

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

**Professional Services Division
June 2015**

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Pasadena Unified School District. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self- Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution**

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Educational Leadership		X	
2) Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation			X
3) Resources	X		
4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel		X	
5) Admission	X		
6) Advice and Assistance	X		
7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice		X	
8) District Employed Supervisors	Not applicable		
9) Assessment of Candidate Competence	X		

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
General Education (MS/SS) 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 Program Standards narrative
- 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: Pasadena Unified School District

Dates of Visit: May 11-13, 2015

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional program narrative; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The team reviewed the eight Common Standards related to the General Education (MS/SS) Induction program to determine if standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The team found that Common Standards 3, 5, 6, and 9 were found to be **Met**; Common Standards 1, 4, and 7 were found to be **Met with Concerns**; Common Standards 2 was **Not Met**.

Program Standards

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for the teacher induction program. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The team found that four program standards are **Met**, Program Standards 1 and 2 are **Met with Concerns** and Program Standard 3 is **Not Met**.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of available program documents, program data, candidate portfolios, and conducted interviews with program leadership, district administrators, private school partners, school site administrators, human resources personnel, support providers, participating teachers, and completers. Due to the finding that Common Standards 3, 5, 6, and 9 were found to be **Met**; Common Standards 1, 4, and 7 were found to be **Met with Concerns**; Common Standards 2 was **Not Met**, and Program Standards are **Met** with the exception of Program Standards 1 and 2, which was **Met with Concerns** and Program Standard 3 that was **Not Met**, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

1. That Pasadena USD is to develop and implement systems that monitor key program components and include the active involvement of key stakeholders.
2. That Pasadena USD is to develop an assessment system that addresses both program and unit evaluation, including the analysis and use of the data results.
3. That Pasadena USD, in regards to support providers and professional development providers:
 - a. establish and employ minimum criteria for support provider selection
 - b. provide initial training that meets common and program standard requirements
 - c. establish and maintain a ratio of SP:PT that takes into consideration the support providers' other job responsibilities within the district (full-time teacher vs. teacher on special assignment vs. retired educator)
 - d. develop and implement an evaluation of the services provided to participating teachers
4. That Pasadena USD establishes collaborative relationships with other PreK-12 organizations and institutes of higher education in order to meet the requirements of common and program standards.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials

General Education (Multiple Subject/Single Subject) Clear

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Pasadena Unified School District be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Pasadena Unified School District continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader: **Kafi Payne**
Oakland Unified School District

Common Standards: **Barbara Billich**
San Lorenzo Unified School District

Alison DeMark
Fullerton Elementary School District

Program Sampling: **Teresa Stringer**
Irvine Unified School District

Staff to the Visit: **Gay Roby**
CTC Consultant

Documents Reviewed

2013-14 PT State Survey results	Participating Teacher Portfolios
2014-15 SA Mid-year Survey Results	Progress towards Completion
Agendas from SA meetings	PT Agreement to Complete Induction
Assessment Day evaluation forms	PT eligibility Forms
Board Policy on employment non-discrimination	SA Letters of Commitment
Calendar of Monthly Meetings Prof. Development	SA Reference Forms
Ed Join posting for SP position	SP Application
Exit cards (monthly meeting evaluations)	SP Retention Surveys
NTC-FAS Tools	

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards	Program Sampling	TOTAL
Candidates	9	2	11
Completers	1	3	4
Employers	5	4	9
Institutional Administration	5	5	10
Program Coordinators	1	1	2
Leadership Team Members	3	3	6
Support Providers	5	5	10
Program Development Providers	4	4	8
Credential Analyst	1	1	2
TOTAL	34	28	62

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

Pasadena is the ninth largest city in Los Angeles County. It is one of the primary cultural centers of the San Gabriel Valley. The city is known for hosting the annual Rose Bowl football game and Tournament of Roses Parade. In addition, Pasadena is also home to many scientific and cultural institutions, including the California Institute of Technology (Caltech), the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Fuller Theological Seminary, Art Center College of Design, the Pasadena Playhouse, the Norton Simon Museum of Art and the Pacific Asia Museum.

The greater Pasadena area is bounded by the Raymond Fault line, the San Rafael Hills, and the San Gabriel Mountains. The Arroyo Seco, a major geographic feature and home of the Rose Bowl, flows from headwaters in Pasadena's towering Angeles National Forest greenbelt in the San Gabriel Mountains. Pasadena is bordered by 11 communities and covers 23.1 square miles.

The Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) provides PreK-12 and adult education for Pasadena, and also serves the city of Altadena, and the unincorporated community of Sierra Madre, California. The district has 4 high schools, 5 middle schools, 3 K-8 schools and 15 K-5 elementary schools.

PUSD is run by a board of education, whose members serve four-year terms through geographic sub-districts. Duties of the board include budgeting, approving expenditures, establishing policy, making employment decisions, approving textbooks and courses of study, and approving academic initiatives.

Ethnic diversity reported on the CDE website for PUSD's student population in 2013-14 is as follows: white 29%, Asian 28%, Hispanic or Latino 16.5%, black or African American 10.5%, Filipino 7.4%, two of more races, 7.2%, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 1.1%, American Indian or Alaska Native 0.3%, and none reported 0.1%. Staff ethnicity for 2011-12, the last year information was collected, was white 76.7%, Asian 7.5%, none reported 5.2%, Hispanic or Latino 4.1%, black or African American 3.4%, Filipino 1.5%, native Hawaiian 0.4%, and two or more races 0.2%.

Education Unit

Pasadena Unified School District's (PUSD) Teacher Induction program is housed in the Human Resources Department and is overseen by the assistant superintendent there. In fall 2013, the district hired a part-time outside consultant to administrate the one program that PUSD sponsors, a general education (MS/SS) induction program. To increase program knowledge and efficiency, two district employees with experience as support providers and district professional development providers joined the consultant/program consultant to form the leadership team that runs the program on a day-to-day basis. For the 2014-15 year, the program uses 6 professional development providers and 11 support providers.

**Table 1
Program Review Status**

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers (2013-2014)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2014-2015)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
General Education (MS/SS) Induction	Advanced	15	44	CTC

The Visit

The visit took place at the district office from May 11-13, 2015. The site visit team consisted of a team lead, two common standards reviewers and a program sampling reviewer, and a state consultant.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Met with Concerns

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Findings

Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) sponsors a general education (MS/SS) induction program as part of an extensive system of support for all its teachers. During the site visit's initial meeting, the superintendent and district leadership expressed a strong commitment to recruiting and retaining high quality teachers, including a vision of high quality support and mentoring that was echoed throughout the district and program leadership. Multiple interviews with leadership indicated strong support for the credential program as a vehicle for teacher professional growth. Interviews also confirmed that candidates appreciated this district support, and especially valued the support of their support providers.

While enrolled in the induction program, candidates use the New Teacher Center Formative Assessment System (NTC-FAS) to advance their practice and demonstrate application of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, Induction Program Standard 5: Pedagogy, and Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for All Students. Individualized support is provided through collaboration with a support provider (SP). Together, the SP and candidate pairs develop an Individual Learning Plan identifying areas within the candidate's practice on which to focus and improve, including setting specific goals for the candidate to achieve. Candidates access professional development in support of those goals through the support of their support provider. Interviews with candidates revealed that support providers guide candidates throughout the induction process and provide support in meeting the requirements for completion. A significant number of candidates indicated that a skillful support provider, ideally one at their school site, enabled them to make meaning of the induction process. Clearly, the mentoring by their SP was the most valued aspect of the program. On the other hand, candidate interviews also highlighted that the formative assessment process itself seemed tedious, burdensome, and the least meaningful aspect of the program.

The program is under the leadership of the chief of human resources who confirmed in interview conversations her understanding of the importance of communication and collaboration. She grants authority to the program coordinator to establish and maintain direct communication with key service areas such as curriculum and instruction, site administrators, and human resources. Through interviews with a variety of stakeholder groups, it was confirmed that the induction program, staffed by a consultant along with two PUSD employees, has been able to maximize these communication links and maintain relationships with various

other departments within the district. However, maximizing collaboration does not extend to any formal relationships with universities/Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) or other PK-12 organizations.

Site administrator interviews confirmed a desire and commitment on the part of the district's principals to support beginning teachers' participation in induction. Principals reported appreciating the triad element of the program, where participating teachers, principals, and support providers met to set aligned goals. They also indicated satisfaction with the level of communication with the program coordinator, both at principal meetings and individual site meetings. An October principal meeting agenda shows the induction program on the agenda for a breakout session to discuss accreditation and the colloquium, as well as a reading on "10 ways to principals can support teachers to develop dispositions and skills of highly effective teachers." The program coordinator also shared quotes from participating teachers in the induction program about ways that their principal supported them.

Key expectations and program requirements are outlined for all candidates at the annual Kick-Off meeting and candidate interviews reported satisfaction with the programs' communication regarding credential completion requirements. Support providers assess candidate portfolio evidence to determine sufficiency for recommending the candidate for the credential. Upon receipt of the final clearance, credential analysts advise candidates through completion of the online recommendation process. Interviews with the credential analyst, the program coordinator, and district leadership confirmed a strong and supportive collaboration between the program and the credential office.

The program coordinator, who is an outside consultant, has been given authority to coordinate the varying needs of the program to best benefit beginning teachers. Interviews confirmed that district leadership continues their full commitment and support of induction into the next fiscal year. Even during the recent economic downturn, the district found ways to continue to support new teachers through the induction program. However, the site visit team could not find monitoring or tracking systems for many of the program components. The team did not see evidence of strategies and systems in place to organize procedures, protocols and processes, including the use of assessment and evaluation data to inform program practices. Participating teachers reported they did not receive program information in a timely manner. For example, the criteria for assessing their portfolios were not shared with them until after the assessment was complete.

Rationale

While episodic communication occurs between district personnel and limited local IHE, there is currently no formal collaborative relationship with any college or university. Additionally, although communication is strong in the district, the team could not find evidence that relevant stakeholders are involved in the organizing, coordinating, and governing of the program. Finally, the team could not locate effective strategies and systems to achieve the needs of the program.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**Not Met**

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Findings

Pasadena USD collects limited feedback from stakeholder groups through surveys and evaluations of professional development sessions although it is unclear how the resulting data is consistently used. The review team could not find evidence of any system in place for collecting feedback on multiple measures that inform program decision-making. The leadership team described how exit tickets collected at the end of each monthly meeting are reviewed by the team for individual needs and/or questions and a team member is assigned to follow up with each one but no evidence of this analysis and use was found. While candidates and support providers participated in end of year surveys in the 2013-14 school year and the results of these surveys were provided, it is not clear how the data collected from these surveys were analyzed for program evaluation and improvement.

While the program reports keeping data on participant performance and completion, no evidence of this data was provided. A master list of program requirements by the month was provided, but there were no participants listed. During interviews, the leadership team described a process they developed in the 2014-15 school year to track candidate progress through master lists given to the support providers. This process included the requirement that they keep the master list in a folder and track their own candidate's progress. No evidence was provided as to how this master data will be used by the leadership team to track candidate and program completer performance and unit operations.

Data collection is uneven throughout the program. Some evidence of data being used informally to problem solve was described by the leadership team, however no formal system or process of using data to improve the program was outlined or communicated. The current leadership team described using surveys at the beginning of the year to plan professional development for this year's participants; while the survey results were not provided as evidence, the resulting calendar for the 2014-15 training topics was provided. Additionally, the 2014 Biennial Report provided limited evidence that analysis does occur, but it is unclear how that analysis and the resulting action plan were done. A system for program-level tracking of candidate progress and competence was not found, nor was there a system evident for soliciting program effectiveness data to be used for improvement purposes.

Rationale

The team could not find evidence of the existence of a system of assessment and evaluation, nor information on how any such system analyzes and utilizes the limited data collected for future improvement. Limited data was available both in regards to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence as well as program effectiveness.

Standard 3: Resources**Met**

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Findings

PUSD ensures that resources are available for the induction program to operate by providing adequate funding, personnel, and facilities. The chief of human resources who oversees the induction program noted that despite shrinking budgets due to declining enrollment in the district, they have prioritized induction to meet the needs of candidates working toward credential requirements.

PUSD provides a yearly budget for the induction program with the chief of human resources working with the chief business officer to ensure adequate allocation of program funding. The chief of human resources assumes primary responsibility for maintaining and monitoring the budget and meets regularly with the program coordinator to keep communication open.

The chief human resources officer reviews the program budget with the program coordinator and the budget is reviewed annually at the end of July and September. In interviews, the chief of human resources talked about the district budget development process as well as how revisions after the September review occur. From interviews with program leadership, it was noted that in the fall of 2014, these systems were tested when the program increased by almost threefold. The induction program required, and was subsequently allocated, additional fiscal resources to meet the needs of a larger program.

District administration states that induction is linked to the goals of student achievement in their Local Control and Accountability Plan and is therefore an important component of their district. The chief human resources officer described a clear process for the leadership team to analyze program financial needs and communicating those needs to district leadership. District leadership repeatedly stated its commitment to providing financial resources to maintain an induction program for its teachers. The program coordinator and the rest of the leadership team independently corroborate this process and support from district leadership.

The program is granted office space at one of their school sites and at venues throughout the district to hold professional development sessions. Additionally, the chief human resources officer shares her office space with the director when needed.

The district provides a part-time coordinator for the induction program on a consultant agreement. Additionally, there is a Teacher on Special Assignment and a 1.0 FTE teacher who are paid hourly for time spent helping plan and implement the program. These, along with the coordinator comprise the leadership team—a leadership infrastructure fairly new to the program’s operations. The two teachers on the leadership team also act as support providers

for several participating teachers, one supporting 3 and one supporting 5 new teachers. The leadership team is aware that continued growth of the program would bring a need for more support providers.

The district has provided for a part-time coordinator, stipends for both support providers and the leadership team, as well as clerical support when requested. Resources are also allocated to allow participating teachers to observe other classrooms. Participating teachers and site administrators reported that they find this extremely helpful in improving candidate practices.

While the team found limited evidence of data collection and analysis, they were unable to locate evidence of a systematic approach for using data to inform the coordination of the program. Interviews revealed that when the program's former clerical support staff member moved to take on a full time position, her position was not filled. At that time, program leadership devised a checklist to track progress of candidates through the program's requirements but given the need versus the capacity of program leadership to collect the data, this proved difficult without dedicated clerical support.

The information resources are managed by the leadership team and are viewed as adequate by district and site administrators, as well as the participating teachers. The leadership team meets regularly to plan for program implementation and make decisions regarding who will take responsibility for communicating information to candidates, support providers and/or site administrators. The first year teachers did report that they do not always receive program information in a timely manner; however, site administrators and second year teachers felt they received the right information at the right time.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Met with Concerns

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Findings

Currently, the induction program employs a part-time consultant and a leadership team to guide the program on a day to day basis. The leadership team consists of the consultant, a classroom teacher, and a teacher on special assignment. The teachers on the leadership team have additional responsibilities in professional development and also serve as support providers. In the current year, a cadre of eleven support providers provides guidance to 44 candidates, with a range of 1 to 11 participating teachers reportedly assigned to a support provider.

The leadership team, professional development providers, support providers, as well as the district leadership team are reflective of a diverse society and are considered to be qualified persons in the area of current knowledge of content. With extensive professional development services provided by the district, ample opportunity exists to extend professional knowledge and understand current educational trends.

Given the small size of the PUSD induction program and the local context with declining enrollment and layoffs in recent years, few new support providers have been hired. As a result, the team was unable to locate evidence of policies in practice related to minimum criteria for the support provider qualifications or for consistent screening practices of applicants.

While in past years the program has not found a need for support provider recruitment, current growth of the program as well as large caseloads for some support providers will require additional recruitment. The PUSD human resources department has a delineated process for hiring support providers and during interviews, the chief human resources officer expressed a commitment to hiring diverse candidates.

There was a lack of evidence to indicate that there is a formal process for evaluating support providers that has been implemented with consistency. Interviews with support providers and program leadership corroborated this. Additionally, the team found no documentary evidence of regular evaluation of program leadership or evidence relating to the recognition of support providers or program leadership excellence.

Program leaders are highly collegial in their planning and preparation. For example, they meet frequently to plan professional development for candidates and support providers, and discuss other elements of the program. However, there is little evidence of professional development provided to program leadership regarding effective strategies in operating an induction program, the skills of mentoring, and California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Additionally, with no evidence of the current content of support provider initial training, it is unclear what training topics are provided for new support providers.

No evidence was provided that the group members who are an integral part of the program reach out to other relevant stakeholders within or beyond the district for the express purpose of involving them in the organization, coordination and governance of the program. Leadership team members understand that there is a need to be more connected with the local teacher preparation programs as evidenced in their program assessment documents and interviews. There has been some effort to reconstitute a steering committee.

Rationale

No evidence was found or confirmation given of a criteria and process for hiring qualified persons to provide professional development, and provide support services. The team did not find evidence of systematic relationships with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate

learning, and educator preparation. Additionally, no evidence was found regarding the systematic evaluation of professional development providers and support providers.

Standard 5: Admission

Met

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Findings

Applicants to the Pasadena BTSA Induction Program are admitted using well-established criteria and close cooperation between the induction and human resources offices. The district credential analyst described how new teachers' credentials are reviewed and how those that are eligible for the induction program are advised about program requirements and participation. New hires who meet the criteria for admittance into the induction program are informed using the Notification of Eligibility for Induction Participation, advising the candidate of the requirement to contact the program coordinator within 14 days for an advisement meeting. A copy of this document is sent to the program coordinator to notify them of the potential candidate. At the advisement meeting, the coordinator reviews documents to be completed for entrance into the program and gives the candidate detailed information regarding the district's induction program requirements.

The district's chief human resource officer described the district's policy and procedures for seeking out applicants from diverse populations. Additionally, the chief human resource officer noted that the applicant pool to PUSD is large enough to allow diversity needs to be addressed in the hiring process. The unit reviews candidates to determine that they have appropriate pre-professional experiences during the application and interview process. The interview process reveals the candidates' sensitivity to a diverse population and follow-up on the letters of reference is used to determine if their skills and prior experiences demonstrate their potential for professional effectiveness.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Met

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Findings

Candidates are first introduced to the teacher induction program when they meet with human resources personnel to sign their contract. Interviews with the credential analyst yielded

information about how the induction office is notified of new candidates. This information was further confirmed during the program coordinator interview when it was mentioned that the program receives new hire names the same day that a contract is signed. New teachers receive a new hire packet and induction-eligible teachers receive a Referral for Advisement form that is completed and sent to the teacher induction office. Both program documents and stakeholder interviews conclude that support providers are matched to participating teachers soon after hire.

The candidates indicated they had appropriate information accessible in order to meet program requirements. Both the program narrative and candidate interviews identified the “check off lists” as a key component in ensuring program completion. Participating teachers indicated the mid-year portfolio review process was helpful in providing feedback, but were disappointed that the rubric used to assess competence was not provided to participating teachers until after the review was completed. Interviews with the credential analyst confirmed that the verification of completion process, which includes portfolio completion and signatures from all key stakeholders is in place.

The program narrative states that the institution provides advice and assistance to participating teachers on an ongoing basis; interviews with program leadership, support providers and participating teachers found that there were no formal advice and assistance sessions offered to participating teachers but information is relayed through support providers and program personnel. Program interviews also found the use of the triad meetings between the principal, participating teacher and support provider to be a useful tool for providing a foundation of support for the participating teacher. Principal interviews reiterated that the triad meetings in the beginning of the year provided a solid foundation into understanding the participating teacher’s goals and/or areas of focus for the year. The program narrative provided evidence of an Intervention Action Plan for use in the instance that a participating teacher is struggling to meet program requirements however, program interviews with program leadership, support providers and principals all echoed that early intervention from a support provider proved to help get participating teachers on the right path and the form was not often needed. Additionally, participating teachers submit an induction portfolio twice a year and receive feedback to ensure their evidence and reflections meet program standards and that they are making adequate progress.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Met with Concerns

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

Findings

The program uses the New Teacher Center Formative Assessment System (NTC FAS). Both participating teacher and support provider interviews highlighted the system, with its case study student component to be one of the strongest indicators in determining researched-based strategies for improving student learning. Together with the Continuum of Teaching Practice (CTP), participating teachers highlighted the case study process as strong indicator of self-assessed student growth. Participating teacher and support provider interviews further emphasized the CTP document as a useful tool in determining areas of focus for the participating teacher.

While the unit implements a planned sequence of activities for participating teachers in induction that addresses the required components of the program standards, the team could not find evidence of a system of regular evaluation. There are some processes including exit tickets for monthly professional development sessions with candidates and support providers, however the program did not provide evidence of regularly disaggregating the data or evaluating the data for program-wide trends and issues.

The Program Assessment narrative indicated the program seeks to recruit and retain highly qualified support providers. The support provider job description posted on EdJoin detailed support provider responsibilities, but lacked detail in identifying minimum qualifications, nor was minimum qualifications identified elsewhere. Support providers indicated they were encouraged to apply for the support provider position by a site administrator or an induction program leader. Interviews with principals and district administrators further verified that they recommend individuals for a support provider role who they feel exhibit the qualifications of a successful support provider. Examples of qualifications delineated through the interview process included a skilled classroom teacher, having a good rapport with colleagues, and a strong knowledge base. All available evidence reiterated that program stakeholders share an ideal of a quality support provider; however the team was not provided any evidence of minimum qualifications.

The program narrative described participating teachers as having multiple opportunities to understand and address equity through the formative assessment system. During the inquiry process, participating teachers identify two focus students that represent both English learner needs and the full range of abilities and special needs of students in their classroom during the inquiry. The inquiry is designed to use the formative assessment tools from NTC-FAS to collect, analyze, and share data on the effectiveness of teaching English learners, special populations,

and the full range of learners in their classroom. Interviews with participating teachers and support providers further clarified that both the case study students, and the equity observation provided evidence that highlighted the participating teachers ability to develop research-based strategies for improving student learning. Interviews confirmed a belief that any PUSD teacher would naturally have both an English learner and special population student in their assigned classrooms; there does not appear to be any procedure or tracking system in place to verify this belief or policy or procedure in the event that a participating teacher does not have an ELL or Special Population (IEP/504/GATE) student as a student of record in their classroom.

Rationale

The team could not find evidence of collaboration between the unit and its partners regarding the criteria for selection of support providers. Additionally, the team could not find evidence that the unit regularly evaluates candidate assignments to verify opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors

Not Applicable

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

This standard does not apply to institutions that sponsor only second tier programs.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Met

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

Findings

Participating teachers collect evidence throughout the formative assessment process and produce a portfolio to document their knowledge and growth within and across the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Participating teachers submit portfolios twice a year for review. Support providers work in teams to review the portfolios, assessing participating teacher growth via a 4-point rubric. Support providers are paired in teams with representation of the varied experiences and job assignments. Support provider interviews confirmed that this process helps to further develop both support providers' and participating teachers' understanding of the formative assessment process. Those support providers who were new to the role appreciated being paired up with an experienced support provider. Following both the mid-year and final review, participating teachers receive their portfolio feedback and have an

opportunity to make any necessary or voluntary changes. A leadership team member signs the end-of-year portfolio review and a letter is sent to participating teachers indicating year 1 or year 2 completion.

The induction portfolio process highlights participating teachers' growth in both the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the induction standards. Participating teacher interviews found that the formative assessment system highlights the teacher's ability to effectively support student growth in the state-adopted academic standards. Additionally, teacher interviews found the Continuum of Teaching document to be a strong indicator of teacher growth within the CSTP.

Participating teachers reported satisfaction in receiving clear information on program requirements. They further reported that the program “checklist” supports them in organizing their artifacts and evidence of practice for final demonstration and evaluation.

Interviews with all stakeholders confirmed that district programs share a vision that includes new teacher support and development as an integral component. Participating teacher interviews found that participating teachers view the support provider mentorship key in their success of navigating both the Continuum of Teaching Practice (CTP) and the formative assessment system.

Program Reports

General Education (MS/SS) Induction Program

Program Design

The Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) is the lead educational agency for the Pasadena Induction Program, which is committed to providing advanced preparation for preliminary teaching credential holders by means of formative assessment, individualized support, and targeted professional development. PUSD’s Induction Program provides a sequenced structure of both formative assessment and professional development to assist participating teachers in professional growth and meeting the academic learning needs of all students.

As reported by the chief of human resources, PUSD has experienced a drop in hiring over the past several years resulting in low numbers of participants in the program. Throughout this period, Pasadena’s district leadership has shown both strength and commitment to the development and growth of their new teachers. The program has organized their new teacher support to embrace district initiatives, which helps to eliminate redundancy for new teachers and assists participating teachers in making the connections between application and demonstration of the standards, classroom observations, and successful pedagogy. During interviews, site administrators commended the program for the personal and professional growth they have witnessed in each of their teachers, therefore improving the learning for all students. Over the last year, due to the commitment from district leadership and individual

support providers, the program has begun to develop and implement plans for future growth of the program.

The induction program maintains regular and consistent contact with departments within the district and communicates with all personnel involved with induction. However, the team was unable to find documentation of any regular and systematic collaboration outside the district, with college and/or university faculty to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. For example, the program does not currently serve on any local college advisory boards and does not currently have any formal collaborative agreements with local college representation, although there is evidence that these relationships existed in the past.

The team found abundant evidence that the district provides the program leadership with the power and authority to administrate the program. Stakeholders within the program expressed the importance of the program for new teacher support and development within the district. After interviewing program leadership and district leadership, and reviewing limited documentation, the evidence revealed a lack of systems to aid program leadership in the tracking of program components. For example, program evaluation is done sporadically, but the team did not see an effective system that coordinates the collection, review and analysis of evaluations, subsequently using it as a catalyst for program improvement and change.

The Pasadena Induction Program provides participating teachers with a comprehensive induction program that includes a formative assessment system based on the CSTP, mentoring from trained support providers, on-going professional development, and networking time for support provider/participating teacher pairs. These varying components guide a candidate's demonstration of application beyond their pre-service teaching experiences. Through interviews and review of evidence, the team confirmed that the program and the district offer professional development opportunities that are both common to most beginning teachers and responsive to individual teacher's needs. However, coordination of the administrative components of the program, including support provider preparation and program evaluation, were not found to be systematic and consistent. Documentation of support provider initial preparation that fulfills the requirements of the standards was not found, nor was any feedback of program efficacy from all stakeholders. No evidence of multiple methods of evaluation from all stakeholders to assist in providing feedback to improve the induction program was found.

With the downturn in the number of beginning teachers hired in the district, formal sessions of support provider training have not been needed for the past several years. Currently, with new support providers selected this year, initial training has consisted of meeting with leadership team members to receive initial training, although the content of this training was not provided. In interviews, support providers stated they felt they were well trained to fulfill their job responsibilities, however, no evidence of support provider training was shared that included such items as training agendas, outlines, power point presentations, evaluations, etc. Following this initial training, during monthly Forums, support providers dialogue with colleagues and leadership to make on-going modifications and differentiation of their support in order to meet participating teacher needs.

Through interviews with support providers and participating teachers, the team observed how much participating teachers appreciated the influence of positive support from organized, strong support providers. In spite of this, the team did not see defined criteria for the support provider position, consistent with the provider's assigned responsibilities in the program. Initial and ongoing professional development was not well defined and outlined. The team did see a calendar of support provider forums and the topics, but did not see evidence of formalized training sessions for new support providers. The team learned through interviews, that the support providers are innately strong mentors, but the team was unable to find defined criteria for assigning support providers to participating teachers. Several site administrators stated they did not provide any input regarding who was chosen as the support provider on their campus. However, they did reiterate how impressed they have been meeting and communicating with the support providers and with the support they continually give participating teachers.

The caseload among support providers differed significantly. For example, there is a retired teacher who reported supporting eleven participating teachers and a full time teacher supporting seven participating teachers while other full-time teachers are assigned three. No evidence was given regarding defined criteria for the varying amount of support provider to candidate ratios.

No evidence was found that Pasadena Induction Program has a comprehensive system of evaluation leading to program revision and improvement. The team reviewed documents provided by the program leadership and it was determined the program has a process of collecting a minimal amount of feedback from participating teachers and support providers after support provider forums, monthly meetings, and professional development trainings, but it was not evident how the results of the evaluations were used or how they impacted program improvements.

Course of Study

The primary purpose of the Pasadena Unified School District Induction Program is to provide two years of support to teachers in the completion of a research-based formative assessment system, the New Teacher Center Formative Assessment System (NTC FAS). The formative assessment tools demonstrate participating teachers' application of pedagogical knowledge and skills in the context of their diverse classrooms as a pathway from the Preliminary Teaching Credential to the Clear Teaching Credential. This collaborative model focuses on improving classroom practice and on developing reflective teachers who are responsive to the diverse cultural, social and linguistic backgrounds of all students. Interviews with a variety of stakeholder groups confirmed the reliance of the program on the NTC FAS system to provide growth in the candidate's professional practice and to demonstrate proficiency in the program standards. Participating teachers did report they felt the reflection requirements were excessive.

The formative assessment processes and tools help participating teachers examine and assess their classroom practice and identify areas of strength, and conversely, areas for professional growth as related to the CSTP, Induction Standards 5 Pedagogy and 6 Universal Access: Equity

for All Students. Each teacher's developing practice is assessed and strengthened through the formative assessment experience over two years.

The Pasadena Induction Program has clearly defined learning outcomes for participating teachers that combine support and assessment. NTC FAS is used as a program structure to guide reflective conversation between the support provider and the participating teacher. Linked professional learning opportunities are available to new teachers through the district's professional development offerings and lists of opportunities are made available to new teachers through the induction program. Interviews confirmed that support providers encourage participating teachers to attend professional development trainings supporting identified goals on their Individual Learning Plan. During interviews, the program leadership explained the strong connection between the district initiatives and goals and the induction program. For example, the district provided an all-day staff development, presented by teachers on special assignment, on the topics of special education and English language development.

Interviews confirmed that PUSD effectively implements the use of the formative assessment system, created by The New Teacher Center to support and inform participating teachers about their professional growth as they reflect and improve upon their teaching. Review of the participating teacher portfolios confirmed documentation showing application and demonstration of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession within the PUSD induction program.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Support providers and the teacher induction coordinator provide participating teachers with on-going advice and assistance throughout the formative assessment process. In the fall, participating teachers and support providers collaboratively assess the teacher's developing practice on the Continuum of Teaching Practice, which is explicitly aligned with the CSTP. The results of this initial assessment guides and informs their work during the first semester as they develop professional goals, examine the learning environment, design lessons, and analyze student work. A review of portfolios revealed the induction program requires participating teachers to add their Teaching Performance Assessment results to their portfolio to encourage a dialogue between the support provider and the new teacher on current levels of classroom practice, which should be a voluntary practice.

Mid-year portfolio checks and final submission documents show growth of both the participating teacher and her/his case study students. Participating teachers accumulate and organize assessment data and evidence with the guidance of their support providers into their induction portfolios using NTC FAS tools. Interviews with site administrators, support providers, and program leadership confirmed application and demonstration of pedagogical skills and provision of universal access (program standards 5 and 6) within the program's components. They are embedded in the program's formative assessment system and the professional learning opportunities reinforce common concepts.

In collaboration with their support providers, participating teachers make adjustments and modifications to classroom instruction, based on assessed student needs throughout the year. They reassess their practice against the Continuum of Teaching Practice again at mid-year and at the end of the year, summarizing strengths and areas for growth, and setting next steps. Interviews with support providers and candidates, and a review of portfolios confirmed that assessment of quality and effectiveness of candidate competency is measured through the formative assessment system.

Support providers and the teacher induction coordinator read candidates' induction portfolio submissions, which include written reflections and supporting documents using a rubric. Written feedback is provided to participating teachers. Those with adequate portfolios are recommended for a credential. If needed, candidates are able to resubmit their portfolios until their documents are accepted as complete. The district's credential analyst confirmed that the program leadership supports her in recommending for the clear credential, providing another example of PUSD's strong internal relationships.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, support providers, professional development providers, and leadership, the team determined that all program standards are met for the General Education (MS/SS) Induction Program except for the following:

Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design - Met with Concerns

The team was unable to find evidence of support provider preparation that meets the requirements of program standards, a system of program evaluation, or collaboration with the professional development efforts of any partner organizations.

Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration - Met with Concerns

While evidence of communication with teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations was found, no evidence of collaborative relationships was found.

Standard 3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers - Not Met

The team was unable to find evidence of selection criteria for support providers or professional development providers. No evidence was found to confirm that support provider initial preparation/ training includes the required elements outlined in the standards. Additionally, there is no system to assess the quality of support provider services and no evidence was found regarding providing formative feedback to support providers on their work. Finally, there are no criteria for caseload maximums for support providers that take into consideration other job responsibilities of the support provider (full-time classroom teacher, teacher on special assignment, or retired educator).