

**8th Year Report of Progress for
Tehama County Department of Education
June 2018**

Overview of this Report:

The Committee on Accreditation, on behalf of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, assigned the status of **Accreditation with Stipulations** to Tehama County Department of Education and its credential programs on June 13, 2016. The accreditation team identified concerns with respect to Common Standard 1 (Educational Leadership), Common Standard 2 (Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation), General Education MS/SS Clear Induction Program Standard 2 (Communication and Collaboration), Education Specialist Program Standards 2 (Communication and Collaboration), 5 (Admission), and 7 (Field Experience and Clinical Practice), and Designated Subjects Program Standards 3 (Early Orientation) and 5 (Beginning Teacher Support and Advisement). Tehama County Department of Education was required to submit a 7th year report within one year of the Committee on Accreditation action, indicating progress in addressing those areas of concern. On June 29, 2017 the Committee on Accreditation, on behalf of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, took action to remove five of the six stipulations assigned to the Tehama County Department of Education. The Status of the Tehama County Department of Education remains: Accreditation with Stipulations. The Tehama County Department of Education must provide a report within one year of the date of the Committee on Accreditation action, indicating progress in addressing Common Standard 1 (Educational Leadership).

Recommendation:

That the COA accept the follow up report from Tehama County Department of Education and remove the stipulation addressing Common Standard 1 and change the status of Tehama County Department of Education to Accreditation.

Background:

A site visit was held at Tehama County Department of Education from May 1 - May 4, 2016; the report of findings from that visit was presented to the Committee on Accreditation at its June 13, 2016 meeting ([full report](#)). The COA assigned the status of Accreditation with Stipulations and required a 7th Year report. On June 29, 2017 the Committee on Accreditation, on behalf of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, took action to remove five of the six stipulations assigned to the Tehama County Department of Education. The Status of the Tehama County Department of Education remains: Accreditation with Stipulations. The Tehama County Department of Education was required to submit a report within one year of the date of the Committee on Accreditation action, providing evidence that relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. The report is to address the institution's progress with respect to the unresolved standard identified as met with concerns during the site visit and the June 29th COA meeting; Common Standard 1 and Program Standards and the rationale for the findings were as follows:

Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Rationale: The inclusion of relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and governance of the program is a recent development for the Tehama Alliance for Teacher Excellence Induction program. Interviewed stakeholders expressed optimism about their increased role in the governance of the program as part of the advisory council. While established, the team was unable to find evidence of relevant stakeholders actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs prior to the 2015-16 year.

The required follow-up report submitted to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing on May 10, 2018 outlines the actions taken by Tehama County Department of Education to address the concerns identified by the Accreditation Team. The report, included in Appendix A, describes progress achieved with respect to Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership identified as “met with concerns” by the Accreditation Team for all programs. Evidence of such progress is included in Appendix A. Commission staff have reviewed this report and the extensive documentation provided to substantiate the progress described in the report.

Appendix A
Tehama County Department of Education
Report of Actions Taken to Address Concerns
June 2018

Common Standard 1: (Educational Leadership)

Finding: Met with Concerns

Rationale: *The inclusion of relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and governance of the program is a recent development for the Tehama County Department of Education (Alliance for Teacher Excellence) Induction program. Interviewed stakeholders expressed optimism about their increased role in the governance of the program as part of the advisory council. While established, the team was unable to find evidence of relevant stakeholders actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs prior to the 2015-16 year.*

Evidence

Since our Site Accreditation Visit in May of 2016, the Tehama County Department of Education has increased its efforts to actively involve stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and governance of all induction programs (Education Specialist, Career Technical Education, and General Education). The Tehama County Department of Education Consortium serves a vast region covering nine counties, 30,140 square miles, and approximately 120 districts with diverse structures and contexts (single school districts, large school districts, urban and rural districts, charter schools, correctional facility/state prison adult schools, etc.). The unique characteristics of our consortium pose challenges in terms of increasing and sustaining the involvement of stakeholders. These challenges have led to the development of a multi-prong approach toward increased and sustainable stakeholder engagement. Instead of holding single regional meetings with one committee, we consult with multiple groups of stakeholders and offer multiple opportunities to engage in the organization, coordination, and governance of the induction programs. The following committees and program activities represent our efforts to continue to develop meaningful and sustainable stakeholder engagement:

1. **2017-2018 District Representatives:** We revised our Memorandum of Understanding in [2017-2018](#) to foster the active engagement of [partnering districts](#) in the organization, coordination, and governance of the Induction Programs. The [MOU](#) will be a component of the enrollment process during the 2018-19 academic year. It outlines the district's and the program's responsibilities in support of new teachers and their mentors. Under the agreements outlined in the 2018-19 [MOU](#), districts will continue to designate [district representatives](#) (slide 3) to participate in the Advisory Council. These representatives will communicate the districts' interests and needs, and also share updates from the Advisory Council meetings during countywide or districtwide meetings. The Program Administrator intends to continue soliciting the support of [Region 2 CISC](#) (County Assistant Superintendents) in [identifying designees](#) to serve as countywide representatives in our Advisory Council and in scheduling them in their agendas. Furthermore, each partnering

district will continue to designate a [district coordinator](#) who will be responsible for [acting as a liaison](#) between the program staff, Mentors, Candidates, and Site Administrators and foster communication amongst stakeholders. The [MOU](#) continues to formalize the engagement of partnering districts in the organization, coordination, and governance of all Induction Programs. We developed a communication plan for the 2018-19 academic year which will include quarterly meetings with [district coordinators](#) in each county to provide timely and relevant information in support of Mentors and Candidates. Seminar schedules, mentor training content, ILP processes and resources, program data, monthly newsletters, and Advisory Council meeting notes will be shared and discussed. The expectation is that these items will be shared with district school boards, superintendents, and site administrators in our consortium.

2. **2016-2017 District Representatives:** We revised our Memorandum of Understanding to foster the active engagement of partnering districts in the organization, coordination, and governance of the Induction programs. The [MOU](#) was a component of the enrollment process during the 2017-18 academic year. It outlined the district's responsibilities and the program's responsibilities. A specific effort was made to improve district representation on the Advisory Council by stipulating that districts designate countywide representatives to communicate their needs and interests and share updates regarding our induction program. The Program Administrator intends to solicit the support of Region 2 CISC (County Assistant Superintendents) in identifying designees from each county to serve as countywide representatives. Furthermore, each partnering district will designate a district coordinator who will be responsible for acting as a liaison between the program staff, Mentors, Candidates, and Site Administrators. The [MOU](#) formalized consistent and regular engagement of partnering districts in the organization, coordination, and governance of all Induction programs.
3. **2017-18 Advisory Council:** The Program Administrator and staff encouraged the 2016-17 Advisory Council members to continue serving during the 2017-18 academic year to maintain a level of consistency in the group's collective knowledge and understanding of Teacher Induction. The schedule for the 2017-18 school year was communicated to all [former Advisory Council attendees](#)(2016-17) via an [email invitation](#), along with an opportunity to RSVP. In an effort to increase participation and improve our stakeholder's representation in our [Advisory Council](#) (slide 3), we offered the option to participate online [via web-conferencing](#).

We held three [Advisory Council Meetings](#) in [2017-18](#). Our Advisory Council agendas ([December](#), [March](#), and [May](#)) included items that not only updated our Advisory Council members, but also engaged them in conversations. The dialogue generally led to recommendations or actions ([December](#), [March](#), and [May](#)) which guided the organization, coordination, and governance of all programs (slide 5 in the [December](#) meeting and slide 6 in the [March](#) and [May](#) meetings). For example, during the [May 3, 2018 Advisory Council meeting](#), members engaged in dialogue about the [program structure](#) ([slides 17-22](#)) for the General Education, Education Specialist and CTE programs

in 2018-19. The Program Administrator and staff also sought the Advisory Council's feedback and approval of a portfolio showcase to support the program's assessment of the candidate's progress towards mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession for a clear credential recommendation ([slides 39-49](#)). The Advisory Council reviewed the proposed 2018-19 budget, recommended revisions, and approved it ([slides 50-56](#)). Furthermore, the Advisory Council reviewed the [2017-2018 MOU](#), made recommendations for revisions, and approved it with revisions ([slides 57-63](#)) for the 2018-2019 academic year. During the [March 22, 2018 Advisory Council agenda](#), program data ([slides 16-21](#)) was reviewed by members and [recommendations](#) were made to support our continuous improvement efforts. At the [December Advisory Council meeting](#), members reviewed the completer surveys and made recommendations for continuous improvement ([slides 28 and 29](#)). Also, the members reviewed and made recommendations regarding the questions to be included in the Mentor, Candidate, and Site Administrator mid-year surveys ([slides 21 and 22](#)). Finally, Advisory Council members reviewed and approved the proposed Early Completion Option process during the [December](#) meeting ([slides 23-25](#)). In an effort to maintain all Advisory Council members informed and involved, minutes (embedded in the facilitator notes section of the slides) were forwarded to all members ([December](#) and [March](#)).

4. **2016-17 Advisory Council:** The Program Administrator and staff invited the 2015-16 Advisory Council members to continue serving in their current capacity during the 2016-17 academic year to maintain consistency in the knowledge and understanding of the structure, policies, and organization of our Induction Programs. The meeting schedule for the 2016-17 school year was communicated to [all former Advisory Council attendees](#) via a [save the date flyer](#). This flyer was followed by an [email invitation](#) and an opportunity to RSVP. In an effort to increase participation and improve our stakeholder's representation in our [Advisory Council](#), we offered the option to join our meetings online [via web-conferencing](#).

We increased the number of [Advisory Council Meetings](#) from two meetings in 2015-16 to three meetings in 2016-17. Our Advisory Council agendas included items that not only updated our Advisory Council members, but also engaged them in dialogue which resulted in recommendations or actions. These recommendations and actions guided the organization, coordination, and governance of all programs. For example, during the [October 18, 2016](#) Advisory Council meeting, members engaged in dialogue about the Site Visit Report and the [Leadership Team's recommendations](#) to address the Common and Program Standards identified as "met with concern". The Program Administrator and staff sought the [Advisory Council's feedback and recommendations](#) to guide its efforts to remedy all concerns. We also reviewed the [Transition Plan](#) and requested the [Advisory Council's recommendations](#) to further align our programs to the revised California Teacher Induction Standards. The Advisory Council was asked to review the [proposed budget](#), recommend revisions, and approve it. Additionally, program data was reviewed by members and recommendations were made to support our continuous improvement efforts. Finally, Advisory Council members shared [ideas and topics for professional](#)

[development](#) for district and site administrators. Advisory Council members recommended that our Program Administrator and General Education Coordinator collaborate with Assistant Superintendents to present at countywide meetings with the intent of developing rapport with District Superintendents and engaging in conversations about the needs of their districts. The [meeting in June](#) provided the Advisory Council members an opportunity to offer timely input regarding the development of the program's instruments, tools, budget, and professional development content.

5. **Mid-Year and End-of-Year Surveys:** In [2016-17](#) (slides 9-12) and [2017-18](#) (slide 17), mid-year were administered to solicit feedback from [Mentors, Candidates](#), and [Site Administrators](#). In [2016-17](#) (slides 9-12) and 2017-18, end-of-year surveys ([Mentors, Candidates, Site Administrators](#)) were also administered to solicit feedback from Mentors, Candidates, and Site Administrators. These surveys included questions that measured levels of satisfaction regarding the quality of the mentoring, program resources, and the relevance of the feedback and support provided; and it sought [recommendations](#) for program improvement and closer alignment to district initiatives and Candidates' needs. The data gathered was shared with and analyzed by Program Staff, [Coaches](#) (slides 9-12), Program Administrators, and the [Advisory Council](#) (slides 17-19). Recommendations for improvement guided the [team's planning](#) (p. 7, item 7-Standard Data) and implementation for 2018-19.
6. **Seminar Surveys:** Mentors and Candidates were provided opportunities after each seminar to share [feedback](#) regarding the relevance, quality, and value of the seminar topics, resources, and tools. They communicated whether these seminar topics, resources, and tools were meaningful and supported their growth and development. This feedback was reviewed by Coaches and the Program Administrator to inform planning and improve the delivery of seminar content.
7. **Coaches Feedback:** Coaches (Professional Development Providers) provided feedback within 24 hours of [facilitating each seminar](#). They posted feedback regarding seminar components or activities that worked well and those that did not. They also shared recommendations for revisions or modifications with peers in order to improve the delivery of the upcoming seminars. At the end of the year, this feedback will support the [team in making recommendations](#) to improve the organization and coordination of the upcoming year.
8. **Meetings with Individual Districts:** This year, the Program Administrator scheduled [one:one meetings](#) with five districts (Hamilton Unified School District, Gerber Union Elementary School District, Red Bluff Elementary School District, Enterprise Elementary School District, and Shasta Union High School District), who were part of a pilot program to discuss the experiences of Mentors and Candidates, answer questions, discuss district needs, and plan the upcoming year.
9. **2017-18 Countywide Administrator Meetings:** The Program Administrator collaborated

with [County Assistant Superintendents](#) and presented in [Countywide Administrator meetings](#) within the Consortium ([Lassen](#), [Modoc](#), Siskiyou, and [Tehama](#)) in the [fall of 2017](#) and in the [Spring of 2018](#). In Shasta County, we collaborated with Amy Barker and invited partnering districts to a luncheon, following a County Operative meeting. During these meetings, the Program Administrator shared the [proposed MOU for 2017-18](#), the importance of establishing an optimal learning environment for Candidates and Mentors, and encouraged district superintendents to make recommendations and provide feedback regarding the responsibilities and agreements outlined. The importance of the [District Coordinator position](#) was also explained during this meeting. The Program Administrator emphasized the importance of maintaining open communication between the induction program and partnering districts to continue to better serve the needs of the Candidates, Mentors, and districts. In the [spring of 2018](#), the Program Administrator shared program updates, the current program structure and the program's vision and goals. District Administrators were encouraged to provide feedback and ask questions regarding the program's vision, goals, and structure for the 2018-2019 academic year.

10. **2016-17 Countywide Administrator Meetings:** The Program Administrator and General Education Coordinator collaborated with County Assistant Superintendents and participated in [countywide meetings](#) in five of the nine counties within the Consortium (Lassen, Modoc, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity). In Shasta County, we invited all District Superintendents to two meetings held at the Shasta County Department of Education Professional Development Center. In Butte and Glenn County, we scheduled individual meetings with partnering districts. Meetings in Plumas County were scheduled and cancelled twice due to severe weather conditions and other cancellations by the Plumas County Office Superintendent. An option to attend these [meetings via web-conferencing](#) was offered to all superintendents. Please see the [list of attendees](#) throughout the Consortium.

The [topics addressed during these meetings](#) included the following: the transformations in teacher induction, shifts in the roles of Site Administrators, mentor selection criteria, systems of support for Candidates and Mentors, and partnerships between District and Site Administrators and our Induction program. We also formally invited them to become members of our Advisory Council. Lastly, we solicited [feedback](#) regarding their professional development needs to support Candidates and Mentors, the challenges they are facing in supporting new teachers, and ideas to strengthen our partnerships and improve communication. This feedback led to the development of a webinar series targeting District and Site Administrators. The topics selected for these webinars reflect [feedback provided by District Superintendents](#) during these countywide meetings.

11. **2017-18 Administrator Newsletter:** The Program Administrator shared a [newsletter](#) with partnering districts to provide updates regarding the following topics:
 - o [Program at a Glance](#) (slides 3-13)
 - o [New Teacher Center Pilot Program](#) (slides 14-19)
 - o [Site Administrator Survey](#) (slides 20-21)

- o [2017-18 Memorandum of Understanding](#) (slides 22-23)
 - o [Portfolio Showcase](#) (slides 24-26)
 - o [Early Completion Option](#) (slides 27-30)
 - o [Program Data](#) (slides 31-32)
 - o [Communication with Stakeholders](#) (slides 33-34)
 - o [Advisory Council](#) (slides 35-36)
12. **2016-17 Administrator Webinar Series:** The Program Administrator developed and offered a [webinar series for Site Administrators](#) in the Spring of 2017. Each webinar session addressed one component of the theme, “Building a System of Support for Instructional Excellence” ([Communication, Collaboration, and Coordination](#)). In the [first webinar](#), participants discussed the new California Teacher Induction Standards and the new role of Site Administrators and Mentors. This session served to initiate a conversation about the importance of strengthening partnerships to support Candidates and Mentors. In the [second webinar](#), participants discussed the importance of establishing a network of support within their district or school for Candidates and Mentors, how to honor the unique role of each partner, aligning district goals with the individual goals of the Candidate, and providing input in the development of professional growth plans. In the [third webinar](#), the Program Administrator shared program tools and resources designed to individualize mentoring based on Candidate’s needs, foster reflective practice and enduring professional skills, and strengthen the coaching skills of Mentors. The webinar series was a foundational step in our efforts to develop partnerships and engage [Site Administrators](#) in the coordination and organization of all induction programs.
13. **2017-2018 Region 2 Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee:** The Program Administrator attended the [Region 2 Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee](#) meetings during the [2017-2018](#) academic year. The Program Administrator submitted written reports in [November](#), [February](#), and [May](#) and presented information in person in [May](#). The written reports ([November](#), [February](#), and [May](#)) and in person presentations included updates on the following topics: shifts in Teacher Induction Programs, shifts in the roles and responsibilities of the Site Administrator, Mentor, and Candidate, mentor selection criteria, and strengthening partnerships to expand our system of support for Candidates, the MOU, the ILP, seminar dates and locations, Advisory Council meetings, completer survey ([Ed. Specialist](#) and [General Education](#)), mid-year survey data ([Candidate/Mentor](#), [Site Administrator](#)), and the Newsletter. Additionally, we solicited feedback regarding the alignment of our Induction Programs to the new California Teacher Induction Standards ([slides 8-11](#)) and potential program fee increases ([slide 14](#)). The purpose of these reports was to engage this group of instructional leaders in the organization and coordination of the Induction Programs.
14. **2016-2017 Region 2 Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee:** The Program Administrator attended the Region 2 Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee meetings during the [2016-17](#) academic year. The Program Administrator submitted

written reports in [February](#) and [June](#) (2017) and presented in person in [June](#),(2016) [December](#), and [April](#). The written reports and in person presentations included updates on the following topics: transformations in Induction programs, shifts in the roles and responsibilities of the Site Administrator, Mentor, and Candidate, mentor selection criteria, and strengthening partnerships to expand our system of support for Candidates, etc. Additionally, we solicited [feedback](#) regarding our partnership with New Teacher Center, and the alignment of our Induction Programs to the new California Teacher Induction Standards. We sought recommendations regarding mid-year survey data. The purpose of these reports was to engage this group of instructional leaders in the organization and coordination of the Induction Programs.

15. **2016-17 Focus Groups:** The Program Staff and Administrator hosted seven [focus group](#) sessions, which invited [Mentors, Credential Candidates, and Site Administrators](#) to provide feedback to guide the coordination and organization of Induction Programs for the upcoming academic year. The [feedback](#) provided by [focus group members](#) was shared with the Leadership Team on June 11th, 12th, and 13th and with our Advisory Council on June 15th to inform the organization, coordination, and governance of all Induction programs.
16. **Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent:** The Program Administrator schedules [semi-annual meetings](#) with the Tehama County Superintendent of Schools and monthly meetings with the Tehama County Assistant Superintendent to seek input regarding the organization, coordination, and governance of the Induction Programs. The following [topics](#) were discussed throughout the year: the MOU, program updates, program data and feedback, planning for the upcoming year, a partnership with New Teacher Center, staffing needs, and mentor training sessions.
17. **Leadership Team:** The Leadership Team continues to meet during the school year ([2016-2017](#) and [2017-2018](#) (online and [face to face](#)). The Leadership Team is comprised of all program staff, Coaches (Professional Development Providers), and Program Coordinators (CTE, Education Specialist, and General Education). The meetings ([2016-17](#) and [2017-2018](#)) are structured to engage the Leadership Team in dialogue and provide an opportunity for input regarding the organization and coordination of the Induction Programs. For example, the team reviews professional development seminar feedback, mid-year and end of year survey data, and data gathered informally to identify the program's strengths and areas of growth. Based on the strengths and areas of growth identified, the Leadership Team makes recommendations for program improvement. During the June Planning Sessions ([2016-17](#) and [2017-2018](#)) and quarterly meetings ([2016-17](#) and [2017-18](#)), Coaches are invited to participate in the planning ([2016-17](#) and [2017-18](#)) and development of professional learning seminars, the Individual Learning Plan, Collaboration Log, and instructional resources. [Coaches with specific expertise](#) are also invited to plan specific topics for professional development seminars. These recommendations ([2016-17](#)) influence the organization and coordination of the Induction programs.

18. **Program Coordinators:** Program Coordinators (CTE [2016-17](#) and [2017-18](#), [Education Specialists 2016-17](#) and [2017-18](#), and General Education [2017-18](#)) are consulted informally and formally throughout the year and are actively engaged in the organization and development of resources, templates, protocols, and strategies for their respective Induction Program. Instructional resources and templates are aligned to specific Induction Program requirements. The ILP templates for the [Career Technical Education](#) and [Education Specialist](#) Candidates were adapted from the [General Education template](#) to align more closely to the Candidates' teaching contexts and program requirements. [Tutorial videos](#) and resources were developed to support the Candidates in specific Induction Programs. For example, the collaboration between the [Career Technical Education Coordinator \(January and February\)](#) and the Program Administrator led to the development of an [MOU](#) intended to clearly communicate the program requirements to CTE Candidates, Mentors, and Program staff. This document offered a transparent system for communicating program requirements and monitoring the CTE Candidates' progress toward completion. Collaboration with Education Specialists resulted in [professional development and resources](#) shared with Education Specialist Candidates enrolled in our program.
19. **Specialized Planning Teams:** Small Planning Teams that include Coaches with specific expertise, the CTE Coordinator, the Education Specialist Coordinators, and the General Education Coordinator were formed to guide and support the organization and coordination of the Induction Programs. These teams collaborate with the Program Administrator in the development of agendas for upcoming Leadership Team meetings, (June Planning [2017](#) and [2018](#)), Mentor trainings ([2017-18](#) and [2018-19](#)), and professional development seminars for the [Career Technical Education](#) (2018-19), [Education Specialist](#) (2017-18), and [General Education programs](#) (2018-19). The [input](#) provided by these planning teams influence the organization and coordination of the Induction Programs and define the professional learning offered to Mentors and Candidates.