

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

Institution: Pasadena Unified School District

Date of Revisit: May 6, 2016

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale: Based on the evidence presented at the revisit the team concludes that all Common and Program Standards are now met. Therefore, the team recommends removal of all stipulations and the accreditation status of **Accreditation**.

2015 Revisit Team Standard Findings

Common Standards	2015 Team Findings	2016 Revisit Findings
1) Educational Leadership	Met with Concerns	Met
2) Unit and Program Assessment	Not Met	Met
4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel	Met with Concerns	Met
7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standards General Education Induction	2014 Team Findings	2015 Revisit Findings
1) Program Rational and Design	Met with Concerns	Met
2) Communication and Collaboration	Met with Concerns	Met
3) Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	Not Met	Met

On the basis of the findings, the team recommends the removal of all stipulations
Further, staff recommends that:

- Pasadena USD be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation
- Pasadena USD continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuance of the accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

On the basis of this recommendation, Pasadena USD is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credential:

Advanced Credentials

Clear Multiple Subject
Clear Single Subject

Accreditation Revisit Team

Chair: **Alison DeMark**
Fullerton USD

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Catherine Kearney**

Interviews Conducted	
Institutional Administration	4
Support Providers/Mentor	8
University Partners	1
Employers	1
Program Coordinators	2
K-12 Induction Partners	2
Advisory Board Members	5
Total	23

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one team member (especially faculty) because of the multiple roles the individual has at the institution.

Background

Pasadena Unified School District hosted a visit on May 11-13, 2015. This was Pasadena USD’s regularly scheduled site visit. The report from the May 2015 accreditation site visit is available on the Commission’s [Accreditation Reports webpage](#).

In June 2015, the Committee on Accreditation placed six stipulations on PUSD and determined that the accreditation decision was **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**. A revisit was required within one year of the action of the COA.

The May 2015 visit resulted in the following stipulations:

1. Pasadena Unified School District is to develop and implement systems that monitor key program components and include the active involvement of key stakeholders.
2. Pasadena Unified School District is to develop an assessment system that addresses both program and unit evaluation, including the analysis and use of the data results.
3. Pasadena Unified School District, in regards to support providers and professional development providers is required to:
 - a. Establish and employ minimum criteria for support provider selection
 - b. Provide initial training that meets common and program standard requirements
 - c. Establish and maintain a ratio of SP:PT that takes into consideration the support providers' other job responsibilities with the district (full time teacher vs. retired educator)
 - d. Develop and implement an evaluation of the services provided to participating teachers
4. Pasadena Unified School District is to establish collaborative relationships with other PreK-12 organizations and institutes of higher education in order to meet the requirements of common and program standards.
5. Pasadena Unified School District is required to submit quarterly reports to the Commission indicating progress made in meeting the stipulations above.
6. Pasadena Unified School District is required to notify all current and prospective teacher candidates of the accreditation status of the institution.

Soon after the visit, Pasadena USD underwent significant personnel changes, assigning a new part time coordinator. Since then, a full time coordinator has been hired and is transitioning into the position. Additionally, an Advisory Board was formed and began meeting. Both the consultant and team lead assigned to the site visit were unavailable for the revisit, so a new consultant was assigned and a team member from the original visit agreed to act as team lead for the revisit. The current coordinator and new coordinator, along with institutional leadership, worked diligently with Commission staff to ensure that they were addressing the

stipulations and providing the evidence the revisit team would need to see in order to recommend removal of the stipulations.

Although much of the evidence was in the form of documentation (handbooks, job descriptions board minutes), interviews were conducted with appropriate constituent groups in order to verify that the stipulations were being addressed and to confirm that the changes were systemic in nature.

2016 Revisit Findings and Evidence

2015 Site Visit Decision	2016 Revisit Decision	Common Standards
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 1: Educational Leadership</p> <p><i>2015 Rationale:</i> While episodic communication occurs between district personnel and limited local IHE, there is currently no formal collaborative relationship with any college or university. Additionally, although communication is strong in the district, the team could not find evidence that relevant stakeholders are involved in the organizing, coordinating, and governing of the program. Finally, the team could not locate effective strategies and systems to achieve the needs of the program.</p> <p><i>2016 Revisit Evidence:</i> Pasadena USD established an advisory board during the 2015-16 year. The board consists of site administration, veteran teacher/support provider, Human Resource administration, and program leadership. Interviews with board members confirmed that they are listened to and that their opinions are valued. Specifically, a site administrator with strong, sometimes divergent opinions was recruited to the board. He spoke strongly about the willingness of program leadership to work with the board to wrestle with difficult issues and seek solutions. This was supported by board minutes and agendas, as well as interviews.</p> <p>Documents and interviews with program leadership, advisory board members, and IHE partners also confirmed that PUSD participates in the regional induction IHE collaborative which meets regularly. While these partnerships continue to emerge, it is apparent that IHE partnerships are being developed, especially with CSULA.</p> <p>Furthermore, document review and interviews with mentors, advisory board members, HR administration, institutional administration, and program leadership confirmed a commitment to the continuous improvement of the PUSD induction program. At the time of the last visit, the program was coordinated by a contractor from outside the district and it was evident that this was ineffective. During the 2015-16 school year, the district assigned a .50 FTE lead support provider/coordinator to manage the program. A fulltime coordinator was brought on in early spring to work with the lead support provider/coordinator to transition leadership. As numerous stakeholders cited the lead support provider/coordinator as essential to the success of the</p>

		<p>program, this transition time has proved invaluable. The lead support provider/coordinator will continue to be available as needed for assistance in the coming year. In addition to adding a full time coordinator, the budget has been increased, and systems have been established for collecting and analyzing data. Mentors and advisory board members articulated their involvement in reviewing and analyzing data, as well as contributing to improvement efforts.</p>
Not Met	Met	<p>Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment</p> <p><i>2015 Rationale:</i> The team could not find evidence of the existence of a system of assessment and evaluation, nor information on how any such system analyzes and utilizes the limited data collected for future improvement. Limited data was available both in regards to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence as well as program effectiveness.</p> <p><i>2016 Revisit Evidence:</i> Documentation and interviews indicated that the PUSD induction program has implemented strategies to collect, analyze, and share data with multiple stakeholders. PUSD executed new surveys for mentors and site administrators, as well as continuing to collect data from candidates. Most significant are the changes made in regard to how the data analysis occurs and program improvement decisions are made. Previously, there was limited data and little input from stakeholders, however at the time of this revisit, advisory board members and mentors were able to give clear examples of meaningful input both in analyzing the data and problem-solving solutions. Interviews with program coordinators further confirmed this. Mentors described looking at both participant and mentor data and driving the decisions about program improvement relative to their work. Additionally, when the site administrator survey response rate was not ideal, the Chief Academic Officer sent out a call for participation. Advisory board members described contributing to the action plan that was created as a result of these data. Review of assessment documentation confirmed what was being described and further pointed to systemic change. Evidence of that change included the establishment of a calendar of assessment activities for 2016-17.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel</p> <p><i>2015 Rationale:</i> No evidence was found or confirmation given of a criteria and process for hiring qualified persons to provide professional development, and provide support services. The team did not find evidence of systematic relationships with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. Additionally, no evidence was found regarding the systematic evaluation of professional development providers and support providers.</p> <p><i>2016 Revisit Evidence:</i> Interviews with district leadership, advisory board and neighboring districts confirmed collaboration with induction leadership in Temple USD, Riverside USD, Hart USD, and the Foothill Consortium. Temple USD further expanded upon the planning and providing of professional development between TUSD and PUSD, allowing for the vetting of professional development provider authenticity and ensuring there is more than one</p>

		<p>opportunity for a participating teacher to participate in professional development and an opportunity for district leadership to compare professional development outcomes and ensure that the professional development met the intended purpose. As these training opportunities emerge, PUSD will need to be vigilant in evaluating professional development so that all participants are ensured consistent high quality.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p><u>Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice</u></p> <p><i>2015 Rationale:</i> The team could not find evidence of collaboration between the unit and its partners regarding the criteria for selection of support providers. Additionally, the team could not find evidence that the unit regularly evaluates candidate assignments to verify opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students.</p> <p><i>2016 Revisit Evidence:</i> Documentation found the establishment of a unit evaluation committee in the form of an advisory board. Advisory board members include varied stakeholders from district leadership, to site administrators to support provides with historical perspective. The advisory board worked with district leadership to establish a set of criteria to ensure uniform selection of support providers.</p> <p>Furthermore, documentation highlighted that there was a vetted process for both the recruitment and evaluation of support providers and professional development providers. Further review of evidence including, mentor teacher recruitment flyer, job description, and interview questions confirmed established criteria was embedded in multiple capacities. Interviews with stakeholders confirmed that support providers and professional development providers met established criteria for their respective roles.</p>
2015 Site Visit Decision	2016 Revisit Decision	General Education Induction Program Standard
Met with Concerns	Met	<p><u>Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design</u></p> <p><i>2015 Rationale:</i> The team was unable to find evidence of support provider preparation that meets the requirements of program standards, a system of program evaluation, or collaboration with the professional development efforts of any partner organizations.</p> <p><i>2016 Revisit Evidence:</i> Interviews with support providers affirmed that they feel well-prepared through monthly mentor meetings as well as informal contact with veteran support providers. First-year mentors described one to one training with the program coordinator, as well as comfort with approaching long-time mentors and the program coordinator individually or at meetings. There appeared to be a high level of collaboration among mentors.</p> <p>As mentioned in Common Standard 2, above, there was clear evidence found through review of documents and interviews with stakeholders that a system of program evaluation has been implemented and is being systematized. All stakeholders that were interviewed could cite examples of their involvement in</p>

		<p>collecting data, analyzing data, and making program improvements as a result of data.</p> <p>Participation in regional activities with P-12 induction partners has been established and will remain in place in future years. Program leadership, advisory board members, and induction partners spoke positively about the benefits of these relationships. Stakeholders cited examples of joint problem-solving, discussions around topics of program improvement, and shared planning and resource allocation for upcoming professional development activities.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p><u>Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration</u></p> <p><i>2015 Rationale:</i> While evidence of communication with teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations was found, no evidence of collaborative relationships was found.</p> <p><i>2016 Revisit Evidence:</i> The Pasadena USD Induction program attends regional cluster and IHE collaborative meetings as well as seeking advice and collaborating with Induction leadership in Temple USD, Riverside USD, Hart USD, and the Foothill Consortium. Interviews confirmed that the collaboration is genuine and mutual. PUSD leadership, as well as induction partners from other P-12 organizations, cited examples including plans to share professional development resources in 2016-17.</p>
Not Met	Met	<p><u>Standard 3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers</u></p> <p><i>2015 Rationale:</i> The team was unable to find evidence of selection criteria for support providers or professional development providers. No evidence was found to confirm that support provider initial preparation/ training includes the required elements outlined in the standards. Additionally, there is no system to assess the quality of support provider services and no evidence was found regarding providing formative feedback to support providers on their work. Finally, there are no criteria for caseload maximums for support providers that take into consideration other job responsibilities of the support provider (full-time classroom teacher, teacher on special assignment, or retired educator).</p> <p><i>2016 Revisit Evidence:</i> As mentioned above in Common Standard 7; documentation highlighted that there was a vetted process for both the recruitment and evaluation of support providers and professional development providers. Further review of evidence including, mentor teacher recruitment flyer, job description, and interview questions confirmed established criteria was embedded in multiple capacities. Interviews with stakeholders confirmed that support providers and professional development providers met established criteria for their respective roles.</p> <p>Additionally, documentation and interviews with support providers confirmed district leadership assertions of monthly support provider workshops and trainings. Support providers felt these meetings were valuable in not only the facilitation of professional growth among the participating teachers they support, but their own professional growth as mentors.</p>

		<p>Support Providers reported receiving feedback from multiple avenues including, district leadership, program survey results and informal conversations with participating teachers.</p> <p>Documentation and interviews with all stakeholders reported the dramatic reduction of support provider and participating teacher ratios. The institution has implemented a max caseload of 3 teachers per support provider.</p>
--	--	--