
3D

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Initial Institutional Approval – Stage V: Consideration of Full Institutional Approval for Santa Barbara Unified School District

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents, as part of the Initial Institutional Approval process, the report from the Provisional Site Visit and the Committee on Accreditation’s recommendation for an accreditation decision for Santa Barbara Unified School District. The Commission will consider granting Santa Barbara Unified School District full institutional approval.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends that the Commission review the Santa Barbara Unified School District Provisional Site Visit report and the Committee on Accreditation’s recommended accreditation decision and consider granting Santa Barbara Unified School District full institutional approval.

Presenter: Sarah Solari Colombini, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- b) Effectively and efficiently monitor program implementation and outcomes and hold all approved educator preparation programs to high standards and continuous improvement through the accreditation process.

Initial Institutional Approval – Stage V: Consideration of Full Institutional Approval for Santa Barbara Unified School District

Introduction

This agenda item presents, as part of Stage V of the Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process, the report from the Provisional Site Visit for Santa Barbara Unified School District as well as the Committee on Accreditation's recommended accreditation decision. Santa Barbara Unified School District was granted provisional institutional approval by the Commission in September 2017 and the Committee on Accreditation (COA) approved its Teacher Induction program in May 2018. The Commission will consider granting Santa Barbara Unified School District full institutional approval.

Background

California Education Code §44372(c) sets forth the Commission's responsibility to rule on the eligibility of an applicant for initial accreditation for the purpose of offering a program of educator preparation. The Commission has established the IIA process whereby an institution seeking to offer one or more educator preparation programs in California must first satisfactorily complete five stages to be approved as a program sponsor.

At its December 2015 meeting, the Commission approved a new IIA process as part of the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation project. Updates to the IIA process were subsequently approved during the February 2017 Commission meeting. An institution that is granted Provisional Approval in Stage IV of IIA, and subsequently approved by the COA to offer its proposed credential program(s), is required to host a Provisional Site Visit the year after its first cohort of candidates completes the program, as indicated in the highlighted column of the chart on the following page. The conclusion of the IIA process is determination by the Commission of whether to grant or deny the institution Full Approval (Stage V).

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, "The Commission may grant or deny full institutional approval or may grant institutional approval with a requirement that the COA's draft stipulations must be addressed and presented to the COA for action within a designated timeframe." If the Commission grants full approval, the Administrator of Accreditation will assign the institution to one of the seven established accreditation cohorts, and the institution will participate in all activities of the seven-year accreditation cycle established by the Commission. Granting full approval with a requirement that the COA's draft stipulations be addressed will remand the issues back to the COA for follow up to ensure that the program sufficiently addresses all concerns raised by the team. Alternatively, the Commission may keep the institution in the provisional stage of the approval process for another year while the institution works with staff to address all stipulations. In this case, the COA will consider any

quarterly or year-out reports on the institution's progress in meeting stipulations, as it does with fully approved institutions, and within one year make a new accreditation determination. At that time, the new decision of the COA will come back to the Commission for its decision. If the Commission denies full approval, the Administrator of Accreditation will inform the institution that it is no longer permitted to admit additional candidates to its programs and will work with the institution to develop a teach-out plan for any current candidates.

Five Stages of the Initial Institutional Approval Process

IIA Process	Stage I	State II	Stage III	Stage IV	Stage V
Action	Prerequisites	Eligibility Requirements	Preconditions & Common Standards	Program Standards	Provisional Site Visit
Purpose	Ensures legal eligibility of institution in California Ensures institution understands requirements of Commission's accreditation system	Ensures that institution has capacity to sponsor effective programs	Ensures institution meets all relevant preconditions Ensures institution meets all Common Standards	Ensures all proposed programs meet all relevant program standards	Program operates for 2-4 years and hosts a provisional accreditation site visit
Requirements	Institution must: 1. Have legal eligibility 2. Attend Accreditation 101 with institutional team	Submit responses to: • 12 Eligibility Criteria	Submit responses to: • Preconditions • Common Standards	Submit responses to: • Program Standards	Institution must: • Collect data • Host provisional site visit
Reviewed By	Staff	Staff	Preconditions: Staff Common Standards: BIR	BIR	Site Visit Team and COA
Authority	Staff	Commission	Commission	COA	Commission
Decision	Determine Eligibility for Stage II	Eligibility: 1. Grant 2. Deny	Provisional Approval: 1. Grant 2. Deny	Program(s): 1. Approve 2. Deny	1. Grant Full Approval 2. Grant Full Approval & Remand to COA to Address Stipulations 3. Continue Provisional Status for 1 Year to Address Stipulations 4. Deny
IIA Status	Not Approved	Not Approved	Provisional Approval**	Provisional Approval***	Full Approval

*At conclusion of stage

**Institutionally approved but cannot offer programs

***May begin offering approved program(s)

Santa Barbara Unified School District completed the first four stages of the Initial Institutional Approval process including hosting a provisional site visit. The timeline for these activities is illustrated in the following table.

Activity	Date
Stage I: Prerequisites	December 2016 – Completed Accreditation 101
Stage II: Eligibility Requirements	April 2017 – Commission Granted Eligibility
Stage III: Preconditions and Common Standards	September 2017 – Commission Granted Provisional Approval
Stage IV: Program Standards Review	May 2018 – Committee on Accreditation Granted Initial Program Approval
Began operating Teacher Induction program	August 2018
Provisional Site Visit Conducted	October 2021
Report of Provisional Site Visit to Committee on Accreditation	February 2022
Stage V: Commission considers Full Approval	April 2022

The Provisional Site Visit was conducted in accordance with the procedures approved by the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. Santa Barbara Unified School District submitted a complete Program Review submission, Common Standards Review submission, and responses to preconditions within six months preceding its Provisional Site Visit. The Board of Institutional Review members assigned to the visit worked together to review all evidence submitted as part of Program Review and Common Standards Review and provided feedback to Santa Barbara Unified School District regarding its preliminary alignment to the Commission’s adopted standards. Staff assigned to the Provisional Site Visit reviewed the institution’s responses to preconditions to ensure full alignment. In October 2021 the institution hosted its Provisional Site Visit and the results of the visit, including the team’s findings and accreditation recommendation, are included in the report in [Appendix A](#) that was presented to the COA at its February 2022 meeting.

The COA reviewed the report and discussed the site visit findings with the team lead and the representatives from Santa Barbara Unified School District. The institution representatives discussed the steps they had already taken to address the stipulations. Following the discussion, the COA agreed with the team recommendation and accepted the recommendation from the team for **Accreditation with Stipulations** and approved the stipulations as written on page 3 of the team report in Appendix A.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission grant full approval to Santa Barbara Unified School District with the requirement that the institution address all stipulations identified in the site visit team report within the time frame designated in the report and report back to the COA for their further consideration and action.

Next Steps

Depending upon the Commission's decision staff will take the appropriate next steps, which are:

- Full Approval: The Administrator of Accreditation will assign the institution to one of the seven established accreditation cohorts and the institution will participate in all activities of the seven-year accreditation cycle established by the Commission.
- Full approval with a requirement that the Committee on Accreditation's (COA) draft stipulations must be addressed and presented to the COA for action within the timeframe designated in the team report. Commission staff assigned to the institution's Provisional Site Visit will work with the institution to obtain timely and appropriate evidence addressing all stipulations within the time frame designated in the report and report back to the COA for their further consideration and action.
- Keep the institution in the provisional stage of the approval process for another year while the institution works with staff to address all stipulations. Commission staff assigned to the institution's Provisional Site Visit will work with the institution to obtain timely and appropriate evidence addressing all stipulations within the time frame designated in the report and report back to the COA for their further consideration and action. Within one year, the COA will make a new decision about the institution's accreditation status and the report will come back to the Commission for its decision about the approval status of the institution.
- Denial: The Administrator of Accreditation will inform the institution that it is no longer permitted to admit additional candidates to its programs and will work with the institution to develop a teach-out plan for any current candidates.

Appendix A
Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the
Initial Institutional Approval Provisional Site Visit for Professional Preparation
Programs at Santa Barbara Unified School District
Professional Services Division
February 2022

Overview of this Report

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

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

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met with Concerns
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met
4) Continuous Improvement	Met
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction	6	3	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
Initial Institutional Approval Provisional Site Visit Team Report**

Institution: Santa Barbara Unified School District

Dates of Visit: October 4-6, 2021

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with district and program administrators, professional development personnel, candidates, completers and other district personnel. 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 Stipulations for the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All preconditions have been determined to be aligned.

Program Standards

All Teacher Induction credential program standards were found to be met with exception of program standards 4, 5, and 6 which were met with concerns.

Common Standards

Common Standards 1, 3, 4 and 5 were found to be fully met. Common Standard 2 was found to be met with concerns.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that three of the Teacher Induction credential program standards were met with concerns and one of the Common Standards was met with concerns, the team recommends Accreditation with Stipulations.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

- 1) That within one year the institution/unit provides evidence that a clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.
- 2) That within one year, for the Teacher Induction Program, the institution provides evidence
 - a. That the program ensures consistent ongoing coaching, training, and skill development for mentors
 - b. That the program leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work

- c. That the program has documented the process for the recommendation for the clear credential, the defensible process for the reviewing documentation, a written appeal process for candidates, and a procedure for candidates to repeat portions of the program, as needed.
- 3) That quarterly progress reports be provided to the Committee on Accreditation to ensure that appropriate action is being taken in a timely manner.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Santa Barbara Unified be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- In granting Santa Barbara Unified full approval, the institution will be assigned to an accreditation cohort and will participate in all accreditation activities in accordance with the timelines of their assigned cohort, 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:

Teacher Induction

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Melissa Meetze-Hall
Riverside and San Bernardino County
Offices of Education

Programs Reviewers:

Christina Petriccione
San Bernardino City Unified School District

Common Standards:

Gail Calhoun
San Gabriel Unified School District

Staff to the Visit:

Sarah Solari Colombini
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Meeting Slides
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
Job Descriptions
Candidate Files

Assessment Materials
Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Meeting Evaluations
Precondition Responses
Induction Support
Evaluation Feedback Forms
Accreditation Data Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	18
Completers	15
Employers	14
Institutional Administration	7
Program Coordinators	3
Content Providers	4
Mentors	16
Credential Analyst	1
Advisory Board Members	11
TOTAL	89

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

Santa Barbara Unified School District was established on June 6, 1866 and is one of the oldest in the state. Its traditions are rooted in the 18th century Spanish era. It serves Santa Barbara and Goleta, California. Santa Barbara Unified School District contains 19 schools and serves 13,000 students of which 50.7% are socio economically disadvantaged and 15.4% are classified as English learners. According to the district’s website, in 2020, over 60% of the population of the district is Hispanic, 32% are white, 3.2 % are Asian, 1.9% are two or more races and the remaining categories of American Indian, Filipino, Pacific Islander, and African American are each less than 1%. There are 9 elementary, 4 junior high, 3 traditional high school, 1 alternative high school, and 1 continuation high school campus.

Education Unit

Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD) has created a Teacher Induction Program (TIP) that is a collaboration partnership between the TIP, SBUSD’s Education Services, English Learner and Special Education departments as well as three local institutions of higher education that offer preliminary preparation programs. The TIP currently serves 92 candidates in their first and second year of teaching. There is a one-to-one ratio of mentors to candidates. District personnel provide professional development to candidates in areas of need as identified by the candidates. In the 2020-21 year, 26 candidates completed the program and were awarded a clear credential.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2020-21)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2021-22)
Teacher Induction	26	92

The Visit

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

Provisional Site Visit in Stage V of Initial Institutional Approval

During Stage V of the initial institutional approval (IIA) process, a new institution hosts a Provisional Site Visit (PSV). The site visit team is composed of program leaders for that type of program as well as experienced Board of Institutional Review members. Because this PSV is based on a routine sixth year accreditation site visit, the team makes decisions on all Common and applicable Program Standards as well as an accreditation recommendation and any stipulations, if appropriate. The institution and its Commission-approved programs, in this case Teacher Induction, has only operated for a short time, three years for the Santa Barbara Unified School District.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

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

PROGRAM REPORTS

Teacher Induction Program

Program Design

The Santa Barbara Unified School District’s (SBUSD) Teacher Induction Program (TIP) resides within the Human Resources Division of the district and is under the oversight of the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources (HR). The Director of HR serves as the district’s credential analyst. The leadership team consists of the Assistant Superintendent of HR, the Director of HR and the TIP coordinator. They meet formally on a quarterly basis to discuss the Induction Program as evidenced by interviews. SBUSD Teacher Induction Program also has an advisory board composed of 15 members that meets two times during the school year to discuss data and provide feedback to the program. The SBUSD Teacher Induction Program has experienced growth over the past year increasing program numbers from 59 candidates in the 2020-21 year to 92 candidates in the 2021-22 school year.

Communication within the SBUSD Induction Program centers around a system of support for the candidates and was confirmed through documentation and interviews. Candidates and mentors indicated the program provided the necessary resources for candidates to complete their Individual Learning Plans (ILP) and other program related requirements. The district budget analyst and TIP Coordinator reported that they are in regular communication to ensure

the program is fully supported with financial resources and adjustments can be made to allocate more fiscal resources should the need arise. The budget analyst reported that the coordinator “lets me know how many teachers she has and what workshops she is offering with respect to the budget.... if she needs something she can email me so that we can move money from another object code to cover the needs.”

The SBUSD Induction program design includes an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) that incorporates reflection on the California State Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) as well as opportunities for candidates to set goals to improve their instructional practice. There are monthly reflections within their ILP submitted to the TIP Coordinator. During interviews multiple candidates reported they are provided feedback on their work and sometimes were asked to resubmit. Although a rubric exists for the candidates, there is no evidence found for a defensible process for reviewing the documentation or a written appeal process for candidates to utilize should it be necessary. There are professional development opportunities for candidates that include monthly Induction meetings, district-based professional development related to individual teaching assignments or self-selected by the candidates, as well as classroom observations with feedback from the TIP coordinator and mentors.

The program includes 50 part time mentors who are full time classroom teachers who support candidates in the program. Evidence for mentor qualifications and the selection process includes a description of mentor qualifications including having a Clear Teaching Credential, a minimum of 3 years of experience and recommendations from site administrators. A strength of the induction program is coordinating an overall system of support for induction candidates through the collaboration, communication and coordination among candidates, mentors, and school and district administrators. Induction leadership and site administrators both reported working closely together to find the best mentor match for their new teachers. Through interviews and documentation, it was found that most mentors support one candidate at their own site and efforts are made to align pairs within similar grade levels and content areas to create the best match to support the candidates. Administrators also stated they collaborate with one another and the TIP Coordinator to find a mentor at another school site if there is not one available for a candidate at their own site. Documentation and interviews of both mentors and candidates confirmed that mentors meet with their candidates for an average of one hour per week blending “just in time” support along with support for achieving the goals identified on their ILPs.

The program assesses the quality of services of mentors by using teacher candidate surveys. Candidates confirmed through interviews that they can give anonymous feedback to the program about their mentors. While the program collects survey data about the quality of services provided by mentors to the candidates, this information or other formative feedback was not provided to mentors about their work. Mentors reported that they have not received evaluations or feedback about their work from leadership. Candidates were very positive about their mentor matches and reported that their mentors helped them reflect on their ILP as well as provided “just in time” support on a regular basis. In one instance where a mentor moved grade levels, one candidate stated she was given the opportunity to choose to stay with the

same mentor or choose a new mentor at her school site within her same grade level to best meet her individual needs. One candidate stated, “Mentors talk about our ILP and “just in time” questions...she supports me with any of the documents and processes.”

Mentors are offered several professional development opportunities throughout the year to assist them in supporting their candidate with their ILP and coursework. This is substantiated through interviews and presentation materials. However, there were inconsistencies in finding evidence related to professional developments provided to mentors to improve their coaching skill set to become an effective mentor. Interviews provided evidence that there was variability between the new and experienced mentors. There was limited documentation regarding training focused on coaching and mentoring. During interviews some of the mentors articulated that they engaged with the *Mentoring Matters* book, while others did not recall any training centered around coaching and mentoring. The more experienced mentors received mentor training through the county program before the district program was established and the newer mentors expressed needing more support in mentor skill development with respect to both initial and ongoing mentor training.

Collaboration amongst multiple stakeholders within the SBUSD Induction program to coordinate new teacher support is a strength of the program and has been evidenced through candidate survey data and interviews of candidates, mentors, administrators, and program leadership. The mentor selection process and the development of the ILPs illustrate areas of strengths of the program’s collaboration and communication. Interviews with site administrators indicated that there is communication and collaboration between them and the TIP Coordinator when pairing new teacher candidates with qualified mentors. One administrator stated, “When I have a new hire, I think about who would be the best match to support them and suggest that person to the program coordinator.... we want a good fit.” Interviews of teacher candidates indicated that they are well supported by both their mentors and their administrators in completing their coursework and field experiences in the credential program. There is strong communication and involvement from the administrators in the development of the ILP of each candidate without crossing the boundaries of confidentiality. One candidate stated, “I really appreciate the input my principal has, even though he knows that he can’t have access to my stuff...he was able to tell me not just how I can improve but how it can fit my personality.”

The program considers a variety of stakeholder input including Advisory Board feedback, candidate surveys, mentor surveys, and statewide surveys. Documentation and interviews provide clear evidence that supports program modifications within the past two years that can be connected to various stakeholder feedback. There is also abundant evidence to suggest that immediate adjustments and changes are being made throughout the year to address mentor and candidate needs on an ongoing basis. The leadership team meets quarterly to look at data and give feedback for next steps to the program. Data analyzed includes feedback from mentors, candidates and ADS survey data. Completers, candidates, and mentors report specific modifications being made to the ILP based on their feedback and expressed appreciation for their needs being addressed. Mentors and candidates also confirmed they are asked to provide

information both before and after training sessions to ensure their needs are being addressed. One candidate stated, “after every meeting there is always an exit ticket, a survey at the end of the slide deck that we have to give feedback or suggestions to add so that [the TIP Coordinator] is better prepared for the next meeting.”

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidate coursework is centered around the ILP that, developed collaboratively with their mentor during the first month of program enrollment. The beginning of the process starts with a CSTP self-assessment and is followed by a self-reflection on candidate strengths and areas of growth that leads to choosing an area of focus and goal setting by the candidate. One candidate found, “I gave myself a higher score at the beginning but then later in the year, I gave myself a lower score. It is not that I regressed. My theory about where I was did not match my practice when I looked at the evidence.”

Once the candidate has established goals for their teaching practice, mentors assist the candidate in identifying resources that will help them in meeting their goals including coordinating selection of district provided professional development, out of district conferences, classroom observations and other resources. Mentors help candidates reflect on monthly reflective writing assignments where candidates describe their progress, challenges, and next steps. Candidates stated that they felt grateful that the process was flexible and could always reach out to the TIP Coordinator if they needed an extension for submitting their reflections. Candidates reported that working with the ILP “is something we do to grow as a professional, not just to clear our credential.”

As candidates convene at monthly meetings, a sense of community is established with candidates and mentors. One completer identified that a strength of the program was this building of community of practitioners “which is so important as a first-year teacher to have people you can connect with, commiserate with, the community was nice.” Mentors reported similar experiences. Those who had been mentors in the county induction program articulated that they appreciate the induction program now being a part of the SBUSD because of the sense of community it offers both mentors and candidates with mentors stating, “It is so connected to our district since it is aligned...it is nice to know people that are in your district and in your discipline.” Both mentors and site administrator interviews reflected that the goals of supporting new teachers in their practice not only served teacher induction activities but also resulted in developing a strong connection with the school and the district community, expressing the desire to foster professional connections that would serve them throughout their teaching careers. One mentor stated, “we focus them on the essential skill of how you reflect on your job and how you do that in a systematic way that impacts your practice. This is something you will do for the rest of your profession.”

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates receive monthly feedback on their ILP submissions from the program coordinator to ensure that candidates are on schedule for program completion and are making appropriate progress. Candidates are summatively assessed for competency based on articulating their

goals in terms of their CSTP focus and demonstrating growth toward mastery of the CSTPs. Candidates are also assessed for completion of the program based on successful completion of all program elements, which consists of participating in program events, participating in weekly mentoring, and submitting the ILP writing assignments. At the end of the program the TIP Coordinator reviews the submitted documentation for evidence of completion and sends a verification to the credential analyst who then submits credential recommendations electronically to the CTC. The TIP Coordinator has stated that in the event an item is missing or does not meet requirements, she will work with the candidate to plan for re-submitting.

Interviews with candidates confirmed that the ILP was the focus of their induction work. One candidate reported “I felt that it prepared me because it asked me the questions in the ILP - like what are you going to do for the multilingual students and the special education students? The outline of the ILP is a nice format in that it centers around students.” Once ILP are completed candidates submit them to the learning management system so that they can be reviewed by the TIP Coordinator. The TIP Coordinator provides feedback to the candidates and candidates are given an opportunity to resubmit if the program director finds the ILP to be incomplete. Interviews and document review determined a lack of evidence that current candidates have received information about a defensible process of document review. Additionally, there was lack of evidence that candidates were provided information or had access to information about a written appeal process. Furthermore, information gathered at the site visit confirmed that candidates did not have access to or knowledge of a documented procedure to repeat portions of the program as needed.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, institutional leadership, employers, and mentors, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Teacher Induction Program except for the following:

Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors – Met with Concerns

While there is evidence of mentor training centered around supporting candidates, interviews confirmed the need for training focused on coaching and mentoring for new mentors.

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

There was a lack of evidence that current candidates have received information about a defensible process of document review, a written appeal process, or a documented procedure to repeat portions of the program, as needed.

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

The site visit review team was unable to find evidence that program leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work. While the program collects survey data about the quality of services provided by mentors to the candidates, this information, as well as any other type of formative feedback, is not provided to mentors about their work.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The vision of Santa Barbara Unified School District’s Teacher Induction Program (TIP) is to provide new educators with a high-quality individualized, job-embedded system of mentoring and support, and professional learning that is grounded in current research and effective practices. This vision, accompanied with the district’s desire to meet the needs of their local context, spurred the development of their own induction program. The experiences of candidates confirm that their induction is not only job-embedded but is also in alignment with their site and district goals. Site administrators report close collaboration with the TIP Coordinator in selection of mentors and professional development opportunities.

Many strengths of collaboration and new teacher support are evident in practice and verified by candidate survey data and responses from interview groups. Stakeholder members, including those from partnering Institutes of Higher Education (IHE), meet twice per year; a majority of stakeholder members have been involved with the advisory team since the 2018 school year. The site visit team consistently heard that the constituents involved in this program appreciated the sense of community that was fostered. Some of the areas for growth are typical for new programs and include providing training and support to individuals new to the mentoring role and providing formative feedback to mentors so that they may improve their practice.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The requisite elements of faculty involvement, research-based practices which support success for all students, collaboration with stakeholder groups and participation in the broader educational community to improve educator preparation were confirmed through evidence review and site visit interviews. Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD) relies on a mentor-based model and uses the Charlotte Danielson framework as the foundation for professional conversations for mentors to provide feedback to candidates in the induction program. At the onset of the induction experience, SBUSD asks candidates to engage in a standards-based self-evaluation. Throughout the course of a candidate’s induction experience, the candidate has multiple opportunities to gather evidence and examine individual practice with the support of a mentor and assess practice against the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

To ensure multi-faceted collaboration, advisory board members represent multiple institutions of higher education in the geographic area. These advisory board members indicate that they

find their participation “invaluable.” Advisory board members were further able to provide information on the review of program data and resultant program modifications. Collaboration and communication were identified as strengths in interviews and they have experienced, “an open and safe environment” as they collaborate with peers. Recruitment and development efforts support both the hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. In addition, interviews confirmed that the program has fiscal resources available to support the needs of the program.

The credential recommendation process includes both the TIP Coordinator and the Director of Human Resources. These parties rely on the use of a learning management system (LMS) InductionSupport.com to determine candidate completion. The Milestone Report and Mentor Log Report guide the recommendation process.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
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.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The SBUSD intentionally recruits and admits eligible candidates to the teacher induction program. High schools in the district have partnerships with local universities to identify students who may be interested in teaching. One notable example of the intentional recruitment efforts is a collaborative program with local universities to support diversification of the teacher workforce. Advisory board members explained, “If local graduates of our high schools go into one of those preparation programs, then we pay for their education in the dual language immersion program.” Additionally, partners from three local universities actively

participate in the TIP advisory board and facilitate meaningful connections between the unit and their teacher preparation programs.

Requirements, including completion of an ILP and regular support from mentors, are established and understood by mentors and candidates, as evidenced by interviews with past and current participants in these two categories. However, a clearly defined process to identify and support candidates needing additional support is not provided to program participants in written form. Interviews with mentors, current candidates, completers, and site administrators confirm that the process to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance is not universally known or implemented consistently.

Rationale for the Finding

The team was not able to locate a clearly defined process to identify and support candidates who needed additional assistance. While there were cases where candidates received support, in some instances support was not timely. Interviews with mentors, teacher candidates, administrators, and advisory board members indicated that some candidates were in need of additional support, but candidates were unclear about how to seek support.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	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.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Inconsistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The Individual Learning Plan includes inquiry cycles and CSTP assessment. Mentors guide candidates in the development of long-term goals with input from site administrators about district plans (District Instructional Plan) and site plans, including the school plan for student achievement (SPSA). Interviews with site administration, candidates, and mentors confirm that goal setting is completed collaboratively between candidate and mentor with priority consideration to the candidates’ teaching context. Site and unit leaders report that candidates actively engage in professional learning topics such as the unique instructional needs of emergent multilingual learners and students with IEPs or 504 plans. Site administrators report that they, “encourage the mentors to use resources like the grading policy as they work with new teachers.” Completers reported that they valued the community that was developed through the TIP program and has continued as they progress through their professional career.

The training and evaluation of site-based supervisors was found to be inconsistent. Evidence collected in interviews and in documents that were submitted, revealed inconsistencies between the training on mentoring skills of more veteran mentors who were trained by the previous county program and those mentors who were more recently trained by the SBUSD teacher induction program. Information gathered confirmed that the mentors more recently trained need more training in mentoring skills and providing support to candidates via the Individual Learning Plan.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The evidence presented demonstrates that the program consistently collects, and reviews data related to candidates and program effectiveness. The graphic depiction of the unit assessment system clarifies the way the unit reviews its effectiveness. There is a clear list of survey instruments used across the program; this includes the type of survey instruments used and which stakeholder groups engage in data collection and analysis. During the site visit, interviews with program and unit leadership, in addition to the advisory board, confirmed that stakeholders meet and have been actively involved in decision making for the educator preparation program. In response to the recent pandemic, an advisory board member shared, “data showed that candidates needed support with how to teach on the block schedule when the district moved to a block schedule because of COVID-19.” The district was able to provide resources and support to teachers as they transitioned from a traditional schedule to the block. Interviews with program leadership and site administrators further confirm the use of program data to make decisions. In addition to the evidence reviewed prior to the site visit, data examples cited by interviewees include data sources, such as meeting surveys and exit tickets.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Although a young program, the SBUSD TIP program has made a positive impact in the teaching and learning in the greater Santa Barbara area. The SBUSD TIP program intentionally uses the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), formative assessment’s inquiry cycles, and an alignment of induction program goals to the district’s teacher evaluation system to equip new teachers to positively impact teaching and learning in their classrooms.

Mentors assist candidates with the development of long-term learning goals that are aligned to the CSTP, often guiding the candidate to choose inquiry goals that align to district and site level instructional places such as the district-wide instructional plan and the sites’ School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA). Interviews with candidates, mentors, site administrators, and completers confirm that candidates are encouraged in their goal setting by mentors, and often site administrators,

Site administrators, district administrators, and mentors confirm that completers engage fully in site level and district level collaboration, providing additional evidence of the positive impact of their participation in the two-year induction program. Advisory board members state that the program is “focused on learning outcomes, a safe space to learn,” and that “mentors are the most valuable component” all of which help equip SBUSD’s teachers better serve the community’s students.