in a group orientation. Information is updated on Canvas as candidates complete requirements specific to the added authorization. All program communication with candidates is documented in Canvas and tracked by the ESE team including candidate check-in, assignments, and portfolio submissions. Interview and document reviews confirmed that during the program orientation, program participants explore the online learning modules and review Portfolio requirements. The OIAA director stated program staff meets weekly and regularly to collaborate on best practices for program implementation. All program policies regarding progress and completion are reviewed during the program orientation and outlined in the program handbook.

In addition, there is frequent communication with external constituents. The executive director meets regularly with the associate superintendent to discuss program updates and review results of program effectiveness. OIAA instructors/field-based supervisors and program coordinator meet regularly to collaborate on best practices for content delivery and coordination to ensure successful program implementation. OIAA instructors/field-based supervisors also collaborate with Special Education Local Planning Area (SELPA) to integrate current legislation. According to the program director, a more formal relationship is maintained with its P–12+ and university partners in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which sets forth anticipated roles and responsibilities of all partners.

In interviews, candidates and completers shared the requirement to submit three evidence-based portfolios demonstrating their knowledge of and ability to implement OIAA program standards and that portfolios were reviewed by instructors/field-based supervisors. A review of course syllabi showed a well-organized course sequence aligned with clear course expectations. This was echoed in interviews with completers where nine out of ten agreed on the high quality and effectiveness of program content. One completer shared he was apprehensive to return to a credential program after 10 years, and that the online component of the program was intimidating to him. He then shared that because the program was so well organized, streamlined, and supported he was successful and would recommend the program to others.

In an interview, the program director confirmed the OIAA program seeks input from a wide range of constituents, including VCOE’s Superintendent’s Council, the county-wide Personnel Administrators’ Network (CPAN), Educational Services Associate Superintendents and Curriculum Directors meetings, district consultants, as well as site and district administrators. Candidates provide input through check-ins, end-of-year surveys, along with informal input provided through individual conversations with the program coordinator and program instructors/field-based supervisors. While input is gathered from constituents, program staff and administration also referenced how they look outside of the program and its related constituents for ways to improve. These groups consistently referenced keeping current with best practices by attending professional learning sessions and being aware of relevant research. These constituents also referenced current legislation and relevant technology trends.

Based on interviews and data from ongoing program improvement, several program modifications have been made in the past few years. A few examples include:

- Integrating all portfolios into Canvas
- Adapting in response to legislation regarding required IEP documents, assistive/adaptive technology resources, and medical information and procedures in a school setting
- Adding requested resources for assessing students with mild to moderate OI disabilities
- Providing additional resources to support candidates with virtual teaching and moving support meetings to a virtual platform, both to address impact of COVID-19

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

According to program documents, during completion of these Canvas modules which encompass the 30 hours of coursework and 45 hours of fieldwork and clinical practice, candidates participate in interactive discussions and activities as well as complete self-assessments, formative assessments, three teaching performance portfolios, and determine next steps for professional growth. A review of syllabi and interviews confirmed the 45 hours of fieldwork related directly to candidates' coursework and supported them in completing their portfolio formative assessment entries. During interviews, OIAA completers reiterated case studies in their portfolios that provided relevant experiences supporting their work with students with OI.

According to documents, to be eligible for the OIAA program, candidates must be employed in a year-long teaching position aligned with the subjects named on their preliminary credential and have access to students who have orthopedic impairments. The field-based clinical experience provides candidates with an intensive job-embedded experience. The online coursework is integrated, reinforced, and supported by the instructor/field-based supervisor who works with candidates to develop and demonstrate competence in their professional role. During interviews, completers and candidates consistently shared the feedback and guidance provided by the instructors/field-based supervisors was the most valuable component of the program. One completer shared that during Course B, the instructor "shadowed" her to assist in providing a specific support for a student with OI, who was also visually impaired.

Assessment of Candidates

Credential analysts (academic advisors) review each candidates' transcript and employment histories to confirm eligibility. Candidates and completers identified the formative assessment process included analyzing and reflecting on the CSTPs and program standards, and then demonstrating instructional practices aligned with OIAA standards to ensure classroom practices meet the learning needs of all students.

Candidates move at their own pace and do not move to a next assignment until the current assignment is satisfactorily completed. Completers reported the assignment feedback provided insight to successfully complete each assignment.

Formal assessment occurs at the end of each course when candidates submit a portfolio which documents how they apply program standards and impact student learning. Portfolios are assessed by instructors/field-based supervisors using a rubric with defined criteria and competencies. Instructors/field-based supervisors are trained, and their use of program rubrics and process calibrated for consistency. Candidates and program completers shared during interviews they received scores, grades, and explicit feedback within 24 hours of submission. The quality and timing of the feedback was identified as the primary reason they would recommend this program to colleagues. One theme which emerged from interviews was the high quality of support and feedback with next steps in cases of needed resubmissions.

Candidates also confirmed they had full access to their assessments in Canvas, as well as clear communication and guidance regarding program completion.

Findings on Standards:

After review of all available information including interviews with candidates, program completers, program personnel, and other constituents, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Education Specialist Added Authorization: Orthopedic Impairment program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

VCOE has experienced a revitalization over the last few years with many new staff members ranging from the superintendent to credential analysts to directors and including the executive director of ESE. Educational partners and veteran staff agreed with the statement of the associate superintendent, “New staff have brought fresh energy and creative ideas to address the needs of the county.” The VCOE vision which states, “All people will benefit from life-long learning” and its mission which states, “The Ventura County Office of Education provides quality services and support for life-long learning opportunities” clearly guide the educator preparation programs and activities. Based on interviews, it was clear that ESE collaborates closely both internally and externally with their partner districts and charter schools to meet the needs of educators and students. ESE creatively uses all available resources, fiscal and human, to fully support and bring their vision and mission to life. Their culture of collaboration built on trust and constant informal and formal person-to-person communication has built many relationship bridges between constituent groups. ESE leadership takes the superintendent’s perspective of compassionate person-first customer service and delivers programs which meet the needs of all educators in the consortium. For example, ESE has addressed educator well-being with an optional pathway for teacher induction candidates titled “Educators Thriving” and professional development to meet the Bridge Authorization requirements. Both activities exemplify ESE’s ability to effectively use resources and collaboration with partners to address both immediate and long-term needs which will greatly impact all students for years to come.

As they continue to develop fresh ideas, it will be important to continue their practice of gathering qualitative data. A valuable next step in the inquiry of their practice is to analyze data formally with their advisory groups to be able to make informed decisions of future actions and to reflect on the benefit of implemented practices. As stated by the associated superintendent, “Quantifying the qualitative may be a worthwhile challenge while trying to bring an individualized education plan and experience to each person.”

All programs, as offerings in ESE, are under the supervision of an executive director who reports to the associate superintendent. ESE’s teacher and administrative induction programs each have their own director, while the Designated Subjects program, (which incorporates AE, CTE, and SS credentials) and the OI credential both report to a program coordinator.

Having all credential programs housed in under the same executive director allows for program decisions to be made quickly and efficiently ensuring candidates, support providers, and field-based supervisors receive a strong and impactful program experience. This focus on communication was clearly evident as a hallmark of ESE program administration.

The level of collaboration, communication, and cohesion within VCOE and ESE was evident in the consistent messaging and vision casting beginning with the County Superintendent and continuing and throughout the education unit and all programs. Systems and structures are in place which allow for communication and collaboration at all levels from the superintendent to participating candidates. This includes the layout of the ESE offices which were redesigned to an open format to enable easy communication.

All ESE program staff meet formally twice a week to collaborate on best practices for program implementation. In addition, the executive director meets regularly with the associate superintendent to discuss program updates and review results of program effectiveness including formal and informal data used to identify program strengths and program modifications. In addition to regular formal meetings, staff made it clear through interviews that informal “hallway conversations” were frequent and an important part of the fluid and responsive action acknowledged and appreciated by candidates and support providers. This level of communication was not just seen within ESE, consultants (district/organization coordinators) and professional development providers (PDPs), meet regularly to collaborate on best practices for program content delivery and program coordination. District coordinators report that communication is consistent, and that feedback is received and implemented by the program.

It was noteworthy to see the level of cohesion and commitment to core values and priorities that permeated throughout this organization. The site visit team perceived a remarkable sense of synergy and purpose in ESE.

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>

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Consistently
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	Consistently
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	Consistently
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Based on documents and constituent interviews, the team determined ESE has created the infrastructure to provide a research-based vision of teaching and learning consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks. Institution and unit leadership articulated their vision for the program through best practice and meeting the needs of candidates and districts. All constituents indicated the ESE actively and regularly seeks feedback through surveys and formally involves them in decision-making through the advisory council and informally during multiple program and institutional meetings. Interviews with partners from institutes of higher education demonstrated a collaborative relationship which enabled a smooth transition for candidates from preparation programs into ESE's induction programs. Other constituent groups described a supportive program for candidates transitioning from industry into teaching through the designated subjects program.

The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for effective operation of all educator preparation programs. Monies are allocated through the three-year LCAP on file with the county as well as through various grants, indicating dedicated fiscal support. Funding supports unit leadership as well as hourly employees such as mentors, consultants, instructors, and field supervisors who facilitate field-based and clinical experiences. Leadership at educational partner institutions speaks highly of unit leadership's responsiveness, organization, and proactive support of new educators. VCOE leadership acknowledged their full support of unit leadership to implement programs, address educator needs, and "creatively and collaboratively" meet the needs of the various constituent groups.

ESE demonstrated a credential recommendation process which monitors completion of program and state requirements. Institutional and unit staff were able to describe their process for maintaining current credentialing knowledge and procedures identified by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Institution leadership and constituents from partnering districts and charter schools described the support provided by the unit to all new educators and administrators as responsive and timely, with an emphasis on customer service. This mentored support from a preliminary through a clear credential creates a qualified, high-quality educator who demonstrates effective professional practices in teaching and learning.

Throughout interviews with institution leadership, unit leadership, and educational partners, a theme of "breath of fresh air" emerged and many describe new members of leadership as having, "innovative ideas and positive energy" and a, "new vision and passion" causing a, "renaissance of the County Office". Interviewees consistently described a culture of collaboration and respect in addressing, "What's best for kids and our community?" Staff identified the Bridge Authorization Program as one, "...standout example of how all branches of the organization and education partners collaborate" and, "With their creative collaboration of resources, human and fiscal, they are able to provide three full days of professional development free of charge to over 500 education specialist teachers which will result in the authorization for each teacher, with forms in hand by the end of the third day" as another example.

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

ESE accepts applicants for its credential programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications. While ESE supports candidates largely hired by districts and charters, the unit also participates in recruiting at job fairs and with marketing materials and campaigns and manages various grants to attract potential educators. Unit leadership and support staff aptly described the process and documents used to determine candidate qualifications and enrollment. All confidential and sensitive information is housed in Salesforce, a secured student information system. The unit continues to explore secure systems of collecting sensitive information digitally, such as transcripts.

The institution leadership, unit leadership and support staff, as well as district partners, spoke to the “intentional recruitment” of diverse candidates from their local community, including classified employees. This group of “grow-your-own” educators also benefits from the various grants managed by the unit. Constituents noted how recruiting from their community created a teaching force that more closely represented their student population in diversity. The demographic data of their community supports this finding.

During regular unit meetings, leadership and staff discuss candidate progress and targeted advice and assistance to promote candidate successful completion of program requirements,

and in conjunction with mentor support, their retention in the profession. The unit has a clearly defined process to both identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies. Unit leadership and support staff share a tracking sheet used in regular collaborative program meetings to identify candidates needing additional support. All communication between unit leadership, directors, coordinators, and support staff with participants is noted in the Faculty Journal function of Salesforce for timely response and consistent support. Additional supports assist candidates with meeting assessment requirements such as TPA and RICA. Unit leadership noted that assignments are presented and available to participants in the online learning management system platform, Canvas.

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.	Consistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
For each <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Documents and interviews confirmed ESE has designed and implemented a high-quality, research-based sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the necessary knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences providing candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program allowing candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required by the credential they seek.

ESE ensures candidates experience teaching diverse students through site-based, clinical experiences. Leadership interviews confirmed candidates and mentors/coaches regularly examine professional practice and identify professional growth goals to develop their skills as an educator working with diverse groups. Additionally, candidates use data collected in relation to equity, diversity, and inclusion and research-based professional development strategies for teaching and learning. Review of documents, such as the individual learning plan (ILP) showed candidates reflect on their practice with their mentor/coach and are provided strengths-based feedback for continuous growth. These learning-focused conversations and interactions are documented in mentor/coach logs.

Evidence indicated admission into ESE’s educator programs begins with the program eligibility form which is also used to verify appropriate candidate employment settings and document significant experience in California public schools. Interviews with the advisory board confirmed ESE and consortium partners offer candidates the opportunity to work with a diverse student population. One interviewee stated, “‘All means all’ is at the forefront of VCOE programs.” This emphasizes creating a learning environment that honors and builds on a student's religious, racial, ethnic, linguistic, and economic backgrounds as well as learning abilities, gender, family structure, and sexual orientation. Interviews with candidates and mentors/coaches, confirmed candidates across programs collect student information through their teaching context to better understand the assets and needs of their students.

Program leaders stated TIP candidates are assigned a mentor, CASC candidates are assigned a coach, and DSC candidates are assigned a support provider and a field-based supervisor. Documents showed ESE ensures all these groups are certified and experienced in the specified context and content for the candidates they are assigned. Interviews with leadership across the six programs, presented consistency in training, supervision, and evaluation of site-based supervisors. Reviewers confirm that site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner across programs. Reviewers also confirmed ESE ensures field-based supervisors, site-based supervisors, support providers, mentors, and coaches receive extensive and ongoing training in their roles and responsibilities. Evidence of the training is documented in the mentor/coach training scope and sequence for each program and presented as a course in the Canvas platform.

Interviews and documentation confirmed program staff evaluates and measures success using multiple measures such as mentor/coach logs, Canvas course completion, attendance at networking sessions, as well as candidate/mentor check-ins and self-reflections.

Documentation showed ESE recognizes field-based supervisors, site-based supervisors, support providers, mentors, and coaches at the end of the year during each program’s culminating activities.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Consistently
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	Consistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Consistently
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Documentation and interviews with multiple constituent groups verified ESE uses multiple sources of data to engage in a continuous cycle of program improvement built upon frequent collaboration with and feedback from constituents. This cycle is implemented at both the unit and program level. Each program collects data from candidates, mentors/coaches, and other relevant constituents, then uses this data to make individual program modifications. Leadership interviews confirmed the unit leadership team frequently solicits feedback including regular check-ins, reflections, evaluations, and program surveys. Leadership then reviews, analyzes, and evaluates trends and patterns to determine modifications needed at the unit level. One administrator stated, “Information is analyzed, and we are constantly looking for trends and patterns to improve program quality and effectiveness.” The unit also conducts a summative review of all programs at the end of each program year. This unit process reflects the continuous improvement cycle of: Plan, Do, Study and Act taught to candidates within the programs. Candidates confirmed they provide input through self-reflection, surveys and regular meetings with their mentors, coaches, and support providers. Leadership stated, “Our surveys tell us how our candidates are doing. The quantitative data shows us what's working and what's

not working.” In response to this, candidates reported they felt supported by the program and that their feedback was valued.

Meeting agendas confirmed data is regularly and systematically collected and analyzed for program improvement, including data available in the Commission’s Accreditation Data Dashboard, and that this information is reviewed in its totality to guide decisions across all levels of the unit in relation to CTC standards as well as overall program effectiveness. The unit meets regularly with key constituents such as district consultants, partnership representatives, advisory board, PDPs, and Human Resources representatives, to share program updates and commonly present data at these meetings to solicit feedback.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

ESE programs are designed and implemented with structures and support in place to ensure candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students. It was clear in interviews with multiple constituencies that ESE has developed a collaborative culture of high expectations and professionalism through clear, purposeful, and immediate feedback and support for improvement. One administrator stated, “The goal is always to impact students.”

Candidates consistently reported they saw an increase in their effectiveness as a result of the strong mentoring component of the program. One program’s completer data from the accreditation data dashboard shows the majority of completers felt the program, “...helped to develop the skills, habits, or tools needed to grow their teaching practice.” Program data from 2020-2021 reported 97.6% of completers indicated their mentor/support provider was helpful in setting and reaching professional learning goals. In an interview with leadership, one administrator stated, “We are committed to being bridge builders.”

In discussions with the leadership team, advisory board members, school site administrators, faculty, and mentors about the effect ESE candidates and program completers have on the educational community, all spoke highly of the impact in local schools and communities.

Institution and community constituents stated how highly spoken of the programs were in and outside of the community.