

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the  
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at  
La Mesa Spring Valley School District**

**Professional Services Division  
May 2018**

**Overview of this Report**

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

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

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

**Program Standards**

	<b>Total Program Standards</b>	<b>Program Standards</b>		
		<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Teacher Induction	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>2</b>

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

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

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

**Institution:** La Mesa-Spring Valley Schools California

**Dates of Visit:** March 19-21, 2018

**2017-18 Accreditation**

**Team Recommendation:** Accreditation with Stipulations

<b>Previous History of Accreditation Status</b>
<i>Although La Mesa Spring Valley School District has operated a Commission approved educator preparation program since 2004, induction programs were not incorporated into the accreditation system until 2011. Therefore, the 2018 accreditation site visit is the first accreditation site visit for this institution.</i>

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. 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. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Program Standards

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for the Teacher Induction program. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concern, or not met. The site visit team found that 4 program standards were **Met**, and 2 program standards were **Not Met**.

Common Standards

The entire team reviewed each of the five Common Standards and determined whether the standard was met, not met, or met with concerns. The site visit team found that two Common Standards were **Met**, two Common Standards were **Met with Concerns** and one Common Standard was **Not Met**.

The team completed a thorough review of La Mesa Spring Valley Teacher Induction program documents, program data, formative assessment system, teacher work products, interviews with program leadership, including district administrators, site administrators, credential personnel, mentors, candidates, completers, and the Induction Advisory Committee. Based on the findings from this review the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

Below are the recommended stipulations.

That within one year, La Mesa Spring Valley Schools must:

1. Provide evidence that it actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.
2. Provide evidence that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.
3. Provide evidence that the program receives sufficient resources to allow for effective operation of the educator preparation program. The resources must enable each program to effectively operate in terms of coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development and instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.
4. Provide evidence that site-based supervisors are carefully selected, trained, and oriented to provide effective, knowledgeable support for candidates.
5. Provide assurance that the institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences.
6. Provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive continuous improvement process in which both the unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness and make appropriate modifications based on findings. This process must include the systematic collection, analysis, and use of candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations. That the continuous improvement process collects feedback from all key stakeholders about the quality of the program.
7. Provide quarterly written documentation to the team lead and Commission consultant documenting all actions to remove the stipulations noted above.
8. That within one year of this action, the institution hosts a revisit with the team lead and Commission consultant to collect evidence of actions to address the stipulations noted above.

#### Precondition Compliance Issue

The team found that the institution was not in compliance with Induction Precondition 5 that requires that “The ILP must be designed and implemented solely for the professional growth and

development of the participating teacher and not for evaluation for employment purposes.” More information on the details can be found in the program report.

In order to operate as an approved program, institutions must be in alignment with preconditions at all times. However, it is the team’s understanding that in order to rectify this particular precondition at this institution, it needs to be addressed through the collective bargaining process. Therefore, in order to allow the process to occur to address the concerns by the team that the precondition be addressed promptly, the team recommended to the Administrator of Accreditation that that the institution provide a letter signed by district leadership and union leadership within 15 days of the visit that acknowledged the issue and demonstrated the parties commitment to rectifying the noncompliance of the institution with Precondition 5 through the collective bargaining process. This letter was provided and is included as Appendix A in this item.

The team also recommends a follow up letter be submitted by district leadership to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing addressing how the institution has responded to complying with and aligning to Induction Precondition 5 as soon as resolution is made.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements.

#### Teacher Induction

Staff recommends that:

- The institutions response to the preconditions be addressed according to the above conditions.
- La Mesa Spring Valley School District not be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- La Mesa Spring Valley School District continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

## Accreditation Team

<b>Team Lead:</b>	<b>Sandy Beller</b> West Covina Unified School District
<b>Common Standards:</b>	<b>Cathaleen Hampton</b> New Haven Unified School District
<b>Programs Cluster:</b>	<b>Debra Sioui</b> Contra Costa County Office of Education
<b>Staff to the Visit:</b>	<b>Karen Sacramento</b> Commission on Teacher Credentialing

## Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission	Program Assessment Feedback
Common Standards Feedback	Program Summary
Common Standards Addendum	Induction Brochure
Preconditions	Meeting Minutes
Candidate Electronic Folders and Documents	Agendas
Candidate ILPs	Calendars
Candidate Transcript	Timelines
Candidate Competency Forms	Exit Interview Questions
Survey Data	Recruitment Fair Flyers
Support Provider Nomination Form	Intake Form
Support Provider Interview Questions	Support Provider Job Description
IAC Agendas	Induction Candidate MOUs
Standards Transition Plan	Support Provider MOUs
Program Assessment Submission	District Organizational Charts
Program Assessment Addendum	Program Communications
	Contact Logs
	Advisement Documents
	Professional Development Agendas
	LMSV Bargaining Unit Contract

### Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	50
Completers	6
Site Administrators	14
Institutional Administration	3
Program Coordinators	2
Faculty	5
Support Providers	5
Field Supervisors – Program	3
Field Supervisors – District	2
Credential Analysts and Staff	1
Advisory Board Members	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>96</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

#### **Background Information**

La Mesa Spring Valley (LMSV) School District is located in the East County area of San Diego County. LMSV encompasses the cities of La Mesa, portions of El Cajon and the unincorporated areas of Casa de Oro, Mount Helix and Spring Valley. The District covers 26 square miles and serves 12,300 pupils with 16 elementary schools (grades K-6), one middle school (grades 7-8), one "dual immersion" literacy academy (grades K-3), and three specialty academies (grades 4-8).

#### **Education Unit**

La Mesa Spring Valley Schools gives authority to the Induction Advisory Council (IAC) which is composed of the Assistant Superintendent of Learning Support, the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, and three members of the La Mesa Spring Valley Teachers Association to design and implement the Induction Program. The Induction Team involves the IAC in a shared decision making process. The Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources is authorized to oversee and manage the entire scope of the La Mesa Spring Valley Schools' California Teacher

Induction Program, under the direction of the IAC. The program is supported by 3 full time release mentors who currently serve 45 year one and year two candidates.

**Table 1**  
**Program Review Status**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Number of Program Completers (2016-17)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Enrolled (2017-18)</b>
General Education Teacher Induction	14	34
Education Specialist Teacher Induction	0	11

**The Visit**

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

## **Program Reports Teacher Induction**

### **Program Design**

La Mesa Spring Valley School District gives authority to the Induction Advisory Council (IAC) which is composed of the Assistant Superintendent of Learning Support, the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, and three members of the La Mesa- Spring Valley Teachers Association to design and implement the Induction Program. The program utilizes a full release mentoring model, with two general education mentors working with elementary and middle school candidates, and one special education mentor working with special education candidates. The dualistic role of the IAC in induction program support and teacher evaluation and employment was evident through multiple stakeholder interviews and reviewed documentation throughout the site visit. These interviews elucidated that IAC discussions about candidate induction support and progress are directly linked to evaluation for employment processes and to those involved in making employment decisions.

Interviews and review of program documentation confirm the strengths of the design of the La Mesa Spring Valley Schools' California Teacher Induction Program which are a focus on developing the skills and knowledge acquired in the preliminary program and their classroom application. It is evident that the program's design takes into account individual teacher needs. In interviews with program completers, a dance teacher reported her induction program was modified, allowing her to incorporate dance into other curricular areas. A second grade teacher, who is assigned to an upper grade teacher reported her mentor facilitating collaboration between the teacher and other second grade colleagues throughout the district to meet the candidate's curricular needs. As one teacher stated, "If I did not have my mentor, I honestly don't know if I would be here."

Program completion requirements are presented to candidates at Advice and Assistance meetings in August. All evidence for the completion of the LMSV Schools' Induction Program is submitted electronically and scored using rubrics. The site visit team noted that a variety of assessment instruments, including rubrics, were available to assess and monitor candidate progress toward completion. However, the team was unable to verify the existence of a defensible process by which candidate competence, as defined by the standard, is measured and utilized to make recommendations for the clear credential.

Individualized support is provided via the completion of an Individual Learning Plan (ILP), based on the candidate's needs and areas for growth. University Transition Plans, weekly mentor observations, and the candidate's self-assessment of their professional practice on the CSTPs guide the development of the Individual Learning Plan (ILP). Review of candidates' self-assessment confirms candidates assess their practice on all elements of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) through the use of a continuum of teaching practice each trimester. The results of the candidate's self-assessments are discussed with the mentor and used to guide the development of the ILP goals for each trimester.

Education Specialist candidates are provided individualized support from their special education mentor, who holds a Mild/Moderate special education credential, and receive professional development aligned with the unique needs of their assignment. In addition to their assigned induction mentor, special education candidates holding a Moderate/Severe credential receive additional assistance from a veteran Moderate/Severe special education teacher with expertise in the candidate's assigned context.

The program provides advice and assistance which outlines the requirements for the candidate's Individual Learning Plan and benefits of program participation. Candidates are surveyed at the beginning of the year to determine their professional development needs. The program lead uses this information to create a variety of professional development options to support each candidate's unique needs. Interviews and review of program documentation confirm professional development opportunities for candidates are planned through ongoing collaboration with the Induction Team, Director of Learning Support, Director of Student Support, Director of Instructional Technology and Media Services. Professional development opportunities provide individualized support for each candidate's knowledge and skills. Professional development is provided throughout the school year in both large and small group formats. Skills gained from professional development are incorporated into Individual Learning Plans.

Interviews with the district's professional developers confirm that the professional development offered to induction candidates is individualized. Induction candidates are provided many district options for professional development in addition to the district's mandatory professional development required of all teachers in the district. Documentation and interviews show the program's professional development provides teachers choice/flexibility in options and goal selection. Candidates work on more than one goal during a trimester, which can span multiple CSTPs. Candidates can revisit or continue goals as needed. Mentors are instrumental in communicating the specific professional development needs of the candidate.

Interviews and review of documents from the program standards addendum verify changes to program requirements have been made over the past two years to reduce the amount of time candidates spend completing paperwork. The program increased the focus on the mentorship process in order to respond better to the individualized needs of teachers. New ILP documents were created to guide candidates to continuously reflect on their practice. As part of the ILP, once per trimester, participating teachers complete a videotaped lesson based on their ILP goals/focus. They watch their lesson with their support provider and document evidence from the lesson. They then reflect on the impact of their lesson on student learning and determine the next steps. After discussing the observation with the mentor, the candidate writes an individual reflection. The candidate submits the reflection to the mentor for assessment.

Interviews with program completers addressed the amount of paperwork required. Program completers stated that the paperwork "felt authentic, not like jumping through hoops." The paperwork was described as tied to school and our district goals and meaningful. Some of those

who were transfers from other induction programs said that their other program was triple the paperwork, with study hours solely devoted to filling out paperwork with their mentors.

Triads are completed annually with the participating teacher, the support provider, and the principal. Because the triad is led by the candidate, an interviewed candidate noted, “the meeting was a catalyst for conversation and helped to get school wide goals aligned with ILP goals”.

Mentors also complete their own CTIP Support Provider Individual Learning Plan, setting mentor professional growth goals. This process was started in December of 2017. Examination of the support provider ILP document shows that the support providers set goals using CSTP Standard 6, and choose their own professional development activities to support their goals. Documentation shows that mentors attended a variety of professional development, including Coaching for Leadership training offered at San Diego County of Education, Diversity Symposium, and the Fresno Induction Conference. However, the program does not have a systematic plan for providing mentors initial and on-going mentor training. Interviews with program leadership confirmed that the program would like to provide a more clearly defined, sequential, and timely system of training for their mentors.

Interviews and review of documents confirm that program feedback is received from candidates and principals in the form of surveys completed twice a year. Exit interviews are conducted by the IAC to assess program effectiveness. In addition, a survey to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development is completed after each training. Candidates are asked to rate their level of engagement and usefulness of the professional development topics and also provide ideas for future professional development topics. However, the mentors do not complete program effectiveness surveys.

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

The La Mesa Spring Valley Schools’ California Teacher Induction Program utilizes the Individual Learning Plans to guide the Induction Program for each candidate. Candidates and their mentors regularly revise and revisit ILPs throughout this process. Each trimester PTs select goals based on the CSTPs to focus their learning and growth.

Interviews and document review confirm the mentor conducts observations in the candidate’s classroom on a weekly basis and usually meets weekly with candidates to reflect on practice and provide “just in time” mentoring support. Mentors keep updated contact logs and detailed observation notes for documentation of their mentor support. Candidate reflection on the mentor’s observation notes serve as evidence of growth and improvement in their ability to reflect on and apply the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs).

Review of program documents confirm candidates are given an individualized calendar of professional development and a calendar of due dates for all of the requirements for successful completion of the LMSV Schools’ California Teacher Induction Program. At the beginning of the school year, at the program’s Advice and Assistance meetings, the Induction Team meets with the candidate at advice and assistance meetings to ensure the candidate is fully aware of the requirements for completion.

Interviews and review of documentation confirm that candidates' complete anonymous surveys after each professional development. They are asked to evaluate the effectiveness of both the professional development and the professional development provider. Twice yearly, they are also asked to evaluate the effectiveness of their mentor and the quality of support they receive. It is not evident that mentors are evaluated by the program stakeholders or that mentors receive formative feedback about their mentoring throughout the school year. In addition, it is not evident there is a procedure in place for release or reassignment of mentors when deemed necessary to ensure quality of services provided by mentors.

Additionally, upon extensive review of program documents and interviews across stakeholder groups the programmatic oversight of a data driven process to discern and analyze the effectiveness and efficacy of the IAC is not evident.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

At the first professional development seminar of each school year the Induction Team presents an overview of the program expectations and requirements. Mentors send emails and give regular reminders about upcoming due dates. Mentors also keep notes about activities that has been completed by candidates as well as those still in need of completion.

During mentor Professional Learning Community meetings, mentors assess the ILPs of each other's caseload of candidates. Beginning at the end of 2018, induction, candidates are required to complete a Capstone Project that is shared at Colloquium. The IAC conducts group exit interviews with year two participating teachers about the knowledge and skills they have gained during their experiences with the La Mesa -Spring Valley Schools' California Teacher Induction Program.

Examination of program documentation confirm the availability of rubrics to assess satisfactory completion of program requirements at the end of each trimester. However, it is unclear how candidate competency, as defined in the standard, is determined to make recommendation for the clear credential.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, program and institutional leadership, mentors, professional development providers, and administrators, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the La Mesa-Spring Valley Schools California Teacher Induction Program except for the following:

#### **Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection, and Training of Mentors**

**Not Met**

According to the standards, the program must provide ongoing training and support for mentors that includes, but is not limited to:

- Coaching and mentoring
- Goal setting

- Use of appropriate mentoring instruments
- Best practices in adult learning
- Support for individual mentoring challenges
- Program processes designed to support candidate growth and effectiveness

Documentation and interviews confirm the program does not have a systematic plan for providing mentors with initial and on-going mentor training.

**Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services      **Not Met****

According to the standards, Induction program leaders must provide formative feedback to mentors on their work. Clear procedures must be in place for the reassignment of mentors, if the pairing of candidate and mentor is not effective.

The program must provide a coherent overall system of support through the collaboration, communication and coordination between candidates, mentors, school and district administrators, and all members of the Induction system.

It is not evident that mentors are evaluated by the program, receive formative feedback about their mentoring throughout the school year or of a process for reassignment of mentors.

Additionally, it is not evident that an overall system of evaluation to provide checks and balances through the collaboration, communication, and coordination between and among all stakeholders is in place. Specifically, this is particularly evident in terms of the program’s responsibility for assuring quality through oversight of the influence and effectiveness of the IAC.

**COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS**

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Consistently</b>	<b>Inconsistently</b>	<b>Not Evidenced</b>
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.</li> </ul>			<b>X</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.</li> </ul>			<b>X</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.</li> </ul>			<b>X</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.</li> </ul>			<b>X</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.</li> </ul>			<b>X</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Finding on Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
			<b>X</b>
<p><b>Rationale:</b> The standard requires the institution involve faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all programs. The team was unable to confirm all relevant stakeholders are included in the decision making process. The Induction Advisory Committee for the LMSV Teacher Induction program, composed of the Assistant Superintendent of Learning Support, the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, and three members of the La Mesa Spring Valley teachers’ union, lacks broad representation from relevant stakeholders. This limited membership and defined role of the IAC impedes the institution’s ability to provide the institutional infrastructure to lead the organization, coordination and decision making necessary to ensure non-evaluative support for induction candidates participating in LMSV Induction. Additionally, as a result of limited representation from a variety of relevant stakeholders on the IAC and the defined role and purpose of the IAC, the CTIP Program Director lacks the authority and institutional support required to solely consider and address the needs of the educator preparation program and the</p>			

candidates it serves. The IAC connection to employment decisions is in violation of Induction Precondition 5 which states candidate support through the Individual Learning Plan process will not be used for evaluation for employment purposes.

After review of program evidence and conducting lengthy meetings with members of the Induction Advisory Committee and members of program leadership, it was apparent there is very specific Bargaining Unit Language around the selection and retainment of the LMSV mentors and program lead, which limits their term of service to a period of three years. This lack of consistency among the human resources assigned to lead the program, significantly impacts the unit's effective operations to provide for the ongoing implementation of the program. The Bargaining Unit Language around the composition of the Induction Advisory Committee further impedes the Program Director's authority and institutional support necessary to address the needs and consider the interests of the program and the candidates it serves.

Although the mentors currently in service provide an outstanding level of individualized, job-embedded support for the newest educators in LMSV, the Bargaining Unit Language also outlines a very specific process by which mentors are recruited, employed and retained. A peer colleague makes a nomination to the IAC. Those prospective mentors who have been nominated by a colleague attend an informational meeting with the Program Director and then are interviewed by the IAC. Principals are not able to make recommendations, nor are qualified individuals who are interested in becoming a mentor allowed to apply. Finally, there are no procedures by which mentor effectiveness is assessed or evaluated, nor are there procedures to remove an ineffective mentor from service until his/her three-year term is complete.

<b>Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Consistently</b>	<b>Inconsistently</b>	<b>Not Evidenced</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	
<b>Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
	<b>X</b>		

**Additional information applicable to the standard decision**

La Mesa Spring Valley extensively recruits candidates to diversify their teaching population by attending job fairs across San Diego County as well as having MOUs with local colleges and universities as demonstrated in program evidence and interviews with Institutional leadership. The Human Resource Specialist confirms there is a clear process for identifying candidates who qualify for Induction and communicating this information to the CTIP leadership in a timely manner. There is ongoing communication between the CTIP leadership, the Human Resources Department, and the Human Resource Specialist to guide candidates through the process of meeting program requirements and ultimately applying for their clear credential.

Through candidate and mentor interviews it is evidenced that candidate support and Professional Development needs are the hallmark of program implementation in order to ensure candidate success in entry to and retention in the profession. Interviews affirmed that the mentors provide consistent support and are readily accessible to the candidates. As one candidate stated, “My support provider is very accessible. She is always there when I need her.” Feedback from mentor, candidate, and administrator interviews verified the program’s impressive approach to assisting candidates in their growth and success. Administrators highlighted the triad meeting as a ‘powerful’ piece for communication as it gave them insight

into how to best support their candidates. Candidates also shared this triad conversation supports the alignment of their ILP goals and site goals.

The program uses the ILP along with a task checklist as evidence of a candidate’s progress in meeting program completion requirements and drive advisement and support efforts. The IAC monitors each candidate’s progress based on reports by mentors. Additional support is provided to candidates who are falling short of meeting completion requirements. However, despite availability of Candidate Competency Forms and Transcript, it is not evident how candidate competency, and progress towards mastery of the CSTP, are measured.

<b>Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Consistently</b>	<b>Inconsistently</b>	<b>Not Evidenced</b>
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	<b>X</b>		
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	<b>X</b>		
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program		<b>X</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.</li> </ul>			<b>X</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
		<b>X</b>	
<p><b>Rationale</b>  LMSV CTIP implements a planned sequence of high-quality job-embedded coursework to support candidates’ induction experience. Interviews with candidates, program leadership and professional development providers confirm the program coursework is tailored to each candidate’s needs including an individual learning plan and an individual professional development plan. The candidates are guided through the coursework by knowledgeable and effective mentors who are experienced in teaching in their context.</p>			

In reference to site based supervisors, through interviews and reviewing documents, it is established the program’s mentor selection process does not allow collaboration with partners except for the limited representation of the IAC. The nexus for this is based in bargaining unit language and IAC practices which determine who is selected as a mentor and define the term limits. Additionally, mentors are required to be trained, oriented to their supervisory role, and evaluated. There is no evidence mentors are evaluated and mentor training is very limited in scope and offering and not uniformly or systemically provided.

After conducting multiple interviews with a variety of stakeholders, it is determined that although candidates’ progress toward completion is monitored by mentors throughout the induction process, there is no system in place to evaluate fieldwork to ensure candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.

<b>Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Consistently</b>	<b>Inconsistently</b>	<b>Not Evidenced</b>
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.		<b>X</b>	
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.		<b>X</b>	
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data.	<b>X</b>		
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation		<b>X</b>	

<b>Finding on Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
		X	
<p><b>Rationale:</b> The LMSV induction program utilizes a variety of data gathering processes including surveys of candidates, site administrators and professional development surveys to assess the quality of program implementation and support program modifications. However, the team noted deficits in the implementation of a comprehensive, continuous improvement process to identify overall unit effectiveness. Candidate and site administrator surveys are conducted and the data is analyzed to make adjustments to support increased relevance of candidates' induction experiences, however, there is a lack of specific data being sought from mentors, the Induction Advisory Council, program leadership and other relevant stakeholders regarding their roles and responsibilities in program efficacy and implementation. Through review of program evidence and stakeholder interviews the review team found the lack of breadth of the program's data collection efforts, as it is designed under the oversight role of the IAC, interferes with the program's continuous improvement process.</p>			

<b>Common Standard 5: Program Impact</b>			
<b>Components</b>	<b>Consistently</b>	<b>Inconsistently</b>	<b>Not Evidenced</b>
<p>The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.</p>		X	
<p>The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students</p>	X		
<b>Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
	X		

**Additional information applicable to the standard decision**

After conducting several interviews with a variety of stakeholders, it was determined that although candidates' progress toward completion is monitored by mentors throughout the induction process, there is no system in place to indicate candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.

However, it needs to be noted that interviews with current induction candidates, program completers and program mentors indicate a high level of support for candidates to demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and effectively support all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. One first year candidate stated, "I can honestly say that if it hadn't been for my mentor, I wouldn't be teaching today." while another reported, "My mentor walked in on a very difficult day, noticed I was struggling and told me she was taking over my class for a few minutes so I could take a breath. As we transitioned, she asked for the biggest issue I was facing at that moment. I sat in the back of the room for 15 minutes and watched her model exactly what I needed to see to handle the issue I was having." The team was impressed by and commends the work of the LMSV program lead and induction mentors to ensure high quality mentoring model to authentically support the unique learning needs of each Induction candidate.

**INSTITUTION SUMMARY**

The La Mesa Spring Valley School District operates an Induction program that has significant strengths in mentoring new teachers in their transition into the teaching career yet also is characterized by institutional structures that are not conducive to supporting this vision and goal.

The team is impressed by and commends the work of the LMSV program lead and induction mentors to ensure high quality mentoring model to authentically support the unique learning needs of each Induction candidate. Through candidate and mentor interviews it is evidenced that candidate support and professional development needs are the hallmark of program implementation in order to ensure candidate success in entry to and retention in the profession. Interviews confirmed that the mentors provide consistent support and are readily accessible to the candidates.

The program has increased the focus on the mentorship process in order to better respond to the individualized needs of teachers. New Individual Learning Plan (ILP) documents were created to guide candidates to continuously reflect on their practice and to provide a more authentic induction experience. Individualized support is provided via the completion of an Individual Learning Plan (ILP), based on the candidate's needs and areas for growth. Candidates assess their practice and growth in the CSTPs through the use of a self-assessment and a continuum of teaching practice each trimester. The results of the candidate's self-assessments are discussed with the mentor and used to guide the development of the ILP goals for each trimester.

As part of the ILP, once per trimester, participating teachers plan a videotaped lesson based on their ILP goals/focus. They watch their lesson with their mentor, collaboratively documenting evidence, and reflecting on the impact of their lesson on student learning to determine next steps. Candidates are surveyed at the beginning of the year to determine their professional development needs. The program lead uses this information to create a variety of professional development options to support each candidate's unique needs.

Although the mentors currently in service provide an outstanding level of individualized, job-embedded support for the newest educators in LMSV, the Bargaining Unit Language outlines a very specific process by which mentors are recruited, employed and retained which does not allow for all interested and qualified teachers to apply to be a mentor. Also, mentor training is very limited in scope and offering and not uniformly or systemically provided. Finally, there are no procedures by which mentor effectiveness is assessed or evaluated, nor are there procedures to remove an ineffective mentor from service until his/her three-year term is complete.

The team was unable to confirm all relevant stakeholders are included in the decision making process. The membership of the IAC is comprised solely of two assistant superintendents and three members of the bargaining unit. There is contractual language which defines the membership of the IAC. This limited membership and defined role of the IAC impedes the institution's ability to provide the institutional infrastructure to lead the organization, coordination and decision making necessary to ensure non-evaluative support for induction candidates participating in LMSV Induction. The IAC connection to employment decisions is in violation of Induction Precondition 5 which states candidate support through the Individual Learning Plan process will not be used for evaluation for employment purposes.



March 22, 2018

To Whom It May Concern:

A meeting was held today between Grant Nelson, President, LMSV Teachers Association, Guido Magliato, Assistant Superintendent, Learning Support, and Tina Sardina, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources, to review the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Committee on Accreditation Summary Report.

We discussed the issue of not being in compliance with Induction Precondition 5 that requires that "The ILP must be designed and implemented solely for the professional growth and development of the participating teacher and not for evaluation for employment purposes."

All parties acknowledge the issue and commit to rectifying the compliance with Precondition 5 through leadership practices and the collective bargaining process on April 18, 2018.

Respectfully,

Brian Marshall  
Superintendent

Grant Nelson  
President, LMSV Teachers' Association

Tina Sardina  
Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources

Guido Magliato  
Assistant Superintendent, Learning Support