

**Report of the Revisit to  
Rialto Unified School District  
March 2012**

**Overview of this Report**

This agenda item presents a report on the revisit to Rialto Unified School District that was conducted on March 5-7, 2012. The initial visit took place January 31-February 2, 2011. This item includes the revisit team findings, the 2011 stipulations, revisit team recommendations regarding the stipulations and the standards that were found to be less than fully met during the initial visit and an accreditation status for the institution.

**Revisit Team Recommendations**

1. That all Stipulations from the 2011 accreditation visit be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision for Rialto Unified School District be changed from *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* to *Accreditation*.

**Background**

Rialto Unified School District (RUSD) offers the General Education (Multiple Subject and Single Subject) Induction program. Although all Induction program standards were met at the 2011 visit, due to the findings that one Common Standard was not met and three were met with concerns the team recommended that the COA grant *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* for Rialto Unified School District and its credential program. The COA accepted the team's accreditation recommendation during its March 17-18, 2011 meeting, approved seven stipulations and required that the institution to prepare for a focused revisit within one year of the date of the COA action. Rialto was required to respond to the stipulations and address all standards that were found to be less than fully meet during the initial January-February 2011 visit.

The first column of the table below includes the Stipulations that were approved by the COA in 2011. The second column includes the 2012 Revisit Team Recommendations.

<b>2011 Stipulations</b>	<b>2012 Revisit Team Recommendations</b>
1. That within one year of this action, the institution hosts a revisit with the team lead and Commission consultant to collect evidence of actions to address the stipulations as well as those standards not met or met with concerns.	Removal of Stipulation
2. That the institution provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for teacher preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.	Removal of Stipulation
3. That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, completers and stakeholders. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement.	Removal of Stipulation

<b>2011 Stipulations</b>	<b>2012 Revisit Team Recommendations</b>
4. That the institution provide evidence that the program receives sufficient resources to allow for effective operation. The resources must enable the program to effectively operate in terms of coordination and program development.	Removal of Stipulation
5. That the institution provide evidence that all faculty and instructional personnel are provided with opportunities for professional development.	Removal of Stipulation
6. That the institution provide interim quarterly reports to Commission staff who will provide updates to the Committee on Accreditation.	Removal of Stipulation
7. That the institution not be allowed to offer any new credential programs until the stipulations are removed by the Committee on Accreditation.	Removal of Stipulation

**Standards Less than Fully Met at the 2011 Visit and the 2012 Revisit Team Findings**

<b>Common Standards</b>	<b>2011 Findings</b>	<b>2012 Findings</b>
1. Educational Leadership	Met with Concerns	Met
2. Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	Not Met	Met
3. Resources	Met with Concerns	Met
4. Faculty and Instructional Personnel	Met with Concerns	Met

Since March 2011, Rialto Unified School District (RUSD) has engaged in many activities to address the deficiencies that were identified by the 2011 accreditation team. In response to Stipulation #1, RUSD submitted quarterly progress reports to the Commission in July, September and December 2011 which described the actions that the institution has taken to correct the stipulations and address the standards. Supporting evidence was included with each quarterly progress report.

In February and March 2012, Rialto prepared an interview schedule that included the constituencies identified by the 2011 team and hosted an accreditation revisit from March 5-7, 2012. The revisit was conducted by the 2011 team lead and the Commission consultant. Following onsite accreditation activities, a draft accreditation report was presented to the institution.

Because RUSD scheduled its revisit for March 5-7, 2012, the final progress report, which was due March 21, 2012, was not presented to the COA. Instead, results from the March 5-7, 2012 accreditation revisit are included in this agenda item and are being presented to the COA for consideration and action.

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Accreditation Team Revisit Report  
March 2012**

**Institution:** Rialto Unified School District

**Dates of Revisit:** March 5-7, 2012

**Revisit Team  
Recommendation:** Accreditation

**Revisit Team Recommendations**

1. That all Stipulations from the 2011 accreditation visit be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision for Rialto Unified School District be changed from *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* to *Accreditation*.

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of *Accreditation* was based on a thorough review of the institutional response to the stipulations and standards less than fully met; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with institutional leadership, unit administrators, faculty, candidates, program completers, and employers; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The revisit team recommends that the seven stipulations approved by the COA in 2011 be removed and found that all Common Standards are now met.

**Documents Reviewed**

Institutional Response	Schedule of Induction Seminars
Site Visit Documentation	Advisory Council Minutes
Professional Development Website	Seminar Evaluation Results
Dropbox	Candidate Evaluations of the Program
Staff Development Calendar and	Evaluation and Survey Tools
Trainings	Completer Evaluations of
Support Provider Calendar	Revised 2011-2012 Induction Budget
Support Provider Contact Logs	Faculty Vitae
Support Provider Professional Growth Plan	Organizational Chart
SP Professional Development Survey	Candidate Files
Data Analysis Spreadsheets	
Vision Statement	

### Interviews Conducted

Candidates	7
Completers	3
Employers	6
Institutional Leadership	6
Program Coordinators	3
Induction Faculty	2
Institutional Assessment Coordinator	1
Induction Assessment Coordinator	1
Fiscal Representatives	2
Support Provider	1
Professional Development Faculty	9
Credential Analyst	1
Advisory Board Members	5
<b>Totals</b>	<b>46</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

### Accreditation Revisit Team

**Team Leader:**

**Anna W. Moore**  
Monterey County Office of Education

**Staff:**

**Marilynn Fairgood**  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

## STIPULATIONS

The following section of this report includes the 2011 stipulations. The stipulations are followed by excerpts from the Rialto Unified School District response to the stipulations, 2012 revisit team findings and revisit team recommendations.

### **2011 Stipulation #1**

**That within one year of this action, the institution hosts a revisit with the team lead and Commission consultant to collect evidence of actions to address the stipulations as well as those standards not met or met with concerns.**

### **2012 Institutional Response**

RUSD reports that Induction staff notified institutional leadership and advisory board members about the accreditation status of the General Education Induction Program and kept them apprised of the program's progress to address all stipulations and meet all standards on a regular basis. In October 2011 RUSD induction program established an Accreditation Team which was responsible for oversight of the 2012 revisit and to support the RUSD induction program through the revisit. In November 2011 RUSD selected March 5-7, 2012 for the revisit.

### **2012 Revisit Team Findings**

In addition to evidence submitted in support of each RUSD quarterly progress report, an onsite review of the induction program website and interviews with the various constituent groups confirmed that the actions and activities to address the stipulations and meet all standards were taken as described in the RUSD quarterly progress reports. Review of advisory committee minutes and interviews with institutional and unit leadership, induction faculty, accreditation team members and professional development faculty revealed that the 2011 accreditation team findings were shared with the superintendent, other institutional leaders, advisory board members, candidates, and employers of candidates. Progress updates about how the program was addressing the stipulations and meeting all standards were presented to institutional administrators during regularly calendared induction program meetings, advisory board meetings and principals meetings.

### **2012 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #2**

**That the institution provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for teacher preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.**

### **2012 Institutional Response**

The induction program's researched-based vision statement was developed by the RUSD administrative team, with input from unit leadership. The statement was reviewed and modified by the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) and the Rialto Accreditation Team. Following input from institutional leadership, advisory committee members, induction

faculty, site administrators and program candidates, the statement was refined and finalized and has been distributed to all stakeholders.

An organizational chart was developed and job descriptions were modified to clearly specify induction program roles and responsibilities. The organizational chart shows that, under the direction of the Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services and in cooperation with Personnel Services, the induction senior director and coordinator are in charge of the day-to-day administration of the induction program.

### **2012 Revisit Team Findings**

The Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, who is also the unit leader, reported that the induction program's vision is aligned with the educational research and practices of RUSD. That vision now guides and enhances the practices and direction of the induction program. Through a review of the induction program website and interviews with candidates, advisory committee members and accreditation team members the team found that the RUSD vision statement is posted on the website and that the vision has been shared with program candidates, institutional leadership, advisory board members, accreditation team members and employers of program candidates.

Interviewees reported that the induction senior director, coordinator and the SP have created a cohesive management team that is responsive to the needs of its candidates and that the team frequently shares information about the induction program and its goals with institutional leadership. Interviewees also reported that the induction leadership team is very approachable and are receptive and quickly responds to suggestions for program improvement. Numerous interviewees stated that there is excellent communication and response time from program leadership. During interviews, candidates, program completers, advisory board members and institutional leadership consistently expressed appreciation for the induction program leadership team.

Interviews with institutional and unit leadership, candidates, program completers, professional development faculty, induction faculty, advisory board members and employers confirmed that they are aware of the leadership structure within the induction program and reported that confusion about the roles and responsibilities of the induction staff no longer exists. Interviewees are aware of who they must contact if there are questions about the program or its participants and were able to quickly name the members of the program's leadership team.

### **2012 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #3**

**That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, completers and stakeholders. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement.**

### **2012 Institutional Response**

Rialto has developed survey tools and feedback forms to evaluate seminars, determine if PT's needs are being met as well as the needs of the induction program. Data are reviewed, analyzed and summarized in a report that is shared with PTs. The program coordinator and support provider determines if program modifications are needed and shares their findings with the senior director and the Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services. Program modifications or improvements are documented in data analysis spreadsheets. PTs communication through eChalk has provided an outlet through which RUSD receives ongoing feedback concerning the PTs' progression through FACT.

A Professional Development Needs Assessment Survey was developed for the PTs and for the SP. A Program Completer survey was also mailed to program completers for feedback and input. IHE program partners also provide feedback. The feedback forms, survey results, suggestions from the RUSD advisory groups and PT Exit interview results and surveys all serve as part of the ongoing system of evaluation and program improvement.

### **2012 Revisit Team Findings**

During interviews, candidates confirmed that the process of seminar feedback and program evaluation feedback is ongoing and frequent. A review of survey data and the analyses of survey results show that survey data are analyzed and that program modifications and improvements are documented and made based upon data analyses and candidate and program needs.

Through interviews with unit leadership and PDAC members and a review of advisory board minutes, the team determined that evaluative data are also shared with unit leadership and advisory committee members. Because some employers also serve as advisory board members, employers reported that their suggestions regarding professional development activities, which are aligned with the RUSD's current educational practices, are presented to induction program leadership as professional development options for induction candidates.

RUSD has partnerships with Cal Poly Pomona, Point Loma and a number of other institutions of higher education. RUSD's relationship with Cal Poly Pomona began as a partnership that was established ten years ago in response to a professional development opportunity for classified employees and their administrators. Partner IHEs provide feedback through their relationship as members of the RUSD advisory board and, more recently, the accreditation team. Frequent feedback is also provided by the IHE representatives who attend the BTSA/IHE Collaborative meetings throughout the year. During interviews, institutional leadership, advisory board members, candidates, completers and professional development staff cited various program improvements that have been made during the past year and commented about the development of a comprehensive data collection process and how evaluative data are now effectively analyzed and used for program improvement purposes.

Interviews with candidates, completers, advisory board members and IHE partners and a review of advisory board minutes, candidate data and program completer survey data confirm that stakeholders are actively involved with the organization, coordination and governance of the RUSD Induction program.

Institutional and unit leadership reported that the current process of program assessment and evaluation is improved from last year and that areas for needed improvement are now easily identified. Because the institution hopes to add an Education Specialist Induction Program, unit leadership reported that the assessment and evaluation processes that are currently in place for the general education induction program will remain in place, ongoing assessment and evaluation of the program will continue and the processes will be enhanced over time to include special education candidates.

### **2012 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #4**

**That the institution provide evidence that the program receives sufficient resources to allow for effective operation. The resources must enable the program to effectively operate in terms of coordination and program development.**

### **2012 Institutional Response**

RUSD reports that it currently serves 20 PTs. A written protocol has been established and the program budget provides for an additional support provider if the number of PTs increases above 25. Provisions are included in the budget for adequate SP support and for induction program administrators and the support provider to attend BTSA trainings and meetings. The budget also includes adequate resources to assist PTs through FACT.

### **2012 Revisit Team Findings**

Through interviews with institutional leadership, program leadership, fiscal representatives and a review of the approved 2011-2012 induction budget the team found that a budget revision process is in place and that funds have been allocated to allow RUSD to hire an additional support provider if the program's participant level exceeds twenty-five participants. In addition to the fiscal support needed for the general administration of the induction program, support for candidates to progress through FACT and induction staff participation in professional development activities outside of the district, the budget also includes funding to pay stipends for substitutes so that candidates may attend professional development trainings.

During interviews with institutional and unit leadership and employers it was stated that understanding of the induction program has matured over the past year and that institutional leadership, unit leadership and employers of PTs all understand the importance of the induction program and that the program will continue to be funded and supported by RUSD.

## **2012 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation #5**

**That the institution provide evidence that all faculty and instructional personnel are provided with opportunities for professional development.**

### **2012 Institutional Response**

Rialto reports that the program coordinator attends regularly scheduled BTSA Cluster Regional Meetings and IHE Network Meetings throughout the year. The senior director also attends IHE Network Meetings. The support provider and coordinator attend all FACT trainings. Rialto also reports that the program has created a calendar of regularly scheduled Support Provider meetings and that the SP completed a Support Provider Growth Plan using the Support Provider Description of Practice and the Support Provider Professional Development Survey.

### **Revisit Team Findings**

Advisory board members, unit leadership, induction staff, employers and professional development staff reported that professional development opportunities are regularly scheduled and provided for all RUSD certificated and classified employees. Employers, candidates and instructional strategists who present candidate seminars reported that the trainings offered are aligned with RUSD's professional development requirements, best instructional practices and student needs. Professional development faculty and PDAC members cited numerous professional development activities including the recent GATE and Common Core seminars that were presented to all principals and other district administrators.

Required professional development activities are identified by the Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, who oversees the Professional Development Center and the induction program, and a review of the RUSD Professional Development website shows that a newsletter listing all available professional development opportunities and upcoming events is posted. After activities are identified, the individual school site is responsible for scheduling and monitoring completion of the required professional development activities for its classified and certificated employees.

Through a review of the RUSD professional development website and interviews with program leadership and staff, professional development staff, institutional administration and fiscal representatives the team determined that professional development trainings offered by BTSA and RUSD have been attended by all induction staff. Following training, induction staff is required to share their newly acquired knowledge with institutional leadership and with the program candidates.

## **2012 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

**Stipulation #6**

**That the institution provide interim quarterly reports to Commission staff who will provide updates to the Committee on Accreditation.**

**2012 Institutional Response**

Rialto submitted quarterly progress reports to the Commission in July, September and December 2011. Each report described the progress made by RUSD in addressing the stipulations and meeting all standards.

**Revisit Team Findings**

RUSD submitted three quarterly progress reports documenting progress made to address each of the seven stipulations and describing actions taken to meet the standards. Reports about the program's progress were shared with the COA during its August and October 2011 meetings and the February 2012 meeting.

**2012 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

**Stipulation #7**

**That the institution not be allowed to offer any new credential programs until the stipulations are removed by the Committee on Accreditation.**

**2012 Institutional Response**

Rialto reports that although it would like to offer a Clear Special Education Induction Program, the institution has acknowledged this stipulation and has not pursued additional certification authorizations. RUSD reports that it will not seek approval for additional certification authorizations until all 2011 stipulations have been removed and all standards have been met.

**Revisit Team Findings**

A review of PDAC meeting minutes shows that Rialto induction program leadership and advisory committee members engaged in discussions about adding an Education Specialist Clear Induction Program back in 2011. However, RUSD understands that the program cannot be added until after the stipulations have been removed and all standards have been met. Commission staff confirms that Rialto has not requested approval of any additional teaching authorization.

**2012 Revisit Team Recommendation**

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

## Common Standards

The 2011 accreditation team found that three of the nine Common Standards were Met with Concerns and one standard was Not Met. This section of the report includes excerpts from the original 2011 team findings on the Common Standards, excerpts from the institutional response, the 2012 revisit team findings and revisit team recommendations.

### **Standard 1: Educational Leadership**

### **Met with Concerns**

*Due to the high number of retirements, many administrative positions at Rialto Unified School District have been newly assigned. The Induction Program director was appointed within the past six months. The team found no evidence of a research-based vision; however, the team was advised through an interview that the director is currently developing a vision for the program.*

*Through document review and interviews with program administration, faculty, and Professional Development Center (PDC) Advisory Council members, the team determined that the Induction Program staff facilitates workshops, works one-on-one with candidates and oversees the work of Extended-Day support providers. The organization, coordination, and governance of the professional preparation program is under development due to recent personnel and institutional changes. Although the team found through interviews that there was a Professional Development Center Advisory Council, evidence of regularly calendared Professional Development Center Advisory Council meetings was not found.*

### **Rationale for 2011 Standard Finding**

*A research based vision for the unit has not been articulated. Candidates and Induction faculty stated in interviews that confusion exists as to the roles and responsibilities of the day-to-day operation of the unit. The full-time support provider is responsible for program implementation as well as support for 45 candidates and provides five expert forum professional development meetings during the year. The team found no evidence that stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of the Induction programs.*

### **2012 Institutional Response**

RUSD reports that induction program implementation continues to be shared between the program's senior director, coordinator and the full-time support provider. The Professional Development Center continues to collaborate with Educational Services, Business Services and Personnel to ensure the effective implementation of the induction program.

The program coordinator and the Fiscal Services supervisor continue to communicate regarding the BTSA budget. Designated funding for the Induction program is allocated according to the planned 2011-2012 induction budget.

### **Revisit Team Findings**

In addition to the findings included in response to Stipulations 1, 2, 3 and 4, through a review of the PDAC meeting schedule, agendas and meeting minutes the team determined that the PDAC has regularly scheduled meetings and that the committee meets quarterly. Information shared during PDAC meetings include updates on the induction program's accreditation status, Title II reporting requirements and presentation of reports from the Professional Development Center. This standard is now **Met**.

## **Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**

**Not Met**

*A document review and interviews with program staff and candidates indicate that the Rialto Induction Program has a process for collecting data on program and unit evaluation and improvement. Documentation was provided regarding the collection of evidence, however, evidence of analysis and resulting program and unit evaluation and improvement was not found.*

*Data on candidate and program completers are collected and analyzed. These data include the State Survey of Program Effectiveness, Individual Induction Plans (IIPs) and local mid- and end-of-year binder checks. Program effectiveness data are captured in professional seminar evaluations. However, evidence of analysis and resulting program improvement was not evident. The full-time support provider reports using observation data and responses to the IIP to assist candidates with their teaching performance. The full-time support provider also reports using feedback from conferences, observations and IIPs to make modifications in the sequence of delivery of the Expert Forums as defined by program Standards. Evidence to support this, however, was not provided.*

*The relationship between candidate performance data and program improvement is unclear. The team found it difficult to link candidate assessments to program strengths, weaknesses, or program improvement.*

### ***Rationale for 2011 Standard Finding***

*The team found no evidence that the education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. Evidence that the system analyzes and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations was also missing. Ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to program effectiveness and program improvement was not evident.*

### **2012 Institutional Response**

RUSD reports that feedback from candidates and stakeholders is used as an ongoing measure to assess the strength of the planned presentations and the needs of the PTs. Results of the seminar feedback are shared with the candidates, at which time PTs have the opportunity to discuss and make further suggestions for program improvement. Results are also shared with the Rialto BTSA Accreditation Team and the PDAC. Survey results from the BTSA Professional Development Needs Assessment Survey have been used to plan professional development for the remainder of the 2011-2012 school year.

### **2012 Revisit Team Findings**

In addition to the findings included in response to Stipulation 3 and through interviews with the various constituent groups, the team found evidence of numerous program modifications that have been implemented in response to candidate needs assessment surveys, program completer and stakeholder surveys, input from the PDAC, results from FACT Modules and candidate feedback. This standard is now **Met**.

### **Standard 3: Resources**

### **Met with Concerns**

*The budget, provided at the site visit, is built on the Teacher Credentialing Block Grant (Tier III) and district in-kind resources such as Title I, Title II and PAR funds which are used to support the professional development of all RUSD teachers. Interviews revealed that a portion of the 2010-2011 BTSA Tier III funding was reallocated for other educational purposes. The team found that there is a budget process in place and that the BTSA Induction budget was approved to support 25 candidates at the beginning of the year, however, 45 candidates are participating in the program. During the Mid-Visit Status Report, the team requested evidence of the process that is used to submit a revised budget that requests additional resources to be used in support of the increased number of candidates. Program leadership indicated that there is a process but the documentation presented did not adequately address this issue.*

*Adequate personnel services are provided to the program to determine eligibility and to file for the credential upon completion. This work is done by Personnel Services with the support of the Induction Program Staff. Induction Program Staff and Professional Development Coordinators contribute to the curriculum, instruction, and professional development for candidates as verified by interviews, agendas and calendared dates. However, sufficient resources were not found to be consistently allocated for the effective coordination of the credential program. Consistent coordination of assessment management was not evident.*

*In addition to the collaboration with Professional Development Coordinators, the Induction program partners with the Educational Services department for professional development related to healthy environments, special populations, data analysis, and English Language learners. Candidates have access to eChalk online resources, BTSA Induction Handbook and the District website that includes a calendar of activities. Interviews with candidates and program completers indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the level of support provided by the fulltime support provider. Through interviews with candidates and unit administration the team found that the full-time support provider serves 45 candidates and concurrently coordinates five expert forum professional development meetings. Unit administration reports their intention to add an additional full-time support provider in March 2011.*

### **Rationale for 2011 Standard Finding**

*The team found no evidence of a budget revision process which allows for consistent allocation of resources to meet program needs. There is no evidence of sufficient resources for coordination of the program and assessment management.*

### **2012 Institution Response**

Rialto continues to provide PT support services based on the approved 2011-2012 BTSA budget. Since the full-time support provider supports twenty (20) candidates there is no need to utilize the budget provision to fund Extended-Day Support Providers at this time. However, funding remains allocated for additional Support Provider services should the total number of PTs exceed twenty-five (25).

In addition to funding for SP mileage associated with school site visits and meetings with candidates, the induction budget includes funding for mileage for the senior director, coordinator and SP to attend BTSA meetings and trainings that are offered outside of the district.

### **2012 Revisit Team Findings**

In addition to the findings included in response to Stipulation 4, through review of assessment and evaluative data and interviews with unit leadership and program leadership the team found that assessment management of program data is overseen by the program coordinator with support from the senior director and the support provider. This standard is now **Met**.

### **Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**

**Met with Concerns**

*The team found no evidence of support for Induction faculty development. A calendar of support provider meetings was provided. The team could find no evidence that confirms that the meetings occur or opportunities for faculty development exist.*

### **2012 Institutional Response**

The coordinator and SP receive continuous support and professional development from the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs). The coordinator attends every training and support meeting included in the CRDs annual training calendar. The SP attends the FACT trainings and the Cluster support meetings. The senior director attends the IHE Collaborative meetings and any of the other meetings or trainings as needed. After each training session the coordinator and the SP debrief and incorporate the practical information, philosophies and best practices into candidate seminars and professional development.

### **2012 Revisit Team Findings**

In addition to the information included in response to Stipulation 5, interviews with institutional leadership, program leadership, professional development faculty and review of the SP Professional Growth Plan, BTSA annual calendar of events and schedule of coordinator and SP meetings the team determined that faculty development opportunities are offered on a continuous basis for all Rialto faculty and staff and that induction faculty takes advantage of the training opportunities.

Professional development faculty and instructional strategists stated during interviews that the district values its teachers and believes that providing quality professional development opportunities will result in good teachers serving within the district. Stakeholders also believe that quality professional development opportunities will serve as a marketing tool to attract good teachers who will wish to serve in the district.

This standard is now **Met**.