

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
Saugus Union School District
Professional Services Division
May 2018**

Overview of this Report

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

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

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

Program Standards

| | Total Program Standards | Program Standards | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | Met | Met with Concerns | Not Met |
| Teacher Induction | 6 | 4 | 2 | |

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

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

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

Institution: Saugus Union School District/Santa Clarita Valley Consortium

Dates of Visit: April 23 – 25, 2018

2017-18 Accreditation

Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

| |
|---|
| Previous History of Accreditation Status |
| <i>Although Saugus Unions School District has operated a Commission approved educator preparation program since 2003, induction programs were not incorporated into the accreditation system until 2011. Therefore, the 2018 accreditation site visit is the first accreditation site visit for this institution.</i> |

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, mentors, candidates, completers, and local school personnel. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit’s operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Program Standards

All Program Standards for the Teacher Induction program were **met** except for Program Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation and Program Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services which were **met with concerns**.

Common Standards

Common Standards 3, 4, and 5 were **met**. Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation and Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support were **met with concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documentation, evidence provided at the site, additional information provided by program and institutional administration, and interviews with candidates, program completers, mentors, site administrators, and employers.

Due to the finding that two Common Standards were met with concerns and two program standards were met with concerns, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends that within one year of this action, the institution submit written documentation in the form of periodic reports to the team lead and Commission consultant documenting all actions to remove the stipulations noted below:

1. That the institution provide evidence that it has created and articulated a research-based vision of teaching and learning that is clearly represented in the Teacher Induction program.
2. That the institution provide evidence that the education unit purposefully recruits, hires, and retains candidates to diversify the educator pool in California.
3. That the institution provide evidence that the induction program's recommendation verification process includes a defensible process of reviewing documentation, a written appeal process for candidates, and a procedure for candidates to repeat portions of the program, which is articulated and available to all candidates.
4. That the institution provide evidence of a system, which ensures that mentors are receiving formative feedback on their work from induction program leadership.

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

Teacher Induction

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Saugus Union School District be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Saugus Union 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 Lead: | Melissa Meetze-Hall San Bernardino and Riverside County Offices of Education |
| Common Standards: | Dan Schaefer San Bernardino City Unified School District |
| Program Cluster: | Loy Dakwa Antelope Valley Union High School District |
| Staff to the Visit: | William Hatrick Commission on Teacher Credentialing |

Documents Reviewed

| | |
|--|---|
| Preconditions | Candidate Individualized Learning Plans (ILP) |
| Common Standards Submission | Mentor Logs |
| Common Standards Feedback and Addendum | Mentor Trainings |
| Program Assessment Submission | Mentor Agreement |
| Program Assessment Feedback and Addendum | Induction Program Policies & Procedures |
| Program Completer Survey | Meeting Agendas, Minutes, and Artifacts |
| New Teacher Intake Forms | Professional Development Evaluations |
| Candidate E-Folders | Advisement Documents |
| Survey Data Results | District MOUs |

Interviews Conducted

| Stakeholders | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Candidates | 16 |
| Completers | 3 |
| Site Administrators | 12 |
| Institutional Administration | 6 |
| Program Coordinators | 1 |
| Mentors | 17 |
| Steering Committee Members | 11 |
| Credential Analysts and Staff | 3 |
| TOTAL | 69 |

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

The Saugus Union School District (SUSD) is the largest elementary school district located in the Santa Clarita Valley (SCV) in Northern Los Angeles County. SUSD is committed to preparing its more than 10,000 students (14% Asian, 4% Black, 6% Filipino, 31% Hispanic, 48% White) for academic and personal success for every child based on the core values of respect, integrity, learning, teamwork, and enthusiasm. Of these students, 13% are English Learners and 21% receive free and reduced lunch.

SUSD is the approved program sponsor for Teacher Induction for the Santa Clarita Valley Consortium which includes Saugus USD, Castaic USD, Sulphur Springs USD, and Newhall School District which have a total of 39 elementary schools. Additionally, candidates and completers for Teacher Induction are participating from Legacy Christian School.

Education Unit

The SCV Consortium Teacher Induction Program is the pathway for teachers with General Education (Multiple or Single Subject) credentials and/or Education Specialist credentials to earn their Clear credentials. It is housed in the Human Resources Department at Saugus USD. The program provides ongoing support and training for eligible teachers who have a full time teaching position. There are 69 candidates enrolled in Teacher Induction and 48 mentors. Last year, 25 candidates completed the program. One part-time (.5 FTE) induction coordinator oversees the program.

Experienced teachers apply to be included in the mentor pool and are selected by each site administrator to be trained and serve as mentors and coaches for induction candidates throughout the program. The induction process includes a series of inquiry based self-assessment and support activities which guide growth for induction candidates to demonstrate competency in all California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Candidates and mentors have a variety of opportunities for collaboration with peers, professional development, and training in inquiry-based processes.

Table 1
Program Review Status

| Program Name | Number of Program Completers (2016-17) | Number of Candidates Enrolled (2017-18) |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Teacher Induction | 25 | 69 |

The Visit

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols with the exception of evidence review for the Common Standards. The team did not receive access to the Common Standards addendum and related documents until one week before the site visit. Subsequently, additional document and evidence review took place during the site visit in addition to the scheduled interviews.

Program Reports Teacher Induction Program

Program Design

The Saugus Union School District induction program, also called the Santa Clarita Valley Induction program (SCV), is a collaboration between the four local elementary school districts and the private and charter schools in their attendance areas. Each year, districts renew their participation in the consortium through a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The program coordinator brings together the steering committee several times a year to plan and review program procedures and practices based on applicable data and current policy. The steering committee is comprised of district assistant superintendents, the program coordinator, lead mentors from each district, the local high school district induction coordinator, and a representative from each of the following: teachers' union, credential analysts, special education administration, and program candidates. Data from state and local surveys, professional development assessments, and individual teacher requests are reviewed within this venue as well. Additionally, districts share professional development plans with the induction coordinator to assist mentors and candidates in selecting opportunities to further their professional practice.

A systematic communication system exists between the program and the districts it serves. Assistant Superintendents who oversee the program for their district discuss ongoing program development at regular administrative council meetings. The districts and private schools invite the program coordinator to review program elements and essential professional development at board meetings, administrative council meetings, and individually through site visits with school administrators. In addition to input administrators provide within meeting structures, administrators are asked to provide input through annual surveys, which inform program design each year.

There are three essential components by which the SCV Consortium is designed:

1. **Standards:** The candidate has multiple, systematic opportunities within each Inquiry to learn about and demonstrate knowledge, understanding and application of the CSTP and induction standards for the purpose of improving their teaching.
2. **Evidence of practice:** Over the course of the two-year induction process, the candidate presents evidence that verifies his/her completion of the two inquiries and the requirements of the induction program, as well as documenting growth over time.
3. **Criteria:** Within each inquiry, candidates self-assess their teaching performance using set criteria as stated in the continuum of practice for each CSTP. Each candidate self-assessment is guided by a trained mentor and is based on evidence gathered within each Inquiry. The Plan, Teach, Reflect, Apply (PTRA) cycle and the formative assessment tools guide this process. Additionally, the ILP is assessed according to a rubric for quality of completion.

Through data-based planning and thoughtful communication, the SCV Consortium induction program has continued to improve the ever-changing needs of its candidates. Areas addressed over the last year and currently include, but are not limited to, mentor recruitment and pairing, exploration of a research-based theory for the mentoring design, the Individual Learning Plan (ILP), education specialist's professional development offerings, a handbook, district credentialing analysts' collaboration, and candidate completion.

To ensure coordination and stakeholder input between the consortium, districts and private schools, the steering committee meets regularly to review and share program progress and information. This structure allows for consistency between the consortium partners to ensure early identification and advisement of new hires for their clear credentials, as well as matching them with mentors at the point of hire.

There is regular and ongoing communication between partner districts, private schools and the consortium. Credential analysts provide immediate information of new hires through the completion of a new teacher referral form. Upon hire, districts complete this referral to determine teacher eligibility for participation in the program and their clear credential program needs. The program communicates regularly with district personnel in regards to teacher program completion progress. Assistant superintendents who oversee the program for their district discuss ongoing program development at regular administration meetings. The districts and private school invite the program coordinator to review program development and essential professional development at board meetings, administrative council meetings, and individually through site visits with site administrators.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Upon completion of the first induction guidance meeting, candidates begin the process of self-evaluation in order to formulate their goals for the inquiry. The induction program features a two inquiry model that leads new teachers to reflect upon their practice through the lens of the CSTP. Induction program candidates reflect on current practice as a means to develop lifelong habits of mind in concerted efforts to improve student learning outcomes consistent with state adopted academic measures.

Candidates engage in a data collection process in order to formulate a goal relevant to their needs. They meet with their own site administration to establish goals through site and district priorities, and they invite their mentor teacher into their classrooms for an informal observation.

Once the candidate has formulated a goal, the mentor teacher supports him/her in seeking opportunities for growth in the identified area(s). As candidates participate in various professional development (PD) opportunities (district PDs, professional conversations, teacher observations, book/article reviews, etc.), mentors have three opportunities to observe candidate practice and provide feedback. Mentors and candidates reflect upon each PD activity experience and the impact on their practice, using the ILP and mentor meeting logs to

document their reflection. The nature of reflection on current practice using the CSTP affords new teachers an opportunity to systematically analyze their practice in an effort to adopt methodologies to demonstrate application of newly learned skills. Each inquiry follows a PTR cycle that allows candidates, with mentor guidance, to identify teaching strengths and areas for professional growth based upon the CSTP and induction program standards.

Candidate coursework in critical areas include analyzing student work, (initial, progress-monitoring, summative) and planning and delivering instruction with attention given to focus students (English learners, at-risk and students with disabilities). Other areas include lesson planning supported by classroom observations and reflection.

Given the job-embedded nature of the candidates' clinical practice, the consortium uses well-defined criteria for selection of mentor teachers and professional development providers to support professional growth. Prospective mentors apply to participate in the program and a panel selected by the steering committee interviews each one. This is the cornerstone of the program, as there is a distinct shift from a document-based program to a relationship-focused one. As the mentor pool grows and training progresses, mentors are increasingly prepared to support candidates in their professional growth.

The ILP is the living document that candidates and mentors use to track their progress on CSTPs. The candidate documents the CSTP goal they develop with their mentor and site administration. They document activities in which they engage to grow in their instructional practice. Further, they document the impact on students and their reflection of their activities. The data from completed ILPs is used to document and share program impact and plan future program activities. Mentors and candidates use the ILP rubric to monitor elements of the ILP and to evaluate its thoroughness.

Candidates and mentors attend monthly meetings in support of their work. Candidates attend three *Collaboratives* during which they have opportunities to collaborate with other candidates across the valley. Mentors participate in three *Support Circles* during which they deepen their understanding of research-based mentoring practices. Additionally, candidates and mentors meet together three times per year for *Induction Guidance* during which they hone in on reflective practice as guided by the ILP. There are also two workshop opportunities during the year. Based on candidate needs survey data, veteran teachers offer mini courses on effective practices they use in their classrooms. Candidates are expected to attend and mentors are invited.

Assessment of Candidates

In addition to the regular assessment mentors provide of their candidates via the inquiry process (weekly meetings, feedback from three observations of practice, and ILP work), there are formal assessment procedures in place so that candidates can receive feedback to plan the next step in their ongoing inquiry. The mid-year assessment is an opportunity for candidates to work with their own mentor as well as another mentor to review actions in their ILP and the

impact they have had on their practice. The tool guides the candidates through planning their next steps.

At the end of the first year of induction, candidates participate in an ILP party event, during which they reflect upon their ILP with a mentor other than their own. The purpose is to allow candidates to reflect on their professional development growth, accomplishments, and review their first year of teaching.

At the end of the two-year induction program, candidates re-assess themselves on all six CSTPs and present their inquiry projects to colleagues and administrators at the colloquium. During this colloquium, year 2 candidates present one of their inquiries to their site administrators and site peers. Year 2 candidates use the cumulative evidence of growth from their ILPs as the starting point for the professional growth plan that begins in the candidates' third year of teaching. All of the evidence collected over time is stored in InductionSupport.com and assessed by the program coordinator and lead mentors.

In 2018-19, candidates and mentors will receive a program handbook outlining their roles and responsibilities, the program requirements, and procedures. In the interim, interviews revealed that candidates participate in an orientation meeting at the beginning of the school year where they are informed of program requirements, assessment procedures and the expected results of those assessments. The induction program also uses a Learning Management System known as InductionSupport.com to track event completion data and elements of their ILP. Candidates, in conjunction with their mentors, upload documentation to InductionSupport.com for assessment by the program leader. Resources on use of InductionSupport.com are available in the Learning Management System.

Findings on Standards

After review of program documentation, evidence provided at the site, additional information provided by program and institutional administration, and interviews with candidates, program completers, mentors, site administrators, and employers, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Teacher Induction program except for the following:

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

The induction program's recommendation verification process must include a defensible process of reviewing documentation, a written appeal process for candidates, and a procedure for candidates to repeat portions of the program as needed. However, based on stakeholder interviews, the team was unable to find evidence that a current defensible process has been implemented. While a draft of the defensible process was offered to the team, the document has not been officially adopted by the steering committee and interviews with stakeholders did not reveal awareness of its existence. During interviews conducted with candidates about the induction orientation process, candidates conveyed that they did not receive information about the defensible process. Program leadership expressed that the draft document would be

subsequently reviewed by the steering committee and, upon approval, be placed in the program handbook for participants' access.

Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services – Met with Concerns

Induction program leaders must provide formative feedback to mentors on their work, including establishment of collaborative relationships. However, interviews indicated that a formative assessment system for providing feedback to mentors was not operational and currently under development. While the recruitment of mentors included a rigorous application process, site administrator recommendation, and interviews, a clearly established system of formative feedback to mentors has not been implemented. Nonetheless, the team found evidence of mentor meetings with candidates via logs in the InductionSupport.com system. There was also evidence to support that these meetings had occurred through candidate acknowledgment and/or commentary on their experiences at the meetings.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

| Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Components | Consistently | Inconsistently | Not Evidenced |
| Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure: | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks. | | X | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. | X | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation. | X | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences. | X | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution. | X | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. | | | X |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 | X | | |

| | | | |
|--|------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. | X | | |
| Finding on Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation | Met | Met With Concerns | Not Met |
| | | X | |

Rationale

The education unit is in the initial stages of exploring and articulating the research-based vision of teaching and learning. Work around this has included investigating research-based educator leadership models. Interviews and evidence reviewed at the time of the site visit indicate that the full articulation was not yet complete. The program coordinator will bring this forward to lead mentors and the steering committee as next steps.

Interviews and document review did not identify intentional recruitment efforts to hire faculty who represent diversity. In this geographic region there are limited recruitment efforts to the extent that interviews with Human Resource (HR) administrators indicate that for a recent posting of 10 teaching positions there were 90 applicants.

Additional information applicable to the standard decision

The institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. This is evidenced by both fiscal and human resources. Collaborative experiences include steering committee participation and outreach to the greater educational community. Interviews and documentation provide evidence of consistent steering committee meetings where program advisement, candidate completion, and other program data are discussed. Further collaboration includes participating on steering committees for proximate higher education partners as well as collaboration across the induction community. Stakeholders shared the benefits of hearing from “multiple voices at the table” to better understand “decisions impact on their work.” Other important infrastructure evidence is found in credential and financial services and support.

| Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Components | Consistently | Inconsistently | Not Evidenced |
| Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success. | X | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications. | X | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession. | | | X |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements. | X | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies | X | | |
| Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support | Met | Met With Concerns | Not Met |
| | | X | |

Rationale

Based on document review and stakeholder interviews, the team did not find evidence that the education unit articulates a consistent approach to purposefully recruit and admit candidates to diversify the educator pool. Interviews with human resources representatives and site administrators revealed that typical teaching position vacancies have multiple qualified applicants, and no additional efforts are needed to attract additional, more diverse candidates.

Additional information applicable to the standard decision

The induction program supports the recruitment and retention of teacher candidates through the completion of a teacher referral checklist at point of hire. Each district in the consortium uses this document to communicate awareness of eligible candidates to the induction program. Recent program process modifications have been instituted by which the credential analysts from each of the consortium districts will meet in the fall and spring to discuss and refine communication systems and procedures, as evidenced by meeting agendas, document revisions, and stakeholder interviews. Candidates are assigned a mentor who meets with them on an average of at least one time per week in formal and informal settings. Examples of on-going candidate support and experiences are housed in the InductionSupport.com website in the form of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs), mentor logs, and program milestones. Candidates report, and documents and electronic evidence provide further evidence that candidates participate in a variety of program processes including goal setting with their mentor and administrator (triad), collaborative meetings, topical workshops, and induction guidance experiences.

| Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Components | Consistently | Inconsistently | Not Evidenced |
| The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards. | X | | |
| The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek. | X | | |
| The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program | X | | |
| · Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning. | X | | |
| · Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. | X | | |
| · The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates. | X | | |
| · Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. | X | | |
| · All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice. | X | | |
| · For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California's adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California's student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards. | X | | |

| Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice | Met | Met With Concerns | Not Met |
|--|-----|-------------------|---------|
| | | X | |

Additional information applicable to the standard

Interviews and document review confirmed that the unit designs and implements clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards. Through the induction program, candidates have the opportunity to experience a cohesive and comprehensive series of learning goals guided by the CSTP. Candidates and completers indicated a focus on all students and support for their learning while developing competencies required of their credential. Candidate interviews indicate that during this experience the candidates valued the mentor teachers, the arrangements to observe other teachers, as well as the learning derived from participating in model lessons. “Seeing it in action by a veteran teacher really solidifies the learning”. Other factors that were beneficial and appreciated by candidates include observation of their own teaching and feedback from their mentor. Institutional administration and steering committee members provided evidence that they analyze program and completer data in conjunction with hiring projections which are impacted by anticipated changes to mentor numbers, including the required credential types and teaching experience.

| Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Components | Consistently | Inconsistently | Not Evidenced |
| The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings. | X | | |
| The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates. | X | | |
| Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data. | X | | |
| The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation | X | | |
| Finding on Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement | Met | Met With Concerns | Not Met |

| | | | |
|--|----------|--|--|
| | X | | |
| Additional information applicable to the standard decision | | | |
| <p>The education unit addresses continuous improvement through a variety of systems and supports that are reflected in the Teacher Induction SCV Consortium vision statement, through purposeful mentor recruitment and selection, mentor training in coaching pedagogy and effective exploration and progressive understanding of the CSTP. Document review and stakeholder interviews confirmed that regular assessment, advice and assistance occur from a variety of sources including the steering committee, during the induction triad meeting, and in the context of weekly meetings with their assigned mentor. Regular assessment of program effectiveness is conducted through a mid-year survey, a completer survey, and through a series of experiences housed in the InductionSupport.com resource (Induction Guidance I, II, and III), as well as through reflective conversations between mentor and candidate using the continuum of teaching practice (CTP).</p> | | | |

| Common Standard 5: Program Impact | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Components | Consistently | Inconsistently | Not Evidenced |
| The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards. | X | | |
| The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students. | X | | |
| Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact | Met | Met With Concerns | Not Met |
| | X | | |

Additional information applicable to the standard decision

The institution ensures that candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate P-12 students through the creation of a detailed Individual Learning Plan (ILP). The ILP is collaboratively developed with guidance by the mentor and site administrator and includes goal setting, specific action research, and measurable outcomes. Candidates self-assess using the CSTPs and CTP at various points during the induction process. Candidate's induction goals incorporate the state adopted academic standards and some elements of the CSTPs. Additional opportunities for thoughtful engagement and reflection on best practices in teaching occur as candidates observe veteran teachers, attend content area professional development, and lesson plan with their mentors. The ILP includes a measurable outcome for each area of action research conducted by the candidate to document positive impact on teaching and student learning. Additional qualitative information is collected through program survey data.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Saugus USD teacher induction program provides a two-year program to general education and special education candidates employed in the four participating consortium districts. Each member district contributes financially to provide ongoing infrastructure. This Commission-approved program focuses on a system of in-class mentoring support provided by veteran classroom teachers who are trained to coach induction candidates. The foundations of the program include: 1) the CSTP, 2) a strong relationship between the induction candidate and mentor, 3) growth and reflection, and 4) the state academic content standards. Communication between program leadership, member districts, mentors, and candidates are a strength for the program. All stakeholders commented on how quickly and thoroughly responses were provided.

Program completer survey data from the Commission (2017) provided program statistics compared to state mean and standard deviation. Given high satisfaction with the program, and based on accreditation guidance from the Commission, when completer data suggests program satisfaction it is not necessary to include completers in the site visit interview process. Saugus completer data met the criteria, suggesting completer satisfaction. However, the site visit team did request that a small number of completers be interviewed in order to get a more complete understanding of their experience. Based on interviews and the completer survey data referenced above, it is clear that candidates view the induction program as overwhelmingly supportive of their daily work in the classroom and not just as a pathway for clearing their credential. They repeatedly mentioned the value they derived from frequent observations, observations of others, and model lessons by mentors. Evidence from the ILP (goals and growth-focused activities) suggests the induction program is making great progress in being able to evaluate program impact. Steering committee and program leadership expressed the importance and a passion for continuing the work.

As the Lead Education Agency, Saugus USD could strengthen their understanding and operationalize their leadership and responsibilities to support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity.