

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the  
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at  
Bay Area School of Enterprise – Reach Institute**

**Professional Services Division**

**May, 2021**

**Overview of this Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Bay Area School of Enterprise Reach Institute**. 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 Major Stipulations** is made for the institution.

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

<b>Common Standards</b>	<b>Status</b>
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	<b>Met with Concerns</b>
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	<b>Met with Concerns</b>
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	<b>Met with Concerns</b>
4) Continuous Improvement	<b>Not Met</b>
5) Program Impact	<b>Met with Concerns</b>

**Program Standards**

<b>Programs</b>	<b>Total Program Standards</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern/Single Subject Intern	6	5	1	0
Teacher Induction	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential	9	4	5	0
Clear Administrative Services Credential	5	2	3	0

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

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

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

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

**Institution:** Bay Area School of Enterprise- Reach Institute

**Dates of Visit:** February 22-24, 2021

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

**Previous History of Accreditation Status**

<b>Accreditation Reports</b>	<b>Accreditation Status</b>
Date: May 20, 2012 <a href="#">Accreditation-Report-for-Reach-Institute.pdf</a>	<a href="#">Accreditation with Stipulations</a>
Date: August 1, 2013 <a href="#">Removal-of-Stipulations</a>	<a href="#">Accreditation</a>

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Major 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, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit’s operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** for the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All preconditions have been determined to be aligned.

Program Standards

Multiple Subject/Single Subject Intern-

Standard 3, Clinical Practice: Met with Concerns

Teacher Induction-

All Standards Met

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential-

Standard 2, Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination: Met with Concerns

Standard 3, Development of Professional Leadership Perspectives: Met with Concerns

Standard 4, Equity, Diversity, and Access: Met with Concerns

Standard 5, Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society: Met with Concerns

Standard 7, Nature of Field Experiences: Met with Concerns

#### Clear Administrative Services Credential-

Standard 2, Program Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination: Met with Concerns

Standard 3, Selection and Training of Coaches: Met with Concerns

Standard 5, California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: Met with Concerns

#### Common Standards

Common Standard 1, Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation; Common Standard 2, Candidate Recruitment and Support; Common Standard 3, Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice; and Common Standard 5, Program Impact were Met with Concerns. Common Standard 4, Continuous Improvement was Not Met.

#### Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found that Standard 3 for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Intern credential program was Met with Concerns; all the Teacher Induction program standards were met; Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential were Met with Concerns; Standards 2, 3, and 5 for the Clear Administrative Services Credential were Met with Concerns; Common Standards 1, 2, 3, and 5 were Met with Concerns, and Common Standard 4 was Not Met, the team recommends **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

1. That the institution provide evidence that it actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.
2. That the institution provide evidence that it 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.
3. That the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) and Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC) programs provide evidence that all faculty who teach and supervise courses and field experiences are qualified and have a thorough understanding of California public schools including content knowledge, knowledge of current context including state adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems, knowledge of diversity in society, and demonstration of effective professional practices.
4. That the institution provide evidence that information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of PASC and CASC program requirements.
5. That the PASC and CASC programs provide evidence that site-based supervisors are credentialed, carefully selected, trained, and oriented to provide effective, knowledgeable support for candidates.

6. That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive continuous improvement process in which both the unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness and make appropriate modifications based on findings. This process must include the systematic collection, analysis, and use of candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations.
7. That the institution provide evidence that the continuous improvement process collects feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the programs.
8. That the PASC and CASC programs provide evidence that it documents the process through which it ensures that all candidates know and demonstrate the knowledge and skills required by the standards prior to recommendation for a credential.
9. Within one year of this action, REACH must host a re-visit to collect evidence of actions taken to address the stipulation(s) noted above.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Reach Institute be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Reach Institute 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.

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.

Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Intern  
Teacher Induction  
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential  
Clear Administrative Services Credential

## **Accreditation Team**

### **Team Lead:**

Robert Perry  
Los Angeles Unified School District

### **Common Standards:**

Connie Best  
Davis Joint Unified School District

### **Staff to the Visit:**

Bob Loux  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

### **Programs Reviewers:**

Terri M. Pieretti  
National University

Julie Holmes  
High Tech High

Amy Gimino  
California State Polytechnic University,  
Pomona

### **Documents Reviewed**

Common Standards Submission  
Program Review Submission  
Common Standards Addendum  
Program Review Addendum  
Course Syllabi  
Accreditation Website

Faculty Vitae  
Assessment Materials  
Faculty and Candidate Handbooks  
Precondition Responses  
Accreditation Data Dashboard

### Interviews Conducted

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Candidates	43
Completers	20
Employers	28
Institutional Administration	8
Program Coordinators	5
Faculty	6
Program Supervisors	10
Mentors	5
Credential Analysts and Staff	2
Instructors of Professional Development	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>131</b>

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

## Background Information

Bay Area School of Enterprise Reach Institute for School Leadership () is a private, nonprofit Institution of Higher Education, accredited by the WASC Senior College and University Commission. Based in Oakland, CA in Alameda County, Reach was founded by a team of 15 teacher-leaders who were inspired to design a new way to develop, credential, and support teachers and educational leaders. Their experience, having matriculated through various teacher preparation programs, was that their programming was disconnected from their practice and rendered them unprepared for the reality of teaching in the classroom. Reach holds firmly the belief that great teaching is at the heart of every great school. In order to change the student achievement outcomes that persist in our urban and rural schools, Reach employs a focus on both instruction and job-embedded learning that impacts their learners' daily work. They aim to produce teachers and leaders who have the knowledge, skill, and capacity to disrupt, at a classroom, school, or district level, the teaching-learning gaps that lead to educational inequities.

## Education Unit

Reach is composed of two academies: the Teaching Academy and the Instructional Leadership Academy. The Teaching Academy houses the Intern and Teacher Induction and Clear Credentialing (TICC) programs. The Instructional Leadership Academy (ILA) houses the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services Credential Programs. The Teaching Academy is overseen by a director. The intern program has three faculty members and the TICC Program has two adjunct faculty members. The ILA has one program coordinator who also serves as the faculty member. The intern program currently serves 68 candidates, while the TICC Program supports 126. Sixteen participants are currently enrolled in the ILA, eight each in the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services Credential Programs.

The majority of students that Reach participants serve are students of color, English language learners, newcomers, and low-income youth in communities throughout the Bay Area including Alameda, Santa Clara, and Contra Costa Counties, and in cities like Oakland, Richmond, and San Jose.

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Number of Program Completers (2019-20)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)</b>
Multiple Subject and Single Subject Intern (Preliminary Teaching Credential)	24	68
Teacher Induction (Clear Teaching Credential)	49	126
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential	11	8



<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Number of Program Completers (2019-20)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)</b>
Clear Administrative Services Credential	10	8

**The Visit**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team and institutional stakeholders were interviewed via technology.

**PRECONDITION FINDINGS**

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

## **PROGRAM REPORTS**

### **Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Intern**

#### **Program Design**

The two-year Intern program, housed within the Teaching Academy (TA), is designed to maximize the nature of on-the-job training of teachers who earn their preliminary Multiple and Single Subject credentials while in the classroom. The program includes an intern pathway delivered in-person at Oakland International High School (OIHS), and at multiple locations in the East Bay, South Bay and San Francisco regions. As highlighted by current intern candidates and alumni, Reach provides a highly supportive alternative pathway to earn their California credential. In order to be eligible for the program, students can work in non-teacher of record capacities while completing subject-matter competency the first year, but must obtain their intern credential and be placed as the teacher of record the second year. The program's focus is to prepare interns to apply an action researcher's mindset to solving problems of practice and to refine and expand their effectiveness through cycles of inquiry.

The TA is overseen by Reach's Dean of the Graduate School, President, and the Board of Directors. The Intern Program is led by the TA Director and a lead faculty member and is supported by a Student Support Associate/Credential Analyst (SSA/CA). The TA Director is responsible for overseeing program goals and plans, curriculum and assessment, communication and student support services, district partnerships and teaching and coaching assignments to ensure program standards are met. Additionally, the director oversees the four full-time program faculty and three part-time subject specific pedagogy instructors who are experienced Pre-K-12 teachers. Three of the full-time TA faculty teach exclusively within the Intern program.

As confirmed by interviews and documents, meetings between partner school administration and Reach faculty and staff take place at the beginning of the year to review MOUs, roles, and responsibilities. The program provides an initial orientation training for preparation program supervisors (instructional coaches) and school site-based supervisors (mentors) to communicate roles and expectations.

Veteran Reach mentors reported having clear communication and guidance on what is expected; whereas new mentors reported they were unclear about what they needed to submit and when, and desired clearer communication, advance notice, and progress-monitoring check-in meetings. A few mentors commended the program for addressing questions and concerns in a timely and effective manner whenever interns were overwhelmed, were not responding to inquiries, or faced personal issues.

#### **Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)**

Candidates first fulfill the state requirements for an Intern Teaching Credential, which include the completion of a 120-hour summer pre-service "Introduction to Teaching Methods and Leadership" seminar course. Multiple and Single Subject candidates then complete two years of

combined coursework aligned with the program standards and TPEs, which consists of weekly in-person seminars and online modules along with practicum assignments, online collaboration, and individual coaching support. Interns complete a five-unit seminar each semester where they receive explicit instruction in the curriculum (Year 1: Foundations of Teaching and Learning; and Knowledge of Students and Planning; Year 2: Assessing Learning and Supporting Equitable Outcomes; and Developing as a Professional Educator) and apply the curriculum to their clinical practice and field experiences. In the spring, they spend six weeks focusing on subject-specific pedagogy (SSP) with an instructor who is an expert in their content area and small inquiry groups of peers teaching the same content area. They unpack the standards and complete a “Plan, Teach, Analyze, Reflect” (PTAR) cycle in their content area in the spring and then complete a summer assignment where they design an SSP unit and assessments to implement the next year.

Throughout the program, candidates meet in cohorts and small inquiry groups designed to address their needs. Alumni and candidates touted their regular meetings and discussions with peers as one of the most valuable components of the program and appreciated being able to address problems of practice and learn from peers with diverse backgrounds and experiences.

Onsite mentors attend an orientation and receive at least 10 hours of training related to Reach’s program, cognitive coaching, inclusive education, instructional strategies for diverse learners, and the CalTPA. Instructional coaches complete at least six formal observations per semester, with some direct coaching and feedback every two-three weeks. Observations are often video-recorded and annotated to promote interns’ reflection on practice, evidence-based feedback, and preparation for the CalTPA cycles. Interns meet with their site coaches regularly and feel well-supported, though through interviews, candidates commented that not all the district employed supervisors held clear credentials in their specific subject area.

Interns appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback to their instructors on what was working and possible changes at the end of each class session. Many mentioned subtle, but meaningful enhancements, such as spending more time and providing additional resources on topics, allowing for alternative forms or formats for assignments, and extending deadlines when interns were overwhelmed with work and/or personal matters. Documentation and interviews also conveyed more substantive changes, such as adding two PTAR cycles focused on how candidates and their students use technology in the classroom to better support candidates with the demands of virtual instruction and CalTPA Cycle 2.

Program faculty shared that they gather feedback from interns after each class session and revisit the feedback at the start of the next class meeting. They also said that interns and alumni provide feedback through end-of-semester and end-of-program surveys that are shared at program meetings. Meetings between partner school administration, Reach staff, and faculty before the academic school year provide additional feedback on the program. Program faculty review program and student learning data at mid-year and end-of-year meetings.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Candidate proficiency in the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) is assessed throughout the program using an iterative curriculum and field-based process. The Reach student handbook and course syllabi highlight the TPEs that will be assessed. During the first summer, candidates complete various Plan, Analyze and Reflect (PTAR) cycles and develop an Individual Learning Plan to prepare them for their first semester of teaching. Each subsequent semester candidates, complete multiple PTAR cycles that provide formative and summative assessments of the TPEs addressed in coursework. At the same time, instructional coaches and mentors monitor candidate progress on the TPEs and their Individual Learning Plan (ILP) goals to guide the development of their subsequent ILPs.

Data from the California Teaching Performance Assessments (CalTPA) and exit surveys convey candidates are “prepared” and “well prepared” with regard to the TPEs. In 2018-2019, Intern first and best attempt pass rates for combined average CalTPA Cycle 1 and 2 scores were 94% compared to the state’s 96% and 100% compared to the state’s 99%, respectively. Although scores have declined since COVID, they are comparable with the state averages and the program has implemented and documented changes to support candidates with virtual instruction.

Candidates and faculty members track and communicate progress via Reach’s online learning management system (Canvas). Student support services also ensure candidates meet requirements to maintain eligibility by tracking progress of program and credential requirements over the course of the two years. The Student Services Associate provides ongoing communication about timelines and deadlines.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Intern Program except for the following:

#### **Standard 3: Clinical Practice – Met with Concerns**

The program does not consistently select district-employed supervisors (mentors) who hold a Clear Credential in the content area for which they are providing supervision.

## **Teacher Induction**

### **Program Design**

The Reach Teacher Induction and Clear Credentialing Program (TICC) was accredited by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in 2007 to offer participants the opportunity to clear their Single Subject and Multiple Subject credentials through a two-year, individualized, job-embedded program. In 2017, TICC revised the program design, to include the addition of the Clear Education Specialist program, in order to align to the new California Induction standards. The program has supported over 530 teachers in earning their Clear Multiple Subject, Single

Subject, and Education Specialist credentials. Induction includes one-on-one mentoring , observations, and a development of a series of Individual Learning Plan (ILP) goals, rooted in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), to set goals and measure professional growth over time.

The TICC Teaching Academy Director provides overall coordination of the induction program, mentors, faculty and support staff. The TICC leadership team consists of the Teaching Academy Director, two adjunct faculty members and a Student Services Associate. The leadership team meets monthly, to plan, monitor, and review assessments. The Teaching Academy Director and Student Services Associate meet weekly to discuss participant issues and logistical support. Interviews confirmed that the program collects feedback through a mid-year and end-of-year program survey to participating teachers and mentors.

Mentors are identified at each school site and are provided training by the TICC program. If no clear credentialed staff is available at the participating teacher's placement to provide support, TICC can provide a trained mentor. The program collaborates with school coordinators, liaisons, and/or administrators to select mentors who meet qualifying criteria. Participating teachers are matched to a trained, subject aligned, preferably on-site mentor, with the same clear credential that the participating teacher is seeking to clear. Mentors have a CLAD or English Language Learner authorization on their clear credential. Interviews with participants, mentors, and program leadership indicate that in the first year, induction candidates are matched with a mentor during the first 30 days. In the first 60 days, mentors and candidates work together to create an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) and determine one to two CSTP elements of strength and growth.

TICC designed their mentor program as a research-based, cognitive coaching model blended with learning focused conversations and a focus on coaching for equity. New mentors attend nine monthly trainings (one per month) of coaching fundamentals. Experienced mentors attend four trainings each year. Mentors meet with their participating teacher at least one hour per week, conduct and share the findings from four observations, and attend coaching trainings throughout the year. Induction participants conduct an observation of an experienced teacher. Interviews with candidates and mentors confirmed a robust mentoring program has been developed to support participant growth.

Review of documentation as well as interviews with past and present induction participants, mentors, faculty, and program coordinators verify that the structure ensures effective delivery of support to participating teachers. Consistency of program delivery was validated by current participants, completers, mentors and faculty.

### **Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)**

Induction begins with candidates attending an orientation at various locations across the Bay Area, including San Francisco, Oakland, and the Peninsula/South Bay. The program uses the Canvas Learning Management System as a portal for submission of work and artifacts.

Interviews confirmed that the program regularly communicates with candidates and mentors. At the beginning of the year, mentor and candidates meet with the candidate's school administrator for a triad meeting. This meeting is a time for the candidate to share with their employer and mentor their ILP goal(s), needed resources, and how the team can support and offer guidance.

The program uses the ILP process, grounded in teacher efficacy, as the candidate's roadmap. The ILP process is designed to guide participating teachers, with the assistance of a trained mentor, through a series of inquiry based critical thinking activities that support their growth as reflective practitioners. Each inquiry cycle focuses on one or more of the standards within the CSTPs forming the lenses by which the candidates assess their teaching and measures their professional growth over time. The mentor trainings were developed to provide resources and tools that would support participants with their ILP and mastery of the CSTPs. Participating teachers confirmed through interviews that they appreciated the flexibility of the ILP process and how the program encouraged alignment of ILP goals to the mission and vision of their school site.

### **Assessment of Induction Candidates**

The assessment process is individualized to each candidate's context. The induction candidates complete both formative and summative assessments of their growth and development as practitioners based on the CSTPs. Candidates, mentors, faculty, and program leadership indicated that all induction teachers participate in the following during each year of the program: at least four mentor observations of their teaching practice, candidate observation of a veteran teacher, and complete one ILP inquiry cycle in year one and two ILP inquiry cycles in year two. In year two, candidates have the choice of completing a second ILP or creating a video presentation of learning to demonstrate growth to mentors and program personnel. All inquiry cycles culminate with candidates successfully completing a summative assessment called Synthesis of Learning. The program offers a remediation process if participants do not reach proficiency.

Throughout the year, participants submit all assignments and evidence of their teaching and learning on Canvas, the program's Learning Management System. Program leaders review and provide formative feedback to all candidates in order to ensure adequate progress is being made. Candidates submit their weekly mentor log which is assessed twice a year. Attendance at the orientation and the completion of the mid-year and end-of-year survey are also assessed as progress of program completion.

An examination of program documents as well as interviews with past and present induction participants, mentors, program leaders, administrators and other stakeholder groups verify that the leadership structure assesses induction participants effectively and consistently. Consistency of program delivery was validated by program leadership, mentors, and current and past participants.

## **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with participating teachers, alumni, faculty, and employers, the team determined that all program standards are **met**.

### **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential**

#### **Program Design**

The Preliminary Administrative Service Credential (PASC) program for the Reach Institute for School Leadership is known as the Instructional Leadership Academy (ILA). The program design was conceptualized to promote relational trust across school communities and anchored to a theoretical model utilizing Anthony Bryk's work around essential supports necessary for school improvement. A centerpiece in the program design is the focus on helping candidates analyze possible causes for equity challenges in schools. The coursework is job-embedded and features a monthly coaching format which is considered a signature of Reach's inquiry-based approach. The ILA was designed to personalize instruction in support of the individual aspirations of candidates. Therefore, in addition to the individual one-on-one coaching support, candidates are organized into small cohorts to promote collective learning opportunities amongst the members of the cohort. The ILA was designed to provide candidates with a three-year journey that it is linked directly to the Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC); candidates are provided with the option to complete an Action Research Master's Degree in the second year, and then, in year three, complete the CASC program, or to not complete the Masters portion.

Presently, the program is recovering from a staff restructuring implemented in September 2020 to avert severe fiscal distress which at the time threatened Reach's ability to continue operations. Leadership indicated that these efforts were ultimately successful in achieving fiscal sustainability, and as of March 2021, the organization now has a nine-month financial reserve. Notably, as part of the restructuring, three instructors departed the program. Communication, however, remains a significant challenge for Reach. Leadership reflects that although town halls were held for situational awareness, communication with all stakeholders about this restructuring and the resulting lag in program activities could have been more systematic and transparent with due consideration given to the confidentiality of some personnel decisions, and the urgency of the financial circumstances. The current leadership team is committed to re-enfranchising any stakeholders who feel disenfranchised by the recent events.

As discussed previously in this report, the Reach Institute consists of two postbaccalaureate academies: the Teaching Academy and the Instructional Leadership Academy which facilitates the PASC program. Oversight for both falls under the Reach Institute Dean of the Graduate School, their President, the Reach Chancellor, and the Reach Board of Directors. However, due to the situation described above, evidence gathered at the site visit was insufficient to substantiate that the organizational structure is in place to drive the program deliverables. In PASC there is one program coordinator who, together with the Graduate Dean, oversees both the PASC program and the CASC program.

The program coordinator's responsibilities include working with the Graduate Dean to ensure the implementation of the program design elements, compliance with Commission requirements, coordination with student services and teaching the program. The program coordinator also has coaching responsibilities.

The leadership structure and process that directly supports the PASC program was intended to be driven by weekly meetings between the program coordinator, faculty, and the Dean/Chief Academic Officer. However, based upon interviews with the lone faculty member charged with the management and teaching of all courses in the PASC, the meetings may occur weekly or every other week. There was no evidence to support that the Dean/CAO meets with the executive director every two weeks to ensure leadership alignment within the program. Since there is only one faculty member, the program did not provide evidence that there are monthly or twice monthly meetings with other faculty to receive updates related to the program and updates related to the overall Reach Institute program.

Evidence was provided by the program in their written program description that communication with candidates is initiated in the admission process. Feedback from candidates is solicited and utilized throughout the program to adjust the curriculum throughout the program but due to the situation described above, evidence gathered at the site visit was insufficient to support that any candidate feedback is contributing to program adjustments throughout the program.

Reach's PASC program consists of eight courses which start with the Instructional Leadership Residency course which has three summer online modules embedded into it. In this course, the candidates execute their initial context analysis leading to the completion of an equity audit and there was sufficient evidence provided by alumni in the program that this was a rigorous and extremely beneficial part of the program. Interviews with alumni indicated that the coursework was also directly aligned with the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) requirements, so alumni felt adequately prepared to submit their cycles and in fact all alumni interviewed had submitted and most passed all three cycles. The clinical supervision hours are embedded into this course as is the completion and submission of the CalAPA cycles. After completion of this course, the candidates complete two more courses on instructional coaching and equity coaching. Candidates then move into a three-seminar series that focuses on data-based professional development. Each of the courses are designed to embed fieldwork experiences that align with the standards.

At the beginning of the year, the PASC leadership convenes district and school partners along with PASC faculty in a partner meeting to go over the program requirements and expectations on the PASC requirements, the course work and the fieldwork. Although the program has a history of holding partner meetings as described in the program documents, due to the recent reorganization, there was no evidence to support that the program held a partner meeting and provided a clear and meaningful update about the program changes that went into effect in the month following the scheduled partner meeting.



The handbook is well organized and describes a powerful vision for fieldwork, but there was insufficient evidence from site visit interviews to confirm that program partners, who were primarily school district employers, were knowledgeable about the handbook or that the field experiences themselves were designed to build shared understanding as depicted in the handbook.

### **Course of Study**

The ILA program sequence is a three-year program that integrates Preliminary Administrative Services Credential components with an action research-based Master's Degree in Instructional Leadership followed by the attainment of a Clear the Administrative Services Credential. The program was designed to embed actual job experiences (fieldwork) throughout the program, but the evidence presented was insufficient to demonstrate that candidates were applying theoretical concepts in authentic settings as depicted in the program handbook.

The candidates are initially enrolled in the Leadership course, a year-long course addressing core program elements including clinical supervision, guidance in collecting data to conduct an equity audit, and the completion of all three CalAPA cycles.

There are seven additional courses that are each four weeks in length and are currently taught by one faculty member who also provides coaching support as well as instructional support for the program. While the program course outcomes were explicit in the documents, there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the course fieldwork activities were being delivered with the level of site support indicated in the documents. The courses are rigorous and demonstrated adherence to the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs), however there is insufficient evidence to confirm that the one faculty member charged with teaching the PASC courses and CASC program is knowledgeable about the structure and content of each course. The faculty qualifications and experience submitted for the written program review are no longer current. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to support whether teaching faculty and coaches are qualified to teach each course as described in the student handbook. The coaching is detailed and rigorous but there is limited evidence that the coaching support is in alignment with each coaching outcome that is articulated for each course in the sequence. There is insufficient evidence to support that field supervision, advisement, and evaluation are being executed in alignment with course outcomes. During interviews with candidates and completers comments were made that the fieldwork was more focused on what was being discussed in their courses and not focused on their actual school experiences.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Candidates are assessed throughout the program with the CalAPA cycles directly tied to the course assessments. The assignments are aligned to the CAPEs and the candidates appear knowledgeable about the CAPEs, however the existing candidates in the program indicated that the sequencing of assignments is unclear and that the expectations for assignments are not clearly delineated. While there is some evidence that the coursework and fieldwork is embedded into the assessment process the candidates in the existing program do not have an understanding of their progress in relationship to program outcomes. As a result of the

situation described there was insufficient evidence to indicate that the assessment process outlined in the documents provided for the program review are being implemented. The only assessment that candidates appear to understand in terms of progress in the program is in relationship to the CalAPA cycles. There is insufficient evidence to support that candidates receive detailed feedback on their assignments from their instructors. However, candidates did indicate that their coaches provide some feedback on assignments during the monthly two-hour coaching sessions. While the program review documents provided detail about rubrics and assessment measures for each of the courses, there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that candidates or the faculty were utilizing these assessments.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that the following program standards are **met with concerns** for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program:

#### **Standard 2: Collaboration, Communication and Coordination- Met with Concerns**

There was no convincing evidence that partnership agreements were being executed as indicated in program review summary. Partners who were interviewed expressed concern about the communication regarding design of field experiences and curriculum development. The program advisory board has not been established to date.

#### **Standard 3: Development of Professional Leadership Perspectives- Met with Concerns**

The program has a strong foundation and framework to carry out this standard, however there was no convincing evidence that candidates could articulate causes of organizational issues. There was insufficient evidence regarding how the program regularly assess candidates in these areas.

#### **Standard 4: Equity, Diversity, and Access- Met with Concerns**

The program has a strong framework to carry out this standard but there was no convincing evidence that candidates are engaging in coursework and field experiences to examine their own attitudes relative to privilege and power in the different domains.

#### **Standard 5: Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society- Met with Concerns**

There was no convincing evidence of candidates understanding that their role is to help students engage in civic responsibility. There is an equity mindset embedded into the coursework, but the candidates were not able to articulate a civic engagement lens framework.

#### **Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences- Met with Concerns**

There was no convincing evidence that the practical field work experiences facilitated the application of theoretical concepts. While the coaching provided to candidates was considered valuable there was no convincing evidence to support that there was articulation with candidate's school site to carry out the range of activities in this standard on a day-to-day basis in a diverse setting.

## Clear Administrative Services Credential

### Program Design

The Reach Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC) program is embedded into a three-year program for candidates who hold an administrative credential. The program is designed to support candidates utilizing an individual needs approach that includes personalized goal development anchored to the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL). According to the program review, these goals are realized through the development of an action plan.

Presently, the program is recovering from a total restructuring to solidify its fiscal and operational stability. Leadership reflects that although town halls were held for situational awareness, communication with all stakeholders about this restructuring and the resulting lag in program activities could have been more systematic and transparent with due consideration given to the confidentiality of some personnel decisions. The current leadership team is committed to re-enfranchising any stakeholders who would feel disenfranchised by the recent events. The interviews with candidates indicated that they did not receive timely information about the changes in the program and therefore the lack of communication has resulted in candidates feeling that they are unsure of program expectations. However, the candidates interviewed did indicate that the coaching sessions have helped clarify some of the program elements.

The Program Design features for the CASC program, including collaboration, communication, coordination and candidate guidance, assistance, and feedback, mirror REACH's PASC program. All comments made in the report above are true of this program as well.

### Course of Study

The coursework in the CASC program is job-embedded and candidates interviewed indicated that the monthly coaching format is being implemented, which is considered a signature of Reach's inquiry-based approach. The coaching sessions are two hours in length, however candidates interviewed, indicated that while the coaching sessions are valuable, they are not necessarily tailored to the individual needs of each candidate. The Instructional Leadership Academy (ILA) program was designed to personalize instruction in support of the individual aspirations of candidates but in the CASC program there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that this personalization was being realized through the individualized learning plan. The individualized learning plan has several elements, including self-identification of leadership strengths, in collaboration with the site supervisor as well as the coach. However, interviews with candidates indicated that the interface with site supervisors was weak or nonexistent. The written program review documents indicated that the individual one-on-one coaching support system was linked to a cohort model, however there is insufficient evidence to support that a cohort model exists to work with the supports identified in the program review documents. Candidates expressed in the interviews that there are limited opportunities for candidates to work in small groups to promote collective learning opportunities amongst the members of the cohort. There was insufficient evidence that faculty and candidates are

addressing critical areas that are delineated in the CAPEs. The candidates interviewed did not understand that the induction program is requiring them to complete one context inquiry each year. The coaches interviewed, while qualified in terms of administrative experience and education, were more focused on coaching as it relates to the course instruction verses collaboration with site supervisors and coaches.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Candidates are monitored throughout the year, but there is not a systematic process in place to monitor the coaching hours. The coaches interviewed indicated that they spend at least one to two hours of coaching per week, however there was a variance in the way in which the coaching sessions were carried out, for example, one coach indicated that his coaching support was carried out by emails and phone calls and all the coaches interviewed indicated that the coaching focuses primarily on the course instruction, as opposed to job embedded experiences at the school site.

As indicated in the PASC report, there is one faculty member who teaches all the courses in both the PASC and CASC program. Both programs utilize guest speakers to address core areas in the course content areas, however there is not sufficient evidence to support that faculty assesses candidate competencies relative to the strengths and weaknesses candidates have self-identified.

Interviews with alumni indicated that the program vision described in the program review documents is rigorous and effective. In fact, the alumni interviewed felt that the program was a transformational experience, but they articulated that the restructured program does not possess the rigor, nor does it offer the high-quality course of study that was characteristic of the program they experienced.

There was insufficient evidence to indicate that site supervisors are trained in supervision. The interviews with coaches, faculty, and candidates illuminated that articulation and collaboration with site supervisors has not been a pillar in either the PASC or CASC program as has been described by alumni of the program.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, those providing professional learning, employers, coaches and supervising practitioners, the team determined that the following program standards are **met with concerns** for the Clear Administrative Services Credential.

#### **Standard 2: Program Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination- Met with Concerns**

There was no convincing evidence that partnership agreements were being executed as indicated in program review summary. There was no convincing evidence that the systems described in the program review documents were being executed to provide program coordination in the advisement, support, and evaluation of the overall program. There was also no convincing evidence that program leaders are providing formative feedback to professional learning providers.

**Standard 3: Selection and Training of Coaches- Met with Concerns**

There was no convincing evidence that the systematic tools described in the program review documents were being utilized to regularly assess the quality of services provided by coaches to candidates using criteria such as candidate feedback, observation of the coach sessions and candidate feedback to assess their professional growth.

**Standard 5: California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders- Met with Concerns**

There was no convincing evidence that the coaches and faculty were utilizing the systematic tools described in the program review to document candidate support and growth.

## INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Reach Institute for School Leadership (Reach) is an educator and school leader preparation program in Oakland, California, that was started a decade ago by teachers, for teachers, with the stated purpose to disrupt the inequities seen throughout the education experience for students, parents, teachers, and administrators. Current candidates and completers were exuberant in expressing the ways in which this concept of disruption of inequality has changed their entire career trajectory. Employers said that they tried extremely hard to hire candidates from Reach, and one primary reason given was the mission to disrupt inequality.

The education unit has four programs: Intern (Multiple Subject and Single Subject), Teacher Induction, Preliminary Administrative Services, and Clear Administrative Services. Currently two of the four programs (Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Intern and Teacher Induction) are running effectively with faculty and staff reporting being very satisfied with their work, however, the two administrative services programs have recently gone through a restructuring with key program personnel being replaced. There is currently only one faculty member for the administrative program teaching eight courses. There is much confusion and consternation at the way the Institution handled communication about the restructuring. The senior leadership owned that lack of effective communication amid the urgency of a financial crisis, but also added a caveat that some of the disarray had to do with confidential personnel matters. The current faculty member has worked over the last few months to begin the process of rebuilding with the support of the senior leadership and the Institute’s board. Current candidates confirmed the efficacy of the faculty member’s efforts thus far, but external stakeholders in the partnering schools expressed that they have not yet been briefed on the situation. There is hope among all stakeholders with whom the team spoke that rebuilding could happen as soon as possible to get back to the place where Reach was offering a high-quality administration program again as they had for the past decade.

## COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	<b>Not Evidenced</b>
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.	<b>Not Evidenced</b>
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.	<b>Consistently</b>
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.	<b>Consistently</b>
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 1: Met with Concerns**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard**

Reach has a stated vision of commitment “to a more equitable world in which every student is supported by highly effective and dedicated teachers, who themselves are supported by highly effective and dedicated school leaders.” This vision is clearly articulated in the documentary evidence presented before the site visit and confirmed in interviews with faculty, staff, candidates, completers, and external stakeholders. Reach’s vision flows into its mission which is “to produce teachers and leaders who have the knowledge, skill, and capacity to disrupt, at a

classroom, school, or district level, the teaching-learning gaps that lead to educational inequities.” Interviews during the site visit showed that the mission of equity was the factor that brought coherence to the four programs of the Institute. Completers shared that this is the salient learning for them during their time at Reach, and they feel it is that which sets them apart as educators and leaders and sets Reach apart as a training center.

Unfortunately, at this time the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services credential programs have experienced a major restructuring that has led to a disruption of program delivery and considerable confusion among current candidates, employers, and other external stakeholders.

As verified through discussions with the Reach senior leadership, the institution supplies the unit with adequate funding to support its efforts but expects each program to carry its own fiscal weight. According to these leaders, the board of the institution made a recent decision to cut staff in the administration credentialing programs as an effort to right size the expenditures of the programs. This decision was the beginning of the entire restructuring which has caused such uncertainty and unrest. Reach senior leadership also shared that they have authority needed to address the needs of all educator preparation programs, including the authority to lead the staff, candidates, faculty, coaches, and external stakeholders through the re-building process post-restructuring.

**Rationale for the Finding**

The standard requires that the institution involve faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all programs, and that the institution collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation. The team was unable to confirm that faculty, instructional personnel, or relevant stakeholders are included in the decision-making process, or that the broader collaborative piece occurs. The standard also requires that the institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences, and the team was not able to confirm that this is being done consistently across all programs.

<b>Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	<b>Consistently</b>



<b>Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
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.	<b>Consistently</b>
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 2: Met with Concerns**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard**

Information provided by the institution demonstrates that the unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications. Reviewed documents listed clear admission requirements for each program. Induction candidates enter the Teacher Induction and Clear Credentialing (TICC) program from the intern program, allowing the candidates to meet the experience requirement for Early Completion Option. The unit consistently 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. The Director of Graduate Programming referred to the staff as “committed to working with marginalized and underserved” populations in education and developing teachers that are “disrupting inequities” with an equity lens. Comments from employers indicated that the reputation of Reach to work with teachers of color was a driving force for their participation. The institution purposefully designed a program to support the diversity of the teaching and leadership staff of local schools and recruited schools to partner with for educator enrollment. They believed their reputation and “word of mouth” was their best recruiting tool. The Student Services Associate (SSA) provides ongoing communication regarding timelines and deadlines.

Personnel were accessible in the intern program to guide and support candidates. Intern and alumni interviews reported the Reach intern program to be a supportive alternative pathway for obtaining a teaching credential. Those participating in the interview process commended the program for providing clear guidance and instructional coaches for addressing their questions and concerns in a timely and effective manner. They referenced the regular peer

meetings as one of the most valuable program components in that they could address problems of practice and learn from peers with diverse backgrounds and experiences. One intern reported faculty support in resubmission of a CalTPA cycle which was successful. Candidates needing more intensive support develop an Academic Support Plan.

Documentation and interviews regarding the TICC verify that the structure ensures effective delivery of support and assessment to candidates. Induction evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts in the Intern Program and Teacher Induction Program. Interviews with Student Support Associates/Credential Analysts (SSA/CA) revealed the vast support, advice, and assistance they provide to candidates in addition to their credentialing responsibilities. Interviews with employers demonstrated the extent of support SSA/CAs provide to employers regarding credentialing requirements and successful completion.

**Rationale for the Finding**

Due to the recent restructuring of the PASC and CASC programs, evidence gathered at the site visit was insufficient to confirm that the institution makes appropriate information and personnel accessible to candidates across all programs. The standard also requires that institutions consistently use candidate progress in meeting competency and performance expectations for advisement with a clearly defined process to support candidates who need additional assistance. The team was unable to confirm that candidate progress and assistance through the program was consistently accessible across all programs.

<b>Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
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.	<b>Consistently</b>
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
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.	<b>Consistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard**

Consistently, through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning. Many stakeholder interviews highlighted and praised the focus of the Reach programs on diversity and equity and appreciated the teacher preparation of “their context” and “type of student.” The documentation provided indicated a coaching for equity lens using “Mentoring Matters”.

Furthermore, 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 students and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.

Documentation and interviews consistently indicated the intern program is developed and operating in alignment with the common standards. Candidates complete performance assessments aligned to the TPEs, are paired with an instructional coach for one-to-one support and feedback, have an on-site mentor for additional coaching and contextual professional

development. Instructional coaches and on-site mentors are fully credentialed and trained in the capacity of their role. Faculty detailed a cohesive sequence of coursework and activities each intern participated in for development of teaching skills. Documentation indicated interns prepare for induction with an Individual Learning Plan created with their coach. Faculty spoke to methods for gathering feedback to inform the program, such as the CalTPA results, as well as updating to new standards and TPA changes.

TICC documentation indicated the TIP program designed to align with the most recent induction program standards and streamlined documentation processes. Candidates are assigned a mentor for ongoing support. Mentors are identified at school sites and are trained for coaching by the institution, as noted above. Candidates self-assess using the CSTPs to develop goals. Activities of being observed and observing veteran teachers are included as learning plan activities to develop teacher practice

**Rationale for the Finding**

Evidence was inconsistent for all programs regarding the process and criteria that result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates and that these site-based supervisors are certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. Evidence provided by the institution was insufficient to determine that the unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for all candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards. Evidence was insufficient to confirm that 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. The team was unable to confirm from the evidence provided all programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.

<b>Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
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.	<b>Not Evidenced</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 4: Not Met**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard**

During interviews, it was consistently reported that there is a “+ Δ” (“plus, delta”) feedback protocol conducted at the end of each class or seminar. Candidates verbally give feedback to the instructor who just listens and takes notes to inform their practice moving forward. Employers reported having completed surveys in prior years, but “not yet this year”, to give feedback to the unit. Faculty reported using the information to make changes to delivery of instruction and to bring relevance to information provided. Student Support Associates/Credential Analysts (SSA/CA) indicated regular meetings with administration to identify procedures needing updates to increase efficiency, effectiveness, and compliance with regulations. The intern program reported a consistent and clear process of reviewing program and student learning data.

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. SSA/CAs reported they have weekly meetings with administrators to discuss processes and at the end of the year, evaluate to make changes for a more efficient admissions and enrollment process. They are also the key staff to inform the programs of regulation changes and recommend updates to programming, requirements, and or policy. The unit leadership team meets regularly for academic program decisions while program faculty meet monthly to address student and program needs. The SSA maintains a shared spreadsheet of student progress. The stakeholder interviews confirmed a meeting between partner school administration and unit faculty and staff takes place once at the beginning of the school year. There is a review of MOUs, roles and responsibilities. One employer reported the meeting “seemed like hours long professional development” and the best part was being placed into “community groups of the same school or teacher type.” They found the peer-network support beneficial.

**Rationale for the Finding**

Assessment of candidate competence relies solely on tasks completed during program coursework. Based on documentation provided and interviews during the site visit, the team was unable to determine that candidate competency is assessed in all areas by all programs.

<b>Common Standard 5: Program Impact</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

**Finding on Common Standard 5: Met with Concerns**

**Summary of information applicable to the standard.**

Each semester, intern candidates complete performance assessments focused on the foundational practices of effective teaching. Candidates are required to successfully complete the course sequence to earn their Preliminary credential.

It was reported that TICC candidates create equity cycles of inquiry which are reviewed by administration and experienced mentors according to a 4 point rubric indicating competency and meeting requirements for program completion and clear credential recommendation.

A review of the data from the California Teaching Performance Assessments and exit surveys convey candidates are “prepared” and “well prepared” per the Teaching Performance Expectations.

Prior to the restructuring, the reputation of Reach programs, as described by various employers, indicated that the unit had a positive impact on schools with a population of marginalized students. However, since the restructuring employers have commented that they are looking at other institutions for their administrators and teachers because of the lack of communication and transparency with Reach, and the disconnect that has evolved.

**Rationale for the Finding**

The program did not provide evidence that the current unit and all of its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are continuing to have a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.