

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Greenfield Union School District

**Professional Services Division
January 2019**

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Greenfield 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** 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	6		

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: Greenfield Union School District

Dates of Visit: October 22-24, 2018

2018-19 Accreditation

Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Previous History of Accreditation Status
<i>Although Greenfield Union 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 visit is the first accreditation site visit for this institution.</i>

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with program leadership, district leadership, site administrators, professional development providers, academic coaches, mentors, candidates, program completers, regional partners, and steering committee members. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Program Standards

All program standards are **Met** for the teacher induction program.

Common Standards

All common standards are **Met** for the institution.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found that all standards for the teacher induction program were met and that all common standards were met, the team recommends **Accreditation**.

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

Teacher Induction

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Greenfield Union School District be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Greenfield 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:	Sean McCarthy Murrieta Valley Unified School District
Common Standards:	Cathleen Hampton New Haven Unified School District
Programs Cluster:	Karen Rock Santa Clara Unified School District
Staff to the Visit:	Miranda Gutierrez Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Documentation	Program Review Documentation
Common Standards Addendum	Program Review Addendum
Individual Learning Plans	Candidates Advisement Materials
Individual Learning Plan Rubrics	Budget Reports
Accreditation Website	Training/Workshop Agendas
Kern Induction Collaborative Agendas	Job Descriptions
CTC Completer Survey Results	Recruitment Tools
Preconditions Report and Response	Collaboration Logs
Mentor Meeting Agendas	Mentor Evaluation Tools
Steering Committee Meeting Agendas	Program Handbook
Continuum for Teaching Assessments	Program Survey Results
Training Presentations/Resources	Assessment Cycle Schedule
Professional Development Calendar	Inquiry Planning Forms
Professional Development Provider Resumes	Inquiry Cycle Presentation Rubric
Mentor Resumes	Inquiry Reflection Forms

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	12
Completers	7
Site Administration	8
Institutional Administration	4
Program Coordinators	3
Mentors	11
Professional Development Providers	4
Credential Analysts and Staff	2
Steering Committee Members	9
Regional Partners	14
TOTAL	74

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

Greenfield Union School District (GFUSD) is located in Kern County in the city of Bakersfield. GFUSD is comprised of approximately 9,400 students in transitional kindergarten through eighth grade in 12 schools (8 elementary, 3 middle, and 1 community). Within the district, 88% of all students are socio-economically disadvantaged. The overall student population is diverse with over 80% Hispanic, 7% African American, 6% white, 2% Asian, more than 1% homeless and foster youth, and 27% English learners.

Education Unit

The GFUSD Teacher Induction Program (TIP) is housed within the Curriculum department and is the only Commission-approved program at GFUSD. The program is led by two program administrators with 28 mentors. Through the Kern Induction Collaborative (KIC), the TIP collaborates with other Teacher Induction programs and institutes of higher education within the region.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2017-18)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2018-19)
Teacher Induction	17	40

The Visit

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

Program Reports Teacher Induction

Program Design

The Greenfield Union School District (GFUSD) teacher induction program is housed and supported by the Curriculum Department. The induction program has two program administrators who run the day to day and long term planning of the program, reporting to the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum. Curriculum specialists, academic coaches, and full time teachers serve as mentors who provide one-on-one assistance and support to the induction candidates. The mentors and candidates meet weekly providing “just in time” support and helping them with the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) stages as verified in interviews. The candidates attend an orientation meeting in August to receive information about the program. They then attend monthly meetings for all induction candidates to review work that needs to be turned in, and to receive professional development. The candidates and mentors use inductionsupport.com for all of its tracking needs. The candidates can find all of the resources for the program, calendar of events, completion records, mentoring resources, documents, surveys, reminders for upcoming events/trainings or milestones that are due. It also is a tracking tool to ensure that candidates have met all requirements to clear their credential.

Interviews and a review of program documents confirm that the program communicates with stakeholders through multiple means. The steering committee meets twice a year with membership from candidates, mentors, curriculum specialists, union representatives, principals, assistant superintendents, and induction leadership. They share data from the surveys and make adjustments to the program as needed with this group. The Kern Induction Collaborative meets monthly with Institutes of Higher Education (IHE), induction programs, and the county office of education in attendance. They collaborate on the ILP transition document from the preliminary program, professional development opportunities, and other areas of need when they arise.

Interviews and a review of program documents confirm mentors receive communication about the program at their monthly mentor meetings. They review the work that is coming up for their candidates, and they receive training for “just in time” support, as well as mentoring and coaching tools.

Interviews with site administrators verify that communication from the program occurs throughout the year. Administrators hear from the induction leadership monthly at their Administrator Leadership Team (ALT) meetings for the district. They also get weekly updates through the superintendent’s email to administrators. The site administrators attend a triad meeting with candidates and mentors to share input on the candidates’ ILP goals. At this time, administrators can suggest optional professional development that could help them with their goal.

As confirmed in interviews, induction has a clear admissions process. After attending the orientation meeting in August, candidates are paired with a mentor. Candidates complete a class profile, observe another teacher, and have their mentor observe them teaching. The candidates and mentors attend a triad meeting with their site administrators to share goal ideas. All this information is used to guide candidates and their mentors in creating their ILP professional goals. After that meeting, the ILP goals are created in stage 1 of the ILP. This guides the candidates work for the year.

Program leadership uses data from multiple sources to make ongoing program improvements. One such change was based on feedback gathered from the Site Administrator Survey, which prompted the program's inclusion on the agenda at the monthly ALT meetings to better inform site administrators about the induction program. Also, beginning in January 2019 they will add another way to give formative feedback to each mentor after the mentor sets their goals.

Program Completer Survey data for 2017-2018 garnered responses from 17 completers (100%). Fifteen of the candidates were paired from the point of hire to two months into their teaching assignment. All 17 finished within two years. All 17 completers found their support provider to be helpful/very helpful in impacting student learning. Additionally, all 17 thought they were well matched with their support provider. Overall, after close review of the survey data, the team felt satisfied with determining that the program had successfully served these completers of the teacher induction program.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The course of study for GFUSD teacher induction candidates takes place primarily with their mentor while working on their inquiries. Candidates attend an induction orientation in August where they are informed of program completion requirements. After attending the orientation meeting in August they get paired with a mentor. The candidates fill out a class profile where they identify students that may need extra support in their classroom. They share and discuss this with their mentors. Then the candidates observe another teacher at a different site in the same teaching assignment. Next, the mentors observe the candidates teaching. The candidates and mentors attend a triad meeting with their site administrator to share goal ideas. All this information is then used to guide the candidates and their mentors in creating the candidates' ILP goals and completing stage 1 in the ILP. This guides the candidates' work for the year.

Throughout the year, the candidates have monthly induction meetings reviewing/clarifying the ILP process and receiving information about the next steps in the program. They are also encouraged to attend professional development that will assist them with their goals.

In stage 2 of the ILP, the candidates work on an inquiry based on the goals created in stage 1. The two parts to the inquiry are planning and reflection. Within the inquiry planning they have an inquiry question, lesson series goals, data gathering resources and strategies, CSTP self-assessment and focus elements, impact on student learning, and evidence. Within the inquiry reflection, they reflect on their professional goal, inquiry question, resources, impact on students, and developing as an educator. They put the progress toward their goal, next steps, additional support, their inquiry question, and anticipated outcomes on the ILP.

Stage 3 of the ILP is their end of the year reflection on how they met their two professional goals, how their instructional practice has evolved, how their goals impacted student achievement, and areas of growth for the following year.

After they have completed their inquiry and all three stages of the ILP, they then have an inquiry cycle presentation where they share their inquiry findings within a small group including mentors. Following the presentation, the year two candidates have an exit interview with one of the induction leaders to share their inquiry growth.

During all of the stages there are multiple opportunities for optional professional development. This could be sponsored by the district, neighboring districts, or local universities. The GFUSD induction program supports educator preparation by implementing a mentoring-focused system of support, candidate self-assessment based on the CSTP, long-term analysis of teaching practice through an ILP, and an inquiry cycle that supports candidate growth.

Assessment of Candidates

As confirmed through interviews and program documents the candidates are assessed using multiple measures. They use inductionsupport.com to assure all candidates have met the requirements of each milestone and trainings attended. This includes their self-assessment on the elements within the CSTP. They also use inductionsupport.com as a tracking tool to ensure that candidates have met all requirements to clear their credential. This is where candidates upload the documentation that the program utilizes to assess candidate competencies, including ILP and inquiry forms, collaboration hours, and meeting attendance. The induction leaders use an ILP rubric to ensure candidates are meeting the standards that the program has established to measure candidate competency. The candidates do an inquiry cycle presentation where they are scored on a rubric to confirm they meet program standards. The year 2 candidates also have an exit interview with one of the induction leaders to share their growth on the CSTP. Once all requirements have been determined to be met, candidates are recommended for a clear credential by program leadership.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with program leadership, district

leaders, site administrators, candidates, completers, mentors, professional development providers, and academic coaches, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the teacher induction program.

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 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. 	X		
<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		
<p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision</p> <p>Greenfield Union School District’s teacher induction program works with relevant stakeholders who are actively involved in coordination, organization, and decision making, as affirmed through interviews and examination of evidence, to prepare candidates to effectively implement the state adopted content standards. Interviews with program leadership and reviews of budget information indicate that sufficient resources are allocated and substantive institutional support is provided to allow for the effective operation of the program. Active collaborations with IHE partners have strengthened recruitment efforts and supported transition of candidates from preliminary programs to the induction program. Interviews confirm that this has supported the district’s efforts to hire and retain candidates who represent and support diversity. Site administrators and district leaders report that mentors are highly skilled at supporting candidates while ensuring the full range of diverse learners meet the state adopted content standards. Candidates report that their mentors are highly capable and supportive, effectively balancing long-term analysis of teaching practice through the Individual Learning Plan with “just in time” support to help meet the diverse needs of their students. Interviews and a review of evidence indicate that a clearly delineated process is carefully monitored to ensure all candidates recommended for a clear credential have met all requirements.</p>			

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		
<p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision</p> <p>The Greenfield Union School District teacher induction program recruits and admits candidates who hold an appropriate preliminary credential. District leadership reports that recruitment efforts and partnerships have helped make the educator pool among the most diverse in the state. District personnel provide support, advice, and assistance to promote the candidate’s successful entry into the profession starting with a comprehensive orientation to the school district and continuing with aid and communication about requirements and resources. Credential analysts shared their roles in assisting candidates from the date of hire through the application for a clear credential, and monitoring progress throughout the induction experience to help ensure success through the use of digital tools and ongoing communication with program leadership. Interviews with candidates and mentors affirmed that the program consistently defines performance expectations and provides resources and support for meeting those expectations, both onsite and online. Clearly defined processes are in place for candidates who need additional support, and program leadership reported that candidates were able to successfully use these tools to “get back on track” as needed, resulting in all candidates successfully meeting expectations for the past two years based on an analysis of completion data.</p>			

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	X		

opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.			
Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met		
<p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision</p> <p>The development of candidates’ knowledge and skills in teaching a diverse population is the program’s focus. To establish teaching context, a class profile is created and the candidate observes an exemplary teacher. With site administrator and mentor input, the candidate establishes individualized professional goals aligned with district and site initiatives. All involved stated that they find this triad meeting valuable. Support in meeting these goals is provided through mentor advisement, district professional development, and monthly induction meetings. Through the ILP inquiry process, candidates implement new strategies based on student needs, and reflect on their effectiveness with guidance from their mentor. This reflection is evidenced throughout the ILP process. Candidates demonstrate their growth in the CSTP through a rubric-assessed presentation and a year 2 exit interview. Candidates report the ILP process is positive and allows them to take ownership of their learning.</p> <p>Mentors are selected by an application with an established criteria. They receive both initial and ongoing training in mentoring and “just in time” support. Mentors are assigned based on credential and teaching context to ensure mentor knowledge of effective practices in each setting. The program employs multiple measures to assess mentor effectiveness, including candidate feedback data, analysis of observations, and monitoring of collaborative logs.</p>			
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		
<p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision</p> <p>The induction program’s approach to continuous improvement includes an ongoing collection and study of data from all stakeholder groups. These multiple measures are used to assess and provide specific data on the effectiveness of the program, course of study, support services provided, and candidate competence. Data sources include program surveys administered to candidates, mentors, and administrators, the program completer survey, candidate ILPs, collaborative logs, and other milestones on inductionsupport.com. Interviews indicate that regular examination and analysis of the data collected informs improvements to program components. For example, site administrators report an increase in communication by the program leadership after they shared this need on a survey. The program leadership confirms that they intentionally made modifications to the program based on this data.</p> <p>The program’s involvement in the Kern Induction Collaborative (KIC) provides a venue to gather information from IHE’s regarding candidates’ preparation as well as collaborate with other induction programs on how to make improvements to GFUSD’s induction program. The interview with KIC verified the strong collaborative relationship and indicated they have seen the program evolve and improve.</p> <p>Interviews with candidates, mentors, steering committee, site administrators and program leadership verified that data-driven decisions provided systematic improvements to the program.</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
<p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision</p> <p>The Greenfield teacher induction program ensures that candidates are meeting state adopted standards and demonstrating growth in the CSTP through the ILP inquiry process, inquiry cycle presentations, and exit interviews. Interviews with candidates and mentors confirmed that opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate practices that have a positive impact on teaching and learning included mentor observations, peer observations, and professional development. There is an emphasis on meeting the diverse needs of the district’s student population as evidenced by the selection of PD foci and confirmed by interviews. The site administrators reported seeing the growth in student achievement as a result of candidates participating in induction. The completers reported their participation in induction continues to impact their teaching and learning after the program. As one said, “I continue to be focused on being reflective and establishing goals beyond induction.”</p>	

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Greenfield Union School District teacher induction program has developed a researched-based system of support for teachers founded on its vision to create a “student-centered district dedicated to preparing each student for a life which is productive academically, physically, socially, emotionally, and economically.” Their collaborative approach to induction involves an array of stakeholders, from district leadership to institutes of higher education. Program leadership works closely with the steering committee, which includes district leadership, site administrators, academic coaches, mentors, and candidates, for advisement on program direction to help ensure it is responsive to teacher needs and aligned to district goals. Collaboration with the Kern Induction Collaborative has resulted in mutually beneficial partnerships, facilitating the transition from the preliminary program to induction, and producing professional development opportunities for candidates. District leaders and academic coaches are also active in the support of the program, providing many relevant professional development choices for candidates that support their individual learning plans. The collaborative approach to program development and candidate support is a distinctive feature of the program, and completer survey data indicates that program design is positively impacting candidate practice.

Another key trait of the GFUSD teacher induction program is its mentoring. The quality of mentorship was consistently identified as a strength of the program. Candidates and site administrators consistently affirmed throughout the visit that mentors were highly effective, and that collaboration between mentors and their candidates was the key to supporting growth and development. Mentors were consistently available, as affirmed both through candidate and completer interviews and via collaboration logs, and were deft at helping develop appropriate goals for individual learning plans while facilitating the inquiry process. Candidates also reported that their mentors were equally adept providing “just in time”

support for every day challenges they faced and were “the best part” of their induction program.