Initial Program Approval for New Program Sponsors
May 2018

Overview
This item consists of two parts. Part 1 addresses the new program proposal for Las Virgenes Teacher Induction program and Part 2 addresses the new program proposal for Santa Barbara Unified School District's Teacher Induction program. Both of these institutions have recently received provisional approval by the Commission as a new program sponsor.

Background
The Commission requires that an institution seeking to offer new educator preparation program(s) must first be approved for initial accreditation as a new program sponsor and must do so by completing the Commission's Initial Institution Approval (IIA) process. At the December 2015 Commission meeting, the Commission approved a new IIA process requiring the satisfactory completion of five approval stages as part of the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation project – updates to the IIA process were subsequently approved during the February 2016 meeting. A graphic detailing the five stages of the IIA process is provided on the following page.

Two institutions have recently been approved by the Commission and now seek program approval by the Committee on Accreditation to offer credential programs.

Part 1. Las Virgenes Unified School District (LVUSD) received provisional approval by the Commission as a new program sponsor in California at the September 2017 Commission meeting (See item 4A- September 2017 Commission meeting) and now seeks approval from the Committee on Accreditation to offer a Teacher Induction program. This agenda item includes 1) a summary of the proposed program and 2) the reviewers' feedback form. Finally, responses to the Teacher Induction standards for the proposed Las Virgenes Teacher Induction program have been posted on the COA meeting agenda page and can be found Las Virgenes Induction Program.

Part 2. Santa Barbara Unified School District received provisional approval by the Commission at the September 2017 Commission meeting (Item 4B September 2017 Commission meeting) and now seeks approval from the Committee on Accreditation to offer a Teacher Induction program. This agenda item includes 1) a summary of the proposed program and 2) the reviewers' feedback form. Finally, responses to the Teacher Induction standards for the proposed Santa Barbara Unified School District's Teacher Induction program have been posted on the COA meeting agenda page can be found at Santa Barbara USD Induction Program.

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Committee on Accreditation 1) grant initial program approval for Las Virgenes Unified School District's Teacher Induction program and 2) grant initial program approval to Santa Barbara Unified School District's Teacher Induction Program.

I	II	III	IV	V
Prerequisites	**Eligibility Criteria**	**Address Standards & Preconditions** **a) Common** **b) Program**	**Provisional Approval**	**Full Approval**
To ensure that the prospective sponsor is legally eligible to offer educator preparation programs in California. To ensure that the prospective sponsor understands the requirements of the Commission's accreditation system. **Staff Determination** If the institution is a legal entity and the team attends Accreditation 101, the institution may move to Stage II	To provide initial information to the Commission about the entity so that the Commission can make a decision if the prospective sponsor is one that has the potential to sponsor effective educator preparation programs. **Commission Decision** 1) Grant Eligibility 2) Grant Eligibility with specific topics to be addressed in Stage III 3) Require resubmission with additional information 4) Deny Eligibility	a) To ensure that the institution meets all of the Commission's Common Standards (e.g., infrastructure, resources, faculty, recruitment and support, continuous improvement, and program impact). Standards are reviewed by the BIR prior to going to Commission. b) To ensure that the proposed program meets all of the Commission's adopted program standards. Standards are reviewed by the BIR prior to going to the Commission. **a) Commission Decision** 1) Grant Provisional Approval 2) Deny Provisional Approval **b) Committee on Accreditation Decision** 1) Approve Program(s) 2) Deny Approval	After the program operates for 2-3 years, sufficient time so that a minimum of one cohort has completed the program and the institution has had ample time to collect data on candidate outcomes and program effectiveness, the institution will host an accreditation site visit. The report from this site visit, including related data, will be presented to the Commission. **Commission Decision** 1) Grant Full Approval 2) Retain Provisional Approval with additional requirements 3) Deny Approval	Once an entity has earned Full Approval from the Commission, the institution will be placed in one of the accreditation cohorts and will participate in the Commission's regularly scheduled accreditation activities. **Committee on Accreditation Decision** Monitors through the accreditation system

Part 1: Las Virgenes Unified School District (LVUSD)

Las Virgenes Unified School District
Las Virgenes Unified School District (LVUSD) completed the first three stages of the Initial Institutional Approval process as follows:

Stage I: Prerequisites 1 and 2	December 2016 - Attended Accreditation 101
Stage II: Eligibility Requirements	April 2017 - Approved by the Commission
Stage III: Preconditions and Common Standards	September 2017 - Received Provisional Approval by the Commission, eligible to offer educator preparation for a three year period

Las Virgenes Unified School District's responses to the Teacher Induction credential program standards were reviewed by a team of two Board of Institutional Reviewers. Reviewers collaborated on the feedback and provided LVUSD with a Report of Findings and LVUSD revised and resubmitted the responses. Following the revisions the reviewers determined LVUSD's responses to be in alignment with the requirements of the Teacher Induction Standards. Below is a summary of Las Virgenes Unified School District's proposed Teacher Induction program. The reviewers

Summary of Las Virgenes Unified School District's Teacher Induction Program Design
Summary of LVUSD's Teacher Induction program will be founded on a research–based mentoring experience that is individualized for each candidate. Candidate growth and development will be grounded in the CSTPs as demonstrated within candidate ILPs. In order to ensure that candidate goals will be developed around the skills and knowledge gained during a preliminary preparation program, LVUSD will partner with local institutes of higher education (IHEs). During the year, candidates will set a professional growth goal based on a CSTP Self-Assessment and Triad Meetings and candidates will engage in three teaching and learning cycles that relate directly to those growth goals.

LVUSD mentors/coaches will receive continuous training throughout each year. This training will support them in professional growth related to their coaching. Every training will include an examination of best practices in both coaching and adult learning and coaches will practice and refine their skills. Each session will build upon coaching skills previously taught by focusing on a different set of skills.

Individual Learning Plan (ILP)
LVUSD candidates will be required to identify within their ILPs professional growth goals that are supported by the CSTPs. To help candidates determine their areas of need and focus, candidates will use a CSTP self-assessment instrument, LVUSD's Continuum of Practice, the triad meeting information and data from coaching conversations. Once LVUSD candidates have developed a professional goal for the ILP, they will then participate in three teaching and learning cycles during the year. The purpose of the teaching and learning cycles is to provide the candidates with

a way to break down their goal into smaller, actionable steps that support their movement toward their professional growth goal. After the candidates complete their teaching and learning cycles, they will then reflect on their experiences and the way they may have grown and developed in their practice.

Coaching (mentoring)

LVUSD's mentoring design will be informed by Cognitive Coaching, Adaptive Schools, Blended Coaching and Equity Coaching and will include 40 hours of coaching. Coaches will be selected and assigned through a collaborative process between the LVUSD Program Coordinator and the site administrators. Qualifications for coaches include:

- Knowledge of the context and content area of the candidates' teaching assignment
- A demonstrated commitment to professional learning, reflection, and collaboration
- The ability, willingness, and flexibility to meet the candidates' needs for support
- A clear teaching credential
- A minimum of four years of effective teaching experience, with the last two in LVUSD

Coaches will collaborate with candidates to self-assess and examine their teaching practice and set goals. Using this information, candidates will develop an ILP which will be aligned to the CSTPs. Within 30 days of the start of the program, candidates will participate in a Triad Meeting with their administrators and coaches. During the Triad meeting, candidates will 1) inform their administrator about their professional goals and 2) receive administrative feedback and support related to their ILP.

LVUSDs mentoring design requires that candidates receive an a average of not less than one hour per week of individualized support/mentoring as well as "just in time" support. Coaches will also observe candidates once each semester (twice per year) at which time they will engage in reflective conversations, support candidates in identifying appropriate observation criteria, and collect evidence during the observations. Coaches will also periodically review the candidates' ILPs in order to assist with any changes or revisions needed. Additionally, release days will be provided for both coaches and candidates to allow them to participate in classroom observations based on the needs of the candidates.

LVUSD's coaches will participate in in a Teacher Coaching Academy where they will receive training throughout the year. Topics covered during the Teacher Coaching Academy sessions include "Building a Strong Coaching Relationship," "Listening and Questioning," "Feedback," "Facilitative vs. Instructional Coaching," and "Reflection on Growth." Additionally, coaches will be required to attend a Summer Coaching Institute in order to receive training before beginning work with candidates. Each coaching training will require coaches to examine their skills, practice and reflect in triads.

Determining Candidate Competence

On a quarterly basis, LVUSD's Documentation Review Panel, comprised of current and experienced coaches, will assess evidence provided by candidates. Using an ILP scoring rubric to

score candidates' coursework the Panel will provide feedback to the candidates. The ILP rubric is directly aligned to and mirrors the ILP and is designed to support growth toward mastery of the CSTPs.

In addition to quarterly reviews, the Documentation Review Panel will convene at the end of the academic year to review candidates' coursework. Using observations, trends, data shared when scoring ILPs, the panel will document candidate growth on a continuum of teaching practice thus tracking and assessing candidates' progress toward mastery.

Prior to recommending candidates for the clear credential, the LVUSD Program Coordinator along with the Credential Analyst will track and verify that candidates have satisfactorily completed all program requirements. Once verified, the Program Coordinator will make a recommendation to the Director of Education and Leadership at LVUSD. Once the Director of Education and Leadership ensures that candidates have met the full breadth of requirements, the recommendation for the clear credential will be submitted.

.

Appendix A
Report of Findings
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Initial Program Review Feedback

Induction Program Standards 2015

Institution	LVUSD
Date of initial review	July 2017,
Subsequent dates of review	September 2017; March 2018, **April 2018**
Date Program Standards Aligned	**April 2018**

General Comments:

Status	Standard
~~More Information Needed~~ ~~More Information Needed~~ Aligned	1: Program Purpose ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** Because each of the subsequent standards requires more information, clarity surrounding program purpose is lacking. • There is a lack of clarity regarding the design of a robust mentoring system.
~~More Information Needed~~ ~~More Information Needed~~ Aligned	2: Components of the Mentoring Design ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** • Course Catalog links to another org chart. Please provide correct document for review or provide other documentation for training courses for Mentors. • The observation document references, "select appropriate observation tool" Please provide either the online link to the tools or link copies of them to your document • The response indicates mentoring design is informed by Cognitive Coaching, Adaptive Schools, Blended Coaching, and Equity Coaching. There is no evidence of a systematic training plan for mentors related to these topics and the coaching strategies outlined do not incorporate all of these items. • The response references mentor observations and coaching conversations regarding the observation. When are mentors trained to do this? • The ILP targets development of a plan that incorporates the input from the teacher. Program provider, school administrator and the Preliminary Program Transition Plan. The school administrator input is provided during the Triad. It is not clear when the Preliminary Program Transition Plan is referenced. Does the

Status	Standard
	mentor serve as the "Program provider" in ILP development or does the Induction Program review / contribute to ILP development?
~~More Information Needed~~ ~~More Information Needed~~ Aligned	3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed**:* • The document review indicates candidates focus on 8 specific CSTP elements each year which have been selected by the program. The standard states, "The candidate's specific teaching assignment should provide the appropriate context for the development of the overall ILP." How will the program's ILP design "provide each candidate with an individualized, job-embedded focus" (precondition 1) • The ILP seems to focus more significantly on inquiries than on the CSTPs. The ILP document includes prompts that suggest the teacher completes the form as an individual and does not set the stage for a collaborative development of the ILP. It was difficult to determine which part of the ILP structure is collaborative and allowed for support from the program, mentor and site administrator. • There is a focus on "Instructional Objective" within each inquiry. It was challenging to see why this was the consistent focus, when any one of the six CSTPs might be the main target of reflection. The prompt encouraging reflection asks about "impact of this activity" but does not specifically address the CSTPs. • The *Documentation Review Panel* document indicates that candidates self-assess on specific elements of each standard, not the entire standard. Are ILP goals limited to these elements or can they be based on any aspect of the CSTP? • It appears there is a prescribed series of required courses for all candidates. In what ways does this series of coursework provide for "individualized, job-embedded" support for new teachers? • In reviewing the Triad meeting document, it remains unclear how this document supports development of a CSTP based ILP. The standard clearly states, "The Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) must address the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession"* and "The ILP must be collaboratively developed **at the beginning of Induction** by the candidate and the mentor, with input from the employer." The intent of the triad meeting to support development of the ILP is to ensure alignment of selected CSTPs with the CSTP goals being focused upon by the employer. There is no clear timeline for when this triad meeting occurs nor how it specifically informs development of the ILP. • Although your narrative states the selection of CSTPs for focus is determined by the candidate and there is a bold sentence on the Self-Assessment document also indicating such, the document itself places six predetermined CSTP elements in front of candidates in a format which does not allow for them to edit for self-selection. Perhaps a full revision of this document is needed to facilitate alignment with induction program standards and the spirit of the CTC revisions

Status	Standard
	• The standard states, "The ILP must include candidate professional growth goals, a description of how the candidate will work to meet those goals, defined and measurable outcomes for the candidate, and planned opportunities to reflect on progress and modify the ILP as needed." A review of the ILP document does not indicate inclusion of a **professional growth goal**, but rather an area of focus and description of an activity and how that activity is aligned with the CSTP. • The ILP Document asks for candidates to list the expected and actual outcomes of the activity without being clear that these are outcomes for the Candidate as stated in the standard. • Question 7 inquires about the impact of the "activity" on the "environment OR student achievement" While the question is a valid question, it is unclear how this question supports reflection on candidate's professional growth. • Question 8 inquires about "next instructional steps". This indicates next steps for instructional teaching of students not revision of a CSTP professional growth goal. • The standard states, "Within the ILP… support opportunities must be identified for each candidate to practice and refine effective teaching practices" There is no evidence of identification of support opportunities for the candidate within the ILP document. • A thoughtful revision of the ILP development process including all related documents is recommended along with a development of a solid timeline for ILP development and revision.
~~More Information Needed~~ ~~More Information Needed~~ Aligned	4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** • Please provide evidence of initial and ongoing training of coaches including but not limited to coaching and mentoring, best practices in adult learning, and reflection on mentoring practice. • How are mentors selected and assigned? The job description and qualifications for a coach are shared, but the protocol for selection and assignment is not present. • Standard 1 indicates that Cognitive Coaching will be used as a strategy by mentors. When is this training delivered? How many hours of mentor / coach training are necessary before a mentor actually starts working with an induction candidate? • When do coaches receive training related to working with adults / best practices in adult learning? • There is an emphasis on induction candidates accessing structured PD related to the CSTPs. How do these trainings promote an individualized job-embedded program? • The design of mentor training remains unclear. The Course Catalog for Coaches itemizes sessions in September that provide a program overview and a webcast

Status	Standard
	to select and register for later trainings. When do mentors actually receive training that specifically addresses coaching and mentoring strategies and best practices? The mentor training schedule suggests that the mentor begins working with the teacher with little or no up front basic mentor training. • Where are best practices in adult learning addressed? Three texts are listed as central texts. *The Multiplier Effect* is the focus of two training sessions but it's unclear how the other two texts are used. • How is support provided for individual mentoring challenges?
More Information Needed More Information Needed More Information Needed **Aligned**	5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** • What is the verification process to ensure each candidate's renewal requirements are fully met prior to recommendation for the Clear Credential? • Please include links to Appeals Process and Program Repeat Policy • The Repeat Policy is written from the perspective of a candidate requesting to repeat a portion of the induction program. It speaks of the candidate making a formal written request to repeat. Typically, candidates are repeating at the request of the program. The program, not the candidate, substantiates the reason for the need to repeat an aspect of the induction program. • The response indicates that the Documentation Review Panel meets on a quarterly basis. The Documentation Review Panel document speaks about review of candidate work, the Inquiry Index. The review is presented as an academic review of the candidate inquiry. Where is the focus on review of the candidate's practical mastery of the CSTPs? • The document entitled *Teacher Induction Program Checklist* is designed to check on completion of various things such as CSTP self-reflection, completion of surveys, attendance at trainings. There is no evidence of the ways in which progress towards mastery of the CSTPs is tracked and assessed. • *The Individualized Learning Plan Scoring Rubric* has few references to the CSTPs. The "Apply" section assesses the candidate's ability to "apply knowledge to future activities". It does not focus on assessing candidate's current skill and ability related to current mastery of the CSTPs. • What is the verification process to ensure each candidate's renewal requirements (not simply completion of Induction program requirements)are fully met prior to recommendation for the Clear Credential? How does the ILP Rubric and Panel that determines progress towards mastery directly link to the successful completion of the activities accomplished in the ILP during the 2 years? Please provide further information on how these are completely aligned.

Status	Standard
	The reviewers need clarity on this process and on who is responsible for checking credentials to ensure ALL requirements? What is the recommendation verification process and what are the roles of the individuals involved in this?
More Information Needed More Information Needed More Information Needed **Aligned**	6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed*:** • How and when will the program gather data to assess quality of services? • Please include links to Appeals Process and Program Repeat Policy • How will formative feedback be provided to mentors? • In what ways does the program ensure ongoing development of mentor skills? • The Repeat Policy is written from the perspective of a candidate requesting to repeat a portion of the induction program. It speaks of the candidate making a formal written request to repeat. Typically candidates are repeating at the request of the program. The program, not the candidate, substantiates the reason for the need to repeat an aspect of the induction program. • Program participant survey could not be accessed – requires a LVUSD email address • No evidence of mentor survey • No evidence of survey targeting school administrators where program participants are assigned. • How are teacher candidates informed of the ability to seek a mentor reassignment? There is no evidence of a mentor survey or an administrator survey. Please provide.

Part 2: Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD)

Santa Barbara Unified School District

Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD) completed the first three stages of the Initial Institutional Approval process as follows:

Stage I: Prerequisites 1 and 2	December 2016 - Attended Accreditation 101
Stage II: Eligibility Requirements	April 2017 - Approved by the Commission
Stage III: Preconditions and Common Standards	September 2017 - Received Provisional Approval by the Commission, eligible to offer educator preparation for a three year period

SBUSD's responses to the Teacher Induction credential program standards were reviewed by a team of two Board of Institutional Reviewers. Reviewers collaborated on the feedback and provided SBUSD with a Report of Findings and SBUSD revised and resubmitted the responses. This process continued until the reviewers determined SBUSD's responses to be in alignment with the requirements of the Teacher Induction standards. Below is a summary of SBUSD's proposed Teacher Induction Program.

Summary of Santa Barbara Unified School District Teacher Induction Program Design

The foundation of SBUSD's Teacher Induction program will be the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP). Each candidate will develop an ILP according to his/her preliminary program transition plan and CalTPA scores. Candidates will identify areas of strength and areas of need framed by the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs). Mentors will be selected for candidates based on an understanding of the candidate's content and context of the teaching assignment. Candidates and mentors will have multiple opportunities to work together during each year of the two-year program. Candidates will work with mentors as they reflect on their development and when refining ILPs. At mid-year and year-end, candidates will analyze the evidence of their achievement of the CSTPs and identify appropriate resources necessary to continue to grow in their practice. Second-year candidates will also engage in this process at the beginning of the school year, taking into account summer professional learning, personal growth and reflection, and/or a new teaching assignment. By repeating this cycle of inquiry, goal-setting, and examination of work, the program intends to foster within candidates the lifelong habit of engaging in such professional practice.

Individual Learning Plan (ILP)

Throughout SBUSD's two year teacher induction program, candidates will engage in a continuous cycle of self-assessment, identifying areas of need, making plans to address those areas, implementing the plans, assessing the outcomes as defined by levels of practice on the CSTPs, recording those outcomes and refining the plans to continue working on growing as a professional educator. SBUSD candidates will first develop their ILPs during the initial weeks of the school year. The ILP will be designed using input from various sources such as a transition document from the candidates' preliminary teacher preparation program, mentor meetings and

information from site leaders as to the candidates' job assignments. The candidates' ILPs will include professional growth goals that are framed by the CSTPs. These goals will describe a specific objective and must be measurable. In addition to conducting and recording reflection on the ILP during weekly candidate/mentor meetings, there will be mid-year and end-of-year opportunities for candidates to refine their ILPs.

Mentoring

SBUSD's mentoring will be a research-based design in which the coordinator will work with site leaders to identify teacher mentors who work at the same site as the candidate they are supporting. The mentoring design will also be informed by the New Teacher Center. Mentors in SBUSD's induction program will interact a minimum of an average of one hour weekly with candidates and these weekly interactions will be recorded in a weekly candidate/mentor log.

During the first 60 days of the program, mentors will work with candidates to determine areas of need around the CSTPs after which the candidate will develop an ILP and growth goals. Mentors will provide and facilitate long-term support as well as "just-in time" support and will engage in reflective conversations with the candidates about their ILPs and progress around the CSTPs. Mentors will participate in quarterly reviews of the candidates' ILPs and will assist in twice yearly revisions of those ILPs. Mentors may also make their classrooms available to candidates as demonstration classrooms and may share professional learning resources such as scholarly publications, online learning communities, information about professional organizations and conferences.

SBUSD will partner with site leaders including special education and early childhood program administrators to ensure that appropriate mentors are provided to induction candidates. Mentors will, as often as possible, teach at the same site, the same grade level and in the same content area as the candidates to whom they are assigned to support. If a content area mentor is unavailable at a site, the SBUSD Coordinator and the Coordinator of Certificated Personnel will assist in identifying prospective mentors at other sites who are a credential match and will then work with the mentor's site leader to determine if the match is appropriate. SBUSD will provide site principals with mentor guidelines which include the following qualifications:

- Hold a Clear California Teaching Credential
- Possess knowledge of the context and content area of the candidate's teaching assignment
- Demonstrate a commitment to professional learning and collaboration
- Are able, willing, and flexible to meet candidate needs for support
- Have completed a minimum of three years of effective teaching practice

Training of mentors will be ongoing and will include an introduction to mentoring seminar, quarterly mentoring meetings and an online learning platform. Mentors will be trained in guided reflection, goal setting, the creation and review of ILPs, supporting candidate growth by means of the cycle of inquiry and strategies for recording observations and providing feedback.

Feedback for mentors will be based on information from candidate/mentor logs, mentor input on ILPs, candidate mid-year and year-end survey data and the mentors' participation in quarterly cohort meetings.

Determining Candidate Competence

SBUSD will assess the progress of its candidates toward mastery of the CSTPs using a holistic review of candidate development. Elements of assessment will also include evidence of the candidates' active engagement in program activities such as the candidate/mentor logs completed after each weekly meeting between the mentors and candidates, monthly candidate cohort meetings, and evidence of professional learning as outlined in the candidates' ILPs. Throughout the two years, candidates and their mentors will provide supporting documentation needed to verify successful completion of the activities outlined in the ILP and the candidates' progress toward mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Prior to recommending candidates for the clear credential, SBUSD will verify that each candidate has satisfactorily completed all of the program activities and requirements. At the end of the program, candidates' final ILPs will be used to set goals for the next 5 years as fully credentialed teachers in California.

Appendix A
Report of Findings
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Initial Program Review Feedback

Induction Program Standards 2015

Institution	SBUSD
Date of initial review	August 23, 2017
Subsequent dates of review	March 22, 2018
Date Program Standards Aligned	**April 23, 2018**

General Comments: The program does not provide evidence related to statements made throughout the document for each of the program standards. Evidence should be directly linked to each statement in the standard in which it is required. The readers are having to work very hard to "infer" from the limited evidence provided. Please provide specific information about how the standards will be implemented, what evidence will be collected to verify the standard, and what criteria will be used to determine candidate competence and program effectiveness.

A comprehensive reading of the program standards indicate that overall, the program design provides the structure to implement an effective teacher induction program. More information is needed for Standard Three.

General Comments have been addressed

Status	Standard
More Information Needed Aligned	**1: Program Purpose** ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** **Please provide a direct link to all evidence in this standard.** More information is needed to determine how the program builds on the knowledge and skills gained during the Preliminary Program. More articulation is needed to define the program purpose in regards to the development of a robust mentoring system. More information is needed concerning how the candidate is moved forward through the program to ensure candidate competence.

Status	Standard
	More information is needed concerning how the individualized learning plan is developed during the mentoring session, per your response. What type of documentation is reviewed during the development of the ILP, and what is the process used to review those documents?
More Information Needed Aligned	**2: Components of the Mentoring Design** ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** **Please provide a direct link to all evidence in this standard.** **The initial sentence of the standard is not addressed.** More information is needed concerning how the program has developed and embedded the theory and research that supports the rationale for the program. How does the program provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate growth on the CSTPs? How is data collected to show candidate growth on the CSTPs over the two years of Induction? Per the standards: How does the program provider determine teacher needs? What are the criteria for growth on the CSTPs that would lead to a clear credential? How does the ILP address the competencies that support the recommendation for the clear credential? What data will be analyzed to determine the emerging needs among candidates mentioned in your response? What **evidence** can you provide concerning a structure of quarterly mentor meetings and monthly candidate cohort meetings differentiated for year one and two, per your response? How will data inform your program, and what types of data will be collected for this analysis? When do candidates select professional learning, based on their ILPs, per your statements? What **evidence** is collected to demonstrate how site administrators provide support throughout the year to new teachers, per your statements?

Status	Standard
	What **evidence** can you provide to substantiate your assertion that there are multiple sources of job-embedded support and collegial structures for new teachers, per your statements?
More Information Needed More Information Needed **Aligned**	**3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System** ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** **Please provide a direct link to all evidence in this standard.** **The initial part of the standard is not addressed.** Information is needed as to how the ILP provides a road map for candidates (based on the CSTPs) during their two years in induction that directs the guidance of the mentor in providing support. (page 3) Where is the **evidence** for each of the meetings that take place, per your response: • candidate and mentor meetings to develop the initial ILP • program mentors and site leaders to solicit input on candidate job assignments and available site resources (i.e., meeting agendas) • TIP coordinator and candidates regarding district initiatives and necessary teaching competencies required to achieve those goals (page 3). Mentors should assist in providing evidence of growth. We are questioning why mentors "assess" the candidate. Does the mentor observe the candidate prior to the development of the ILP in order to assist in providing **evidence** of CSTP levels? We see an administrator evaluation form. Where is the candidate self-assessment document used to determine growth goals? (page 3) Per the ILP, how will candidate goals be defined and measurable? What data will be collected to determine candidate growth and competence? (page 3) More information is needed to specify how the candidates will work to meet their goals, reflect on their progress, and modify the ILP, as needed, per the standard. What is the **evidence** that this takes place? (page 3)

Status	Standard
	What is an Elementary Credential (page 3)? More information is needed about the focused cycles of inquiry, as well as **evidence** of how these cycles will be determined and implemented, based on defined goals of the candidate. What data is collected (for the pre and post assessments) and how is it used to determine candidate growth and student achievement? (page 3-4 of your response) What is the **evidence** that SBUSD (and site administrators) provides resources to meet candidate needs? How are candidate needs assessed and processed? How many professional development offerings, per ILP goal, will a candidate be encouraged to attend? (page 4) What **evidence** is available, per your response, of professional development offerings through Special Education, the English Learner Services and Educational Services? Will a menu of options be provided during the ILP meeting to determine what is available to the candidate? What **evidence** of attendance and candidate reflection of the professional development offerings will be used to determine how they impact growth goals? (page 4) What **evidence** will be collected to substantiate that dedicated time for mentor and candidate interaction, observations of colleagues and peers and professional development (specified on the ILP) is provided? How will mentors and candidates be trained to collect and analyze data? What are the tools to assist in navigating the process that are mentioned in the response? How does the program meet the following element of the standard? "In addition, the mentoring process must support each candidate's consistent practice of reflection on the effectiveness of instruction, **analysis of student** and **other outcomes data**, **and the use of these data to further inform the repeated cycle of planning and instruction."** There is no evidence cited to answer this standard – there is only the restatement of the standard. What is the **evidence** of the development of the consistent practice of reflection by the candidate for the purpose of informing the next cycle of planning and instruction?

Status	Standard
	What **evidence** will be collected to ensure the mentor facilitates the connection of the candidate to the larger professional learning community?
More Information Needed Aligned	**4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors** ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** **Out of 15 statements in this Standard, only 5 have links to evidence. Provide direct evidence links for all sections of the Standard.** **First sentence of the standard is not addressed.** How does the program assign qualified mentors and provide guidance and clear expectations for the mentoring experience based on the **program design**? (page 5) What process is used to determine the qualification of the mentor? What **evidence** is provided to ensure credential match and knowledge of content and context, other than verification and selection by site administrator (what if they are new?) Who determines eligibility for the mentor? Is HR involved? What are the mentor guidelines that are provided to site administrators to ensure that mentors demonstrate ability, willingness and flexibility to meet the candidate's needs? What documentation will the site leaders provide the program that mentors are qualified (per the standard?) What is the **evidence** of effective teaching experience, per the response to the standard? What are the printed guidelines, per the mentor TIP website (provide a link for this evidence.) Per our review, there is no mentor section of evidence provided. Links on the website are not accessible to the reviewers. Again, how will site principals provide **evidence** to the program that they have followed the guidelines in selecting and pairing mentors with candidates? How will the program train their mentors to provide "just in time" support, and longer term guidance? What guidelines and differentiated training (per your response) will be provided? What structure for individual mentor feedback will be in place by the program? Who will provide feedback? What **evidence** can you provide on the following: Guided reflection training for mentors – when and what? How will the program train and calibrate mentor observation collection and analysis to provide feedback to the candidate? Where are the (proposed) agendas for training these strategies?

Status	Standard
	What is the **evidence** (please provide a direct link) to district professional growth **resources**, Institutions of Higher Education or Professional Organizations (which you specify) **resources,** as well as resources for all other areas of professional development listed on page 6 paragraph three? What is the process for acquiring resources, as indicated by the ILPs? How do mentors help candidates access these resources per your statements? Please provide a budget or other evidence, as you specify that funding to cover costs is available. Where is the timeline of dates to be used for the periodic review of the candidate's ILP? Please provide a link to Inductionsupport.com or other software so that the reviewers can determine the process the Coordinator will use to monitor and verify candidate completion (per your statement) based on the ILP. Please provide more information about the training related to coaching and mentoring, goal setting, creation and review of the ILP, use of appropriate mentoring instruments (what are they?). How will the mentors be trained in these areas to support candidates? Please explain the Continuum of Mentoring Practice and provide a copy as evidence, as well as links to all other mentoring instruments. Please explain how each instrument will be used. How is mentoring practice assessed, calibrated and formative feedback provided to mentors across the program? The Cycle of Inquiry is delineated; however, what training will be provided to the mentors for the structure and process of the Cycles of Inquiry and what evidence will be collected to verify candidate participation in the Inquiry process? What feedback will be provided to the candidate (why is this specified as optional per your document)?
	5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** **Please provide a direct link to all evidence in this standard.** **First sentence of the standard is not addressed.** How does the program assess candidate progress toward mastery of the CSTPs?

Status	Standard
More Information Needed Aligned	How does the program provide **evidence** that the candidate has completed all aspects of the ILP, including progress toward mastery of the CSTPs and progress documented through professional development? Mentors should assist in providing evidence of growth. We are questioning why mentors "assess" the candidate. Where on the ILP do the candidates reflect on their learning and growth, related to their goals and their CSTP focus? You specify that the candidate completes a final ILP. How does this assist in measuring progress, as stated in your response? Is there a separate form with specific prompts for candidate reassessment on the CSTPs and reflection on candidate learning? How do the Inquiries relate to the ILP? How do candidates demonstrate progress toward mastery on ALL CSTPs? How is the program defining "candidate competence"? What is the level of competence required for recommendation for the clear credential? Where are the "seminars" listed in your evidence that are required for a candidate's successful completion? Are monthly meetings for candidates required for completion or are they optional? Does the program have a progress monitoring document for the candidates that includes the list of documentation required for completion (that you specify?) What documented **evidence** is required for the verification of program completion – i.e., candidate/mentor contact logs, observation documentation, documentation of attendance at seminars, completion of professional development and candidate reflections on growth, Inquiry focus and analysis of results, etc…? Is there a Program Completion Document that is provided to the credential analysts to verify candidate competence prior to recommendation?

Status	Standard
	Please provide more information concerning the use and timeline for the grievance process. Is there a separate appeal process? What is the **evidence** that candidates are allowed to repeat portions of the program?
More Information Needed Aligned	**6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services** ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed*:** **Please provide a direct link to all evidence in this standard.** How is the quality of services assessed? What is the **evidence**? What assessment instrument(s) will be used? Why are the guidelines for reassignment tied into the grievance process? What is the appeals process defined in Standard 5? The readers are confused as to how the program will use these processes. Please provide more information and **evidence**. Please provide **evidence** of how the program will provide a coherent overall system of support? How does the program provide **evidence** of mentors' direct weekly support to candidates? How does the program provide **evidence** of monthly peer support for candidates? What is the attendance verification process? How does the program provide **evidence** of quarterly mentor peer support and attendance verification? What is the **evidence** that mentors receive regular support from site leaders and the TIP Coordinator? What is the **evidence** that site leaders receive support from the TIP Coordinator and relevant district administrators? What is the communication **evidence** (templates and/or drafts) for communication to all stakeholders in the Induction System?