

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Fremont Union High School District

Professional Services Division November 2018

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Fremont Union High 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

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

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction	6	5	1	0

Preconditions

In addition, two induction preconditions were found to not be in compliance: Precondition 3 (assurance of one hour per week of mentoring) and Precondition 4 (ILP goals developed within 60 days).

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: Fremont Union High School District

Dates of Visit: October 8-10, 2018

2018-19 Accreditation

Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status:
This is the first accreditation visit for Fremont Union High School District. The teacher induction programs were first approved by the Committee on Accreditation on August 14, 2015.
<u>COA Program Approval Document</u> (August 14, 2015)

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 institutional administration, mentors, candidates, completers, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Program Standards

All Program Standards for the Teacher Induction program were **met**, except for Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors, which was **met with concerns**.

Common Standards

Common Standards 2, 3, and 5 were **met**. Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation, and Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement were **met with concerns**.

Preconditions Compliance Issue

In order to operate as an approved program, institutions must be in alignment with preconditions at all times. However, the team found that the institution is **not in compliance** with Induction Preconditions 3 and 4.

Precondition 3 states that “Each Induction Program must assure that each participating teacher receives an average of not less than one hour per week of individualized support/mentoring coordinated and/or provided by the mentor”.

While the Mentor Letter of Commitment includes the expectation that mentors will provide an average of not less than one hour per week of support, candidates and mentors could not confirm that they were meeting this requirement. The team found no evidence of a systematic process by which the Induction Program assures that the required weekly support is met. Follow up interviews with program leadership confirmed that a process to monitor this requirement was not in place.

Precondition 4 states that “Goals for each participating teacher must be developed within the context of the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) within the first 60 days of the teacher’s enrollment in the program”.

While the team reviewed the Induction Calendar available on the induction website that included a projected completion month for various elements of the portfolio, the team found no evidence of a monitoring process for this ILP requirement. Follow up interviews and communication with program leadership confirmed that a process to monitor this requirement was not in place.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that Common Standards 2, 3, and 5 are **met**, Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation, and Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement are **met with concerns**; Induction Program standards 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 are **met**, Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors is **met with concerns**; Preconditions 3 and 4 are **not in compliance**, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

Stipulations

Below are the recommended stipulations for Fremont Union High School District (FUHSD):

1. That within one year, Fremont UHSD must provide evidence that the unit will ensure that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation. (CS1)
2. That within one year, Fremont UHSD must provide evidence of a continuous improvement process focused on induction candidate preparation (distinguishable from new hire support) that includes feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation. (CS4)

Staff recommends that:

- Fremont UHSD must take immediate action to come into compliance with Preconditions 3 and 4 and report these actions to the Administrator of Accreditation at the

Commission on Teacher Credentialing prior to the November 7, 2018 meeting of the Committee on Accreditation.

- Fremont Union High School District take immediate action to address the stipulation conditions above for preconditions compliance issues.
- Fremont Union High School District be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Fremont Union High 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

Team Leader:

Melissa Meetze-Hall

San Bernardino and Riverside County Offices
of Education

Common Standards:

Gail Calhoun

San Gabriel Unified School District

Programs Standards Cluster:

Lindsay Gilbert

Alhambra Unified School District

Staff to the Visit

Jake Shuler

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Preconditions Responses	Induction Program Policies & Procedures
Candidate Individualized Learning Plans (ILP)	Program Completer Survey
Common Standards Submission	Meeting Agendas, Minutes, and Artifacts
Mentor Logs	New Teacher Intake Forms
Common Standards Feedback and Addendum	Professional Development Evaluations
Mentor Trainings	Candidate E-Folders
Program Assessment Submission	Advisement Documents
Mentor Agreement	Survey Data Results
Program Assessment Feedback and Addendum	District MOUs

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	31
Completers	9
Program Mentors	4
Site Administrators	9
Institutional Administration	7
Program Coordinators	1
Credential Analyst	1
Internal Advisory Panel	9
External Partners	2
TOTAL	73

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

Background Information

The Fremont Union High School District is the local educational agency for a two-year teacher induction program. This program, housed in the Teaching and Learning Department, is led by the Coordinator for Academic Interventions (the Coordinator) and supported by an administrative assistant and a credential analyst. The teacher induction program currently serves 19 first year candidates and 20 second year candidates.

The five comprehensive high schools of the FUHSD -- Cupertino, Fremont, Homestead, Lynbrook and Monta Vista -- serve approximately 11,000 students from the cities of Cupertino, Los Altos, San Jose, Santa Clara, Saratoga and Sunnyvale. The FUHSD Adult School serves an additional 11,000 students in part-time programs offered at a variety of venues throughout the community.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2017-18)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2018-19)
Teacher Induction	22 (5 ECO)	19 (Year 1) 20 (Year 2)

The Visit

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

Program Report Teacher Induction

Program Design

Fremont Union High School District operates a two-year teacher induction program that serves general education and special education candidates. The Coordinator of Academic Interventions, who is responsible for coordination of the program, reports to the Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning and oversees a team of four full-release mentors.

Interviews with program and district leadership confirm that there are various lines of communication within the program and with the institution. For example, the Coordinator of Academic Interventions meets regularly with the Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning to ensure that program goals are aligned with district priorities. Similarly, the Coordinator regularly communicates with the Director of Human Resources, credential analyst, and mentor team to identify and enroll candidates in the program. It is also evident through interviews with program and district leadership, mentors, and advisors that the program regularly communicates with the Director of Special and Educational Services regarding coordinated support for education specialists.

Program modifications over the last two years include a continued shift toward a more customized and individualized path for induction candidates. This has included a change in the menu of support activities as well as the way that the candidates engage with program instrumentation. The Individualized Learning Plan (ILP), as described below, documents the job-embedded system of learning (cycles of inquiry).

The structure of coursework and field experience in the induction program includes a mentoring-based system and differentiated experiences for candidates based on individual needs. Recruitment and hiring documents illustrate a rigorous process for mentor selection, which was further confirmed through interviews with program leadership and advisory members. In addition, mentors engage in training and collaboration that supports their effective delivery of “just in time” and long-term support.

Candidates, mentors, site administrators, and program leadership interviews, as well as document review confirm that candidates engage in differentiated experiences in relation to the ILP. For example, individualized and coordinated support for education specialists begins with a meeting between the candidate, the induction mentor, and the Special Education Advisor to delineate the type of support to be provided. At the beginning of the program, all mentors and candidates review and sign a Letter of Commitment which lays out program expectations. For general education candidates, the induction mentor and candidate discuss additional district personnel and colleagues who might be able to provide content support, specifically when the mentor and candidate credentials do not match. The Letter of Commitment includes a place to identify this additional content support, but the program does not yet have a systematic way to monitor the implementation of this support. Additional

differentiated experiences occur within cycles of inquiry where the mentor and candidate choose activities from a menu of options to support the candidate's needs and goals, as identified in the ILP.

Interviews with program leadership, mentors, and the Professional Learning Advisory Team of Educators (PLATE) confirm that the program collects and analyzes input from candidates through mid-year and end-of-year surveys. In addition, the program holds focus group meetings with district stakeholders to gather feedback. This internal candidate feedback is analyzed by the program leader and mentors, and used to guide program decisions.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Fremont Union High School District coordinates and implements an individualized induction program in which the candidate's experience begins with a Letter of Commitment. With this document, the mentor and candidate discuss the requirements for completion of the program, as well as mentoring and additional supports available to the candidate. The mentor and candidate then move into a co-assessment reflection based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs). Candidate strengths and areas for growth from this co-assessment reflection directly inform the candidate's Individual Learning Plan (ILP). Once goals and a focus have been developed in the ILP, candidates engage in a cycle of inquiry which includes planning for instruction, analyzing student work, and reflecting on instruction. As confirmed by document review and interviews with candidates and mentors, this process occurs during the fall and spring semester, where candidates have an opportunity to reflect on their professional growth and move forward with their ILP.

A strength of the program is the mentor team and the way each member of the team works to individualize the program for candidates. Mentors are responsible for supporting each candidate as they work through developing the ILP and engaging in the required cycles of inquiry. In addition, interviews with mentors confirm that they guide teachers to choose from a menu of activities that support the candidate's growth within the ILP and across the CSTP.

Furthermore, within the ILP and cycles of inquiry, candidates have the opportunity to identify focus students with a variety of needs. Review of documentation confirms that candidates identify, analyze, and work to address the needs of focus students based on qualitative and/or quantitative data in the ILP, Pre-Instruction Analysis of Student Work, and Post-Instruction Analysis of Student Work.

Interviews with Year 2 candidates confirm that the ILP and cycles of inquiry directly connected to their teaching assignment and support them in their professional growth as educators. Candidates also confirm that the work with their mentor enhanced their induction experience and supported their individual needs, as well as their abilities to meet the needs of students.

As part of the ILP development and cycles of inquiry, mentors observe candidates. Both mentor and candidate interviews confirm that data from observations is used to provide candidates with feedback as they engage in a reflecting conversation with the mentor.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidate competence is assessed through the Induction Portfolio. Mentor interviews and a review of documents confirm that candidates are assessed based on program criteria for Induction Portfolio standards and Cycle of Inquiry standards, as well as evidence of growth within each CSTP.

Candidates are made aware of the Induction Portfolio expectations when they discuss and sign the Letter of Commitment with their mentor. Induction candidates experience this assessment two times per year and receive feedback through the Portfolio Cover Sheet. Candidates also receive feedback in terms of commendations and recommendations through a conversation with their mentor. The Coordinator of Academic Interventions notifies the candidates once it has been determined that all program requirements have been met and the candidate is recommended for the Clear Credential.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Fremont Union High School District except for the following:

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

Interviews with both candidates and site administrators revealed challenges experienced when there was not a direct content area match between the candidate and mentor. While the induction program assigns qualified mentors, candidates had content specific questions which were not addressed through the non-content matched mentor. The team found a lack of evidence of a consistent, systematic and monitored process for coordinating support between assigned candidates and the identified content supports in their Letter of Commitment.

Common Standards

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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"> 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 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. 		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 			X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. 	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	X		

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	X		
Finding on Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met with Concerns		
Rationale <p>Documents reviewed confirmed that the institution involves faculty and instructional personnel in the collaboration and decision making for the educator preparation program. However, the team found inconsistent evidence of the degree to which this took place consistently.</p> <p>Furthermore, there was no evidence that the unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly or systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 setting, colleges and university, and the broader educational community toward improving educator preparation. There was evidence that the program coordinator collaborates with induction partners and several Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), which place student teachers in the district but no evidence that the faculty and instructional personnel, such as program mentors or advisory team members, systematically collaborate with the broader community.</p>			
Additional information applicable to the standard decision <p>Documents reviewed and interviews with program leadership confirmed that the unit has sufficient resources, authority and support from the district for the effective operation of the induction program. It was also confirmed that the induction program employs, assigns and retains qualified persons to serve as mentors and staff who run professional development.</p>			

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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		X	
Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met		
Additional information applicable to the standard decision Documents reviewed and interviews with candidates and program leadership confirmed that candidates are admitted based on multiple measures, the program is individualized in order to support all candidates, and candidates know how to track their progress in completing program requirements. While it is clear that mentors are trained to help struggling candidates in an individualized manner, there was inconsistent evidence of a clearly defined process in place to identify and support candidates who do not meet competencies.			
Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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.	X		
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning	X		

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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.			
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	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">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.	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.		X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	X		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">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 students and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.	X		
Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met		
Additional information applicable to the standard decision			
Documents reviewed and interviews with candidates and program leadership confirmed that 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. The program continues to update this			

sequence in ways that best meet the needs of their candidates based on individual candidate and mentor feedback and focused conversations with their New Teacher Focus Group.

Interviews and documents reviewed also confirmed that mentors are trained, evaluated, and recognized in a systematic manner and that clinical practice experiences are taking place in school settings that reflect California standards and the diversity of California's students.

There was inconsistent evidence that the program has a systematic way to monitor the implementation of support for those general education candidates where the mentor and candidate credentials do not match.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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.	X		
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.	X		
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data.	X		
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			X
Finding on Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Met with Concerns		
Rationale			
Documents reviewed and interviews with program leadership and candidates confirmed that the program regularly collects and analyzes a wide variety of internal data on candidate experience and preparation, and makes appropriate program modifications. However, the team found no evidence that this data includes regular feedback from key stakeholders such as employers or community partners on the quality of the preparation within the induction program, and the extent to which induction candidates, distinguished from new hires in general, are prepared to enter professional practice. During interviews, when asked about induction candidate preparation, multiple site administrators, district administrators, and program participants			

articulated anecdotal evidence in reference to district-wide support for new teacher hires and professional development rather than induction specific requirements. Current processes do not allow for feedback specific to the induction program.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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.	X		
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	X		
Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Met		

Additional information applicable to the standard decision

Documents reviewed and interviews with candidates and program leadership confirmed that the institution ensures that candidates know and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students, and are assessed appropriately.

Interviews and documents reviewed, including program surveys and the statewide completer survey, confirmed that the personalized support candidates receive from their mentor throughout the induction program is having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

Fremont Union High School District's Induction program provides a sequenced structure of support for new teachers. The strengths of the program include skilled and caring full-time release mentors who understand their roles in supporting new teachers. The mentors are selected via a rigorous selection process and focus on candidate growth across the CSTPs. The district further supports induction efforts by providing resources for the assignment of the program leader and a professional learning advisory team. An additional strength of the program is the interconnectedness of the induction work with other site or district initiatives. This provides the candidates with a meaningful experience that support them in the profession and the students in their classrooms.

The strength of the program also provides challenges. Although, the district provides support to all new hires and cites this as a strength, it was difficult to discern how support is specific to the needs of novice teachers in an induction program. Across multiple interviews, internal stakeholders expressed difficulty in differentiating between outcomes data for inductions candidates compared to all new hires. This is problematic when checking for data analysis and program decision making processes for the induction program. Given that accreditation provides the means for programs to continuously improve based on evidence of candidate outcomes, the district conflation of candidate and non-candidate data provide a challenge.