

**Report of the Accreditation Re-Visit to
Kings County Office of Education**

June 2012

Institution: Kings County Office of Education

Dates of Revisit: May 22 to May 24, 2012

Prior COA Decision: Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations

Accreditation Re-Visit Team Recommendation: Accreditation

The team recommends that:

1. The stipulations from the 2011 accreditation site visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.
3. As part of the Biennial Report, due in Fall 2013, Kings County Office of Education submit updated narratives addressing the Commission's Common and Induction Program Standards. These narratives will allow the program to formally document the progress made and describe the program as it is operating.

Rationale:

The recommendation of **Accreditation** is based upon the institutional response to the stipulations and a thorough review of the institutional self-study, additional supporting documents available during the visit, interviews with institutional administrators, faculty, candidates, student candidates, program graduates, local school administrators, and additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation.

Below are listed the stipulations approved by the COA after the site visit in 2011 followed by information from the 2012 institutional response. Next are listed the revisit team findings and recommendations. After this section, the revisit team findings on the Common Standards and Program Standards are included. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The team reviewed the six Common Standards that were found to be less than fully met at the initial site visit. Based on the information collected from participating teachers, support

providers, site administrators, the advisory board and county office leadership, and review of documentary evidence all Common Standards are now **Met**.

Program Standards

The team reviewed the six program standards that were found to be less than fully met at the initial site visit. Based upon compelling evidence from all stakeholders and review of documentary evidence, the team finds that all the program standards are now **Met**.

Follow-up Revisit Team Findings

Based upon constituent interviews and review of documentary evidence the follow-up revisit team found that Kings COE has provided evidence that all Common and Program Standards are now **Met**. On the basis of these recommendations, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Advanced Credentials

General Education (Multiple and Single Subject) Clear

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:

Melissa Meetze Hall
Riverside County Office of Education

Staff to the Visit:

Teri Clark, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

FACT documentation, electronic portfolios, on Task Stream	FACT portfolio rubrics
Exit Interview questions and rubrics	PT Mid-Year Survey
Kings COE BTSA Web page	FACT training materials
Support Provider FACT Guide	Director and training calendars
Site Administrator Roles and Responsibilities	Training Power points
SP training agendas and meeting schedule	SP-PT Guide
Leadership and Advisory meeting agendas	BTSA Handbook
Training Sign in sheets and attendance records	Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
Cognitive Coaching training materials including Reflective conversation maps	List of all PTs and assigned SPs

Interviews Conducted

	Total
Program Leadership	2
County Office Administration	2
District Administrators	12
Participating Teachers	48
Support Providers	37
e-Portfolio Readers	5
Professional Development Providers	2
Advisory Board Members	19
Total	126

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

The Follow-Up Revisit (2012)

The Kings County Office of Education (Kings COE) follow-up revisit began on Tuesday, May 22, 2012 at the county office. The team met for a team meeting to discuss the interview schedule and questions in preparation for constituent interviews. Faculty, staff and constituent interviews and data review and collection activities began at 2:00 pm and continued through Day 2.

The Team Lead and Commission staff presented the Mid-Visit Status Report to the county office leadership. Faculty, staff and constituent interviews and data collection and review continued throughout the remainder of the day. On Wednesday evening, the team met to discuss all standards and stipulations and to determine the recommendation of all standards met and the removal of all stipulations. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and recommendation of change for accreditation status from accreditation with Probationary Stipulations to Accreditation. The report draft was prepared and reviewed. The Kings COE accreditation revisit Exit Report was held on Thursday May 24 at 11:00 a.m.

Findings on Stipulations

Stipulation #1

The program needs to broaden and stabilize advisory board participation to consistently represent stakeholders of the Kings County Office of Education's Teacher Induction Program (TIP). The advisory board needs to develop a clear guiding vision for the preparation of educators.

Institutional Response (2012)

The Kings County Office of Education (KCOE) BTSA Leadership Team developed a plan of action to increase involvement of all stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and governance of the program. Initial face-to-face contacts were made with each district Superintendent to emphasize the importance of stakeholder participation in all aspects of the implementation of the Induction Program. Based on input from district representatives, BTSA liaisons and Advisory Committee members were selected. The Advisory Committee membership has been expanded to include Institutions of Higher Education (IHE)

representatives, district leaders, site administrators, district and site academic coaches, participating teachers, retired teachers, support providers, and representatives from the KCOE Human Resources and Curriculum and Instruction departments. The KCOE BTSA Leadership Team developed a plan to increase consistent attendance at Advisory Committee meetings. The meetings have been designed to encourage collaboration and involvement in the creation of a clear vision. Multiple means of communication are being utilized to ensure participation.

Revisit Team Finding

The Kings County Induction Advisory Board represents all partner districts as well as the county office. Regular meetings have been held this past year. The members report that they no longer ‘sit and get’ at the meetings, but they ‘roll up their sleeves and do meaningful work.’ Sign in sheets and minutes corroborate that the group is actively advising the county office.

Advisory Board members confirm that this group worked collaboratively to develop a vision, mission, focus areas and steps to support the focus areas. The work began in summer 2011 and continues. The group carefully reviewed the Spring 2011 accreditation site visit report and the stipulations placed on Kings COE by the Committee on Accreditation. The county office leadership worked with each participating district to ensure that the district’s goals and priorities were considered as the Induction Program’s vision and mission was developed.

The current vision and mission truly drive the Kings COE Induction program. Site administrators, support providers and participating teachers use the terminology of the vision and mission and as they discuss the program and the vision has been put into practice by the program.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Stipulation #2

Data needs to be analyzed and used at the program and unit level to guide program improvements and to provide data to the Support Providers within the program.

Institutional Response (2012)

The Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, KCOE BTSA Education/Learning Coordinator, and the Curriculum Consultant examined the current evaluation system and developed a plan to strengthen the process of utilizing data to make program modifications.

After careful analysis of the findings from the Accreditation Visit and 2010-2011 local and statewide data, KCOE made significant changes to the Support Provider training. During the year, stakeholders will have opportunities to provide ongoing feedback in a variety of ways, including, but not limited to, the following: local and statewide surveys, mid-year chats, focus group interviews conducted by the Cluster Regional Director, and portfolio reviews. Information gathered will be analyzed and used to monitor implementation and determine future program modifications.

Program leadership will share results of data collected during Advisory Committee meetings, Education Council meetings, Support Provider trainings, and Participating Teacher meetings. Information will also be provided via the BTSA website, Twitter, and the BTSA Bulletin.

Revisit Team Finding

Data is being collected and analyzed for program and unit improvement. The Advisory Board reports that it is involved in the analysis of the data and in making decisions about program implementation. Support providers, participating teachers and site administrators report that the program leadership has solicited input and followed through on suggestions that have been received. Support providers understand the formative assessment process, its purposes and goals, and where the participating teacher is in the process.

A new process was developed and implemented in 2011-12 where a small group of individuals serve as e-Portfolio readers. These individuals review the participating teacher's formative assessment documentation and provide feedback to the participating teacher but the reader is also gathering information on the formative assessment process across the program. The plan is to use the information to guide the program in continuing to improve the formative assessment process for the participating teachers.

Program and unit assessment are taking place. The assessment system is in its infancy and its procedures need to be formalized in 2012-13. The formalized procedures need to be documented in a full narrative response to Common Standard 2.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Stipulation #3

All stakeholders must be apprised of the function of FACT as a guide for a formative induction program that supports candidates' growth and attainment of professional goals as guided by their IIP. Support Providers must agree to create or capitalize on opportunities for intentional candidate learning in the appropriate pedagogical practices and use of adopted standards—aligned instructional materials and resources (e.g., varying curriculum depth and complexity, managing Para educators, using assistive and other technologies) and to provide intensive individualized support and assistance to help their candidates' demonstrate and apply pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in their preliminary credential program.

Institutional Response (2012)

The Leadership Team has developed a strategic plan to broaden foundational understanding of Formative Assessment for California Teachers (FACT) used during induction. Support Provider selection process and criteria has been solidified and discussed with district leadership and focuses on selecting exemplary teachers. Support Provider training has been designed to increase Support Provider's knowledge, skills, and abilities in an effort to support and inform

Participating Teachers about their professional growth as they reflect and improve upon their teaching practice.

Support Provider effectiveness will be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure that those retained meet the established criteria. District administrators will attend Roles and Responsibilities of K-12 School Organizations training to increase stakeholder understanding. Additionally, the BTSA Curriculum Consultant will work with district representatives throughout the consortium to ensure that KCOE BTSA Induction goals are aligned with district goals and objectives.

Revisit Team Finding

Formative assessment is now at the heart of the Kings COE Induction program. The participating teachers, support providers, site administrators, and advisory board members interviewed were able to articulate the purposes of formative assessment and universally agree that the Kings COE Induction program is supporting all participating teachers to develop and demonstrate the skills defined in the CSTP.

Reflective conversation has become a focus of the Kings COE Induction program in 2011-12 and site administrators, support providers and participating teachers expressed not only their understanding and importance of this focus but the impact and growth this has had on teacher outcomes and student learning. Participating teachers articulated how the formative assessment system and the reflective conversations have supported each participant as they grow and develop expertise as a teacher. Participants were able to share information gathered through the inquiry process related to differentiated instruction, teaching English learners, working with students with special needs, issues of equity and diversity and other areas of focus.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Stipulation #4

The program needs to establish criteria that provides for the demonstration and application of professional knowledge and skills beyond what was learned during pre service.

Institutional Response (2012)

With the support of the BTSA Cluster 3 Regional Director, an implementation plan has been developed to provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate and apply knowledge and skills beyond what was learned at the preliminary credential level. Program leadership has worked diligently to redesign Support Provider FACT training, focusing on formative assessment process vs. completion of documents. IHE representatives have been added to the Advisory Committee. The meetings will be designed to encourage articulation between the program and IHEs in an effort to create a better understanding of how to provide participating teacher experiences that focus on demonstration and application of knowledge and skills beyond what was learned prior to induction.

Revisit Team Finding

Participating teachers and support providers shared examples of how the inquiry process and the action plans that were developed by the participating teachers supported true job-embedded development which positively impacted the K-12 students. The e-Portfolio read confirmed that each participating teacher has developed his or her skills beyond what was learned during preservice preparation. The Exit Interview requires each participating teacher to meet with two experienced educators and respond to a series of questions. The interview is a professional discussion and allows the participating teacher to reflect on the two year induction process and share preliminary thinking on future growth as a teacher. In addition, there are end of year interviews for all first year participants.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Stipulation #5

Quarterly reports are to be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation reflecting progress toward meeting the stipulations above. The first quarterly report will be due on September 15, 2011.

Institutional Response (2012)

Kings County Office of Education BTSA Induction Program will submit quarterly reports to the Committee on Accreditation on September 15, December 15, and March 15, 2012.

Revisit Team Finding

Quarterly reports were submitted in September 2011, December 2011 and March 2012.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Stipulation #6

A return visit is to take place within one year of this action.

Institutional Response (2012)

Kings COE prepared for and hosted a re-visit May 22-24, 2012.

Revisit Team Finding

The revisit took place May 22-24, 2012

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

Common Standards

Findings on the Common Standards 2011

During the May 22-24, 2012 accreditation revisit, the accreditation team made findings related to the six Common Standards that were less than fully met. A summary of the 2011 visit findings is presented in the left hand column below. The 2012 Follow-up Revisit Team findings are presented in the right hand column.

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
1) Educational Leadership	
<p>Met with Concerns: Despite multiple interviews with constituents, (e.g., SPs, advisory committee members, district partners, completers, and current PTs), the team was unable to verify that the implementation of the formative assessment system was part of an overarching, research-based vision about developing teachers’ practices in which the sequence of implementation is critical for effectively informing teachers’ instructional practices. Instead, the team learned that program stakeholders focus on candidates’ completion of program requirements (as represented by submitting completed FACT documents) without regard to whether those FACT documents were used to guide and support the continued development of skills candidates developed in their preservice programs. Although candidates attend the orientation, mid-year, and end of year interviews with the director, they did not have an understanding of how an induction program might deepen their teaching practice.</p> <p>In addition, the team found no evidence that stakeholders are actively involved in any Induction program organization, coordination or governance activity or decision. Likewise, no one in those constituent group interviews identified any experiences of, nor interest in, participating in discussions about program organization, coordination, or governance.</p>	<p>Met The team finds that all stakeholders (participating teachers, support providers, site administrators, advisory board members, and leadership within KCOE) are committed to the collaboratively developed vision and mission of the KCOE induction program. The vision and mission guide the design of the program. The professional development offered by the county office was found by the participating teachers, support providers and site administrators to be supportive and valuable.</p> <p>The advisory board is a group of individuals representing each of the partner districts, the county office and additional stakeholders. The advisory board is very involved in program organization, coordination and governance. The district representatives report that the county office is working with and for them and that the induction program is aligned with their local school and district priorities and goals. It was expressed that the induction program is a joint activity where the districts and the county are working together to support teacher development and K-12 learning.</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
2) Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	
<p>Met with Concerns: The team found that an external evaluator had been contracted to evaluate data for ongoing program and unit improvement, and that data is reviewed by the program coordinator who works with the external coordinator. Nevertheless, there was little evidence that analyses of data reports provided by Sinclair informed program improvement nor that changes made to the program were directly related to analyses of the data. The team could not verify that data is effectively used by the education unit for improvement purposes.</p> <p>Surveys of SPs and PTs indicated that they needed more information about how to implement FACT. The changes that were implemented focus narrowly on the next month's FACT activities and the use of a data collection system, TaskStream, to monitor PTs completion of FACT documents rather than on helping SPs develop a deeper understanding of the purpose of FACT.</p>	<p>Met: The program has made connections with each school district partner to understand the goals of the districts. The districts and schools were asked to provide input to the program coordinator about the design of the program. A district reported that the county office workshop on classroom management that has been provided late in October or early November is too late. The program is planning to provide this professional development prior to the beginning of school for the 12-13 year.</p> <p>The e-Portfolio review takes place in the fall and spring for all participating teachers and provides input to the participating teacher, support provider and the program. Using a portfolio rubric, the readers measure the submitted FACT work against a rubric and provide feedback to the PT.</p> <p>The stakeholders and program leadership universally agree that the program has examined its practices and made data driven decisions in 2011-12 and that there is commitment to continue this process in future years.</p>
4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel	
<p>Not Met: Although the education unit is aware of the importance of identifying faculty and instructional personnel who are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity, the Superintendent and Program Director confirmed during interviews that identifying a diverse and qualified cadre of trainers is extremely challenging given the make-up of the community and the geographic area in which the district is located. When asked about the process used to select professional development providers, no current process was defined. The individuals</p>	<p>Met: The support providers and professional development providers are carefully selected, provided training, and supported throughout the program. The Cluster Region Director from Cluster 3 was brought in to provide FACT training to all support providers and program leadership during the 2011-12 year.</p> <p>There was agreement from both participating teachers and site administrators that the individuals serving as support providers understand the role of a support provider and are fulfilling the role.</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
<p>identified as professional development providers were initially hired years ago and then are re-hired every year. Clearly defined criteria for selection of individuals who are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity are not available. This also prevented the team from confirming the expertise of professional developers' grasp of academic standards, frameworks and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools.</p> <p>There is no evidence that district partners or professional development providers regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in college/university units or with members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching and candidate learning. An advisory committee roster confirmed representation from district and college/university partners, however, sign-in sheets and interviews with advisory committee members disclosed that there isn't a consistent group of stakeholders who meet regularly to assist in program decision making,</p> <p>Finally, the educational unit regularly collects information about the performance of course instructors through professional development surveys completed by the workshop participants (when the workshops are held). However, there was no evidence to confirm that feedback from course evaluations is used to improve the alignment between the training and the needs of the PTs. In addition, feedback to SPs occurs primarily on an informal basis between the Program Director and individual SP and focused overwhelmingly on document completion by their PTs. There is no evidence that feedback addresses how to enhance their skills in facilitating reflect dialogue that is driven by the plan-teach-reflect-apply model. Phone calls and e-mails are used to communicate feedback on PT completion of</p>	<p>The support providers and professional development providers must reapply each year for the positions. There is a plan to use the SP feedback data as part of the subsequent hiring process. SP feedback forms illustrate their ability to demonstrate their knowledge and skills for the desired role.</p> <p>The support providers and program coordinator meet monthly. Ongoing FACT and coaching training is the focus of the meeting along with collegial networking and support. Cognitive coaching has been a program-wide focus in 2011-12 and all stakeholders report that the reflective conversations have been very powerful both within the program and in the greater education community. Participating teachers are asked to provide feedback about support providers during the year and at the end of the year. There is evidence that if the PT-SP match is not working well, the program leadership makes a change.</p> <p>The Professional Development providers for 2011-12 were the Program Coordinator, the BTSA Cluster Region Director and two individuals trained in Cognitive Coaching. Stakeholders universally reported that all providers were well prepared and effective.</p> <p>During interviews there were examples of instances where the participating teacher requested a change and the re-match was made in a timely manner.</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
<p>FACT forms and to address individual challenges. Although there is a process that PTs may use to secure a different SP and a PT survey that assesses the quality of support that was provided through the PT-SP model, the team did not see evidence that the unit formally recognizes excellence or retains only those SPs who are consistently effective.</p>	
6) Advice and Assistance	
<p>Met with Concerns: The education unit provides information and assistance to all candidates. Evidence confirms that candidates who complete program requirements are retained. However, there is little evidence that completion of program requirement ensures that candidates are suited for advancement in the education profession. Interviews with the Program Director, PTs and SPs confirmed that ongoing feedback is provided on candidate progress toward requirement completion but not regarding their performance as measured by reflective practice.</p> <p>The program defines candidate progress in terms of timely completion of documents as reflected in interviews with PTs, SPs, and completers. Although the program has clear timeline requirements for completion of FACT documents, there was little evidence that candidate performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.</p> <p>Although there is evidence that candidate progress is consistently monitored, and information is shared by the Program Director, there is limited evidence that the Participating Teacher’s growth and development as a teacher is emphasized in the advisement/assistance process. In addition, responsibility for utilizing evidence to guide advisement and assistance is almost exclusively left with the Program Director.</p>	<p>Met: Participating teachers report that the program requirements are very clear. The requirements are clearly posted in Task Stream, provided in the newsletters, the handbook, and in the emails sent by the program leadership. The support providers share the information with the participating teachers. If a participating teacher has a compelling reason, the deadlines for activities are stretched, but all participants are required to demonstrate the knowledge and skills required by the program standards.</p> <p>During the fall and the spring, a PT portfolio review takes place where each participating teacher receives feedback on the quality of the formative assessment documentation he or she has submitted through the Induction process. Second year participants were able to articulate that the focus this year is on each teacher’s individual learning and developing in a way to positively impact the K-12 students in the classrooms and that the work in FACT is intimately tied to the individual’s teaching assignment.</p> <p>There is a clear focus on the growth and development of each participating teacher in the KCOE Induction program. Site administrators, support providers, the program coordinator and the participating teachers were all able to identify examples of the growth.</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice	
<p>Met with Concerns: Evidence confirmed that the unit has selected and implemented a planned sequence of experiences through the adopted formative assessment system, FACT, but no evidence that partners (e.g., advisory committee, SPs) assisted in determining how the formative system would be implemented, evaluated, and aligned with district needs. The sequence is mapped out and completion dates are shared by the Program Director with PTs and SPs through multiple avenues (SP monthly meetings, regular e-mails, TaskStream), but the review of TaskStream data reveals PTs' inconsistent completion of the FACT tasks to effectively inform their instructional practice.</p> <p>Although field-based work experiences should provide candidates with opportunities to understand issues of diversity, there is little evidence that the candidates use the formative assessment process to grow and develop as practitioners. There is no evidence that the field experiences are evaluated or the information used to improve the sequence.</p>	<p>Met The formative assessment process is carefully implemented with adjustments for individual participating teachers as requested.</p> <p>The issue of equity and diversity has been a focus for this year as well as working with English learners and supporting all students in learning.</p> <p>The e-Portfolio reading process was implemented in part so that the program would have a thorough understanding of how FACT is perceived by participating teachers and to improve its implementation in future years.</p> <p>It is clear that the participating teachers work with their students is supported by the formative assessment and reflective conversations that are required by the KCOE Induction program.</p>
9) Assessment of Candidate Competence	
<p>Not Met: Interview data collected from all stakeholders verified that the majority of PTs focused on document completion and compliance with completion deadlines rather than on the competencies identified in the Induction Standards. Most feedback provided to PTs and SPs further confirms the emphasis on this completion requirement. PTs currently enrolled in the Induction Program as well as Program Completers expressed concern over the amount of time spent on completing paperwork. In many cases, PTs use release time that is provided by the program and their districts to complete FACT documentation. While candidates participate in mid-year and end-of-year chats, there are no reports/records</p>	<p>Met With the increased understanding of formative assessment, the focus on document completion and compliance has disappeared. Candidates understand that there are requirements and that Candidates continue to report that their priority is their teaching, but now report that FACT and the reflective conversations support their teaching.</p> <p>All stakeholder groups were asked to identify the goals and outcomes of the KCOE Induction program. Responses were rich and on target: "to provide extra support to new teachers (PT), to help turn the book stuff we learned in college into useful practice in our classrooms (PT), to guide me and keep me going in the</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
<p>to review to confirm that these conversations capture a reflective process that is embedded within the FACT formative assessment system. Likewise, the document used to confirm participation in an Exit Interview is a checklist that reflects the PT’s TaskStream form completion report.</p> <p>PTs commented, during interviews, that their priority is their teaching and that the Induction work is something that just needs to be done when there is time. This perception leads to periods of “cramming” when many PTs complete the FACT forms during marathon sessions with their support providers. There is no consistent body of evidence to suggest that that the educational unit understands that the goal of Induction is to develop the habits of mind demonstrated by teachers who know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. As a result, neither SPs nor PTs have that understanding as well. Available evidence and data collected through stakeholder interviews defined program requirements as form-driven rather than behavior-driven.</p>	<p>right direction as a reflective teacher (PT), through the Cognitive Coaching conversations to guide the participating teachers (SP), to increase teacher efficacy and connect with what they are doing in their classrooms (SP), to support the school goals and help the new teacher become a professional colleague (SA), to support my teachers to become more reflective, stronger and more effective teachers (SA).” There was universal agreement that the KCOE Induction program has met these goals in 2011-12.</p> <p>The Exit Interview process has been refined and now involves the second year participants being interviewed by two or three educators with probing questions on important aspects of teaching. There is a set of questions and a four point rubric by which the participant’s responses are judged. The questions focus on teaching English learners and special populations, and equity. The teacher is asked to reflect on the program as a whole and to share where he or she plans to focus growth in year 3 and what his or her next steps are as an educator. Individuals who served as the interviewers and the participating teachers both commented on the depth of the conversations and how the interview process allowed each participant to demonstrate knowledge and skills.</p> <p>The program has a clearly delineated set of completion criteria and all candidates are judged against the criteria. The criteria is clearly outline on Task Stream and within the Handbook.</p>

2012 Revisit Team Findings on the Program Standards

During the April 2011 visit the team found that five Program Standards were **Met with Concerns** and one program standard was **Not Met**. After review of the institutional self-study, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, support providers, program leadership, school administrators, and county office representatives the team determined that all the General Education (MS and SS) Induction program standards are now **Met**. The summary of the 2011 visit and 2012 revisit findings is provided below.

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
Standard 1: Program Design and Rationale	
<p>Met with Concerns: The team was unable to find evidence that the program design provides systematic opportunities for the application and demonstration of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program. While the program design includes a formative assessment system (FACT) which should include evidence of intensive individualized support and assistance to each candidate, SPs’ awareness of the overall program design and program vision did not support their application at a learning-centered level. Overwhelmingly, the candidates, SPs, and Administrators who were interviewed mentioned completion of “documents” and due dates when asked to define the program goals.</p> <p>Foundational to the course of study within inquiry-based system is the development of an Individual Induction Plan (IIP) that guides the activities to support growth and improvement of professional practice in at least one content area of focus. The IIP should be a professional growth plan that details the steps a candidate will take to reach a professional goal based on the CSTP and assessed needs and documented through evidence of the teaching practice. Stakeholders reported and TaskStream evidence verified that, although the candidates complete the required portions of Formative Assessment, the IIP completion does not support the growth and attainment of professional goals.</p>	<p>Interviews with site administrators, support providers, and participating teachers indicate that through the formative assessment system (FACT) and support by trained support providers, participating teachers are provided systematic opportunities for the application and demonstration of pedagogical knowledge. Additional interviews with Advisory Committee members (including district level superintendents) and county leadership confirmed the vision and articulation of an integrated program design. Review of program materials, including participating teacher FACT portfolios, support the vision of teacher growth, job-imbedded professional development, and classroom-based support.</p> <p>Review of program-wide Individual Induction Plan (IIP) data indicates that the participating teachers are using the Inquiry process to guide their growth. Participating teachers are in dialogue with their site administrator, support portfolio and portfolio reviewers in order to support the application of their learning. Portfolios reviewers also add connections and additional resources towards the participating teacher’s professional goal.</p> <p>Interviews with site administrators and participating teachers referenced the connection to school and district initiatives, and supporting the growth in professional practice.</p> <p>Evidence from interviews as well as the review of the IIP and portfolios indicate that the IIP is</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
<p>Specifically, evidence could not be found that the IIP is developed and discussed with the support provider prior to the end of process submission, with a due date of May.</p>	<p>developed and reviewed at multiple points during the year. Portfolio reviewers interviewed confirmed that this revised process contributes to the participating teachers' growth and supports their continued application of the inquiry process.</p>
<p>Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration</p>	
<p>Met with Concerns: Limited evidence was found to demonstrate articulation with preliminary teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations in order to facilitate the transition from teacher preparation to induction and to build upon and provide opportunities for demonstration and application of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program. Regardless of where they completed their teacher preparation, candidates and completers did not make the link between pre-service and Induction. Interviews with SPs did not present contrasting information.</p> <p>The team found evidence that the KCOE TIP offers professional development for site administrators, which emphasizes the importance of new teacher development, and the foundations and processes of induction. Content topics include identifying the working conditions that optimize candidates' success and implementing effective steps to ameliorate or overcome challenging aspects of teachers' work environments. The team did not however find evidence of attendance during the review of documents.</p> <p>Additionally, Administrator interviews on the topic of support did not provide evidence to indicate that steps had been implemented to address challenging assignments for new teachers.</p>	<p>Met Evidence collected from the Advisory Committee, site administrators, support providers and participating teachers indicate that the Induction program is integrated into the individual schools and district plans and goals.</p> <p>Participating teachers articulated the connection between the teaching performance assessment that was completed in the initial preparation program and the formative assessment process in Induction. The Induction process was shared as being embedded in the teaching assignment and connected to school and district goals.</p> <p>Site administrator interviews affirmed the understanding of their roles and responsibilities of within the Induction process. Site administrators cited the connection between teacher preparation and the induction experience of the participating teacher and praised the collaborative model now in place. Site administrators referenced the student-focused dialogues which now take place on their campuses. Dialogues include pre and post assessment data as well as ways to support the participating teacher's investigation into effective instructional strategies.</p> <p>During interviews, site administrators referenced their understanding of the need to support participating teachers and specifically addressed the need to limit the challenges and the extra duties for new teachers.</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
Standard 3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers	
<p>Met with Concerns: Although, support providers attend monthly meetings to receive training on the next month’s work with candidates, there was a lack of evidence that this translates to assist participating teachers to develop the habits of mind necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state academic standards. SP interviews did indicate that the director increased the frequency of meetings with SPs for the 2010-11 year to ensure that SPs understood how to support their PTs completion of FACT documents through Task Stream. The team did not find evidence of support providers facilitating the participating teachers through the reflective analysis of their instructional practice using the formative assessment process. There was no evidence that support providers are assessed by program leadership or that formative feedback is provided to the support providers.</p>	<p>Met: Support Provider training, as confirmed by training documents and interviews with support providers and advisory committee members, now begins with Cognitive Coaching training for all support providers. Monthly support provider meetings now include cognitive coaching components and practice in coaching techniques. Support provider interviews highlighted the changes in the processes they use with their participating teachers. They also indicated that they see growth and changes in their participating because of the change in their coaching style and skills.</p> <p>During interviews support providers identified several avenues for them to receive feedback on their work, including support provider meetings, and mid-year reviews. They are also provided an opportunity to self- assess using a rubric and continuum. The Program Director interview referenced the support provider feedback form which is provided to each support provider at the end of the school year and includes participating teacher and director input. This is also used to guide the support provider selection process for the following year.</p>
Standard 4: Formative Assessment System	
<p>Not Met: Interviews with Participating Teachers and Support Providers revealed that PTs often completed FACT assignments through the electronic system of Task Stream on their own. Interviews with the Program Director, PTs, and SPs confirmed that although additional professional development opportunities beyond FACT are provided for PTs, attendance is low sometimes resulting in cancellation. This is due in part, to the fact that participation is encouraged but not required. As a result, the impact of this professional development on program improvement is not evident. PTs shared during interviews that participation in professional development is often determined</p>	<p>Met: Program leadership, site administrator, and support provider interviews revealed an increased focus on the desired Induction outcomes for the participating teacher. In addressing the topic of formative assessment in the current year all interview groups identified the connection between the participating teachers’ induction work and the meaningful application and connection in the classroom and on the school site. Site administrators referenced the ability to observe participating teacher growth and participate in professional dialogues at their school sites. These conversations are student and learning focused which guides the participating teacher’s focus of their teaching practice. The site administrators felt</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
<p>by the opportunity to secure units rather than to assist them in acquiring strategies to more effectively address the learning needs of their students.</p> <p>There was a lack of evidence that an inquiry based formative assessment system is used as intended to foster a reflective practitioner within the Kings COE Induction program. Formative assessment was not used to guide the growth and development of participating teachers. Because the focus is on completion of specific forms in the Kings COE Induction program, the nature of an inquiry that is collaborative and data-driven, supported by deep reflection was not observed by the team.</p> <p>In addition, review of Individual Induction Plans (IIP's) revealed that identified actions inconsistently reflected the teachers' understanding of appropriate strategies to use to improve student learning. There was a lack of evidence that the IIP is a working document that is revisited and used to guide the participating teacher's growth.</p>	<p>especially able to connect with site goals and shared "...new teachers are getting better, things are going right..."</p> <p>Overwhelmingly, site administrators, support providers and participating teachers talked about reflection and reflective conversation. The site administrators are aware that the goals of the program include the ability to become a reflective practitioner. They further understand how the ability to reflect impacts the ability to continue to grow over time. Support providers understand their role in promoting reflective conversations as well as helping their participating teachers to document this within the FACT modules. While addressing the Cognitive Coaching training they received this year the support providers made the connection to the powerful participating teacher outcomes due to their working together.</p> <p>Review of Individual Induction Plans (IIP's) confirmed that participating teachers are reflecting on their teaching practice. These reflections, along with the support of their support providers, are guiding their next steps of investigation and application in the classroom. Portfolio reviewers also highlighted the evidence of growth they see during portfolio reviews. Through their comments to participating teachers they are also able to support the teachers' next steps.</p>
Standard 5: Pedagogy	
<p>Met with Concerns: A review of evidence, including PTs' completed FACT documents (i.e., IIPs, Lesson Plans) did not illustrate that PTs either grew or improved in their ability to reflect upon and apply their insights of the CSTPs.</p> <p>The team found limited evidence of use of available technology to advance student learning. Some reference to teacher use of technology was evident in Task Stream; however, not of student use. Furthermore, interviews with candidates, included minimal reference to technology use by students.</p>	<p>Met: Participating teachers expressed an understanding of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the Continuum of Teaching Practice (CTP). Teachers explained how using evidence to assess their own practice on the CSTP focuses their efforts to improve their teaching. Site administrators shared that the participating teachers have a thorough understanding of the CSTP and are functioning as if they are much more experienced teachers rather than in their first or second year of teaching.</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
	<p>A review of PT FACT documents, in print and online using Task-Stream, provided evidence that the participating teachers and support providers frequently reflect on the Continuum of Teaching Practice and use the information to guide their inquiry and their individual induction plan. Captured in the summative reflective statements of the IIP, participating teachers were able to attribute student achievement to changes made in instruction and also included next steps or implications for future instruction.</p>
Standard 6(b): Universal Access—Teaching Special Populations	
<p>Met with Concerns: The team did not find consistent evidence of intentional candidate learning in the appropriate pedagogical practices related to teaching Special Needs students, nor was there evidence of the use of adopted standards-aligned instructional materials and resources (e.g., varying curriculum depth and complexity, managing Para educators, using assistive and other technologies. Interviews with candidates did not indicate that attention had been drawn to this group of learners.</p>	<p>Met: Participating teachers shared that the topic of special populations, along with teaching English learners, equity, and using technology to support instruction, was a focus of the induction program. The program provided each participating teacher with the <u>Pre-Referral Intervention Manual</u> to support each participating teacher to differential instruction and meet the needs of all students. The county office is providing workshops focusing on the Common Core standards and what teachers will need to do to support all students in learning.</p> <p>Additional documentation of the increased focus on appropriate practices was found in the student selection and lesson design sections of the formative assessment. The written reflections at the end of the inquiry indicate an emphasis on analysis of student outcomes and the impact of instructional strategies on student learning, for the full-range of learners.</p>