Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Milpitas Unified School District

Professional Services Division
March 2020

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at the **Milpitas Unified 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 Major Stipulations** is made for the institution.

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

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

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction	6	4	1	1

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: **Milpitas Unified School District**

Dates of Visit: **February 3-5, 2020**

Accreditation Team Recommendation: **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
Date: March 7, 2011	Accreditation

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Major 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 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:

Preconditions
All preconditions have been determined to be aligned.

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 site visit team found that four Program Standards were **Met,** and one Program Standard was **Met with Concern**, and one Program Standard was **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 four Common Standards were **Met with Concern** and one Common Standard was **Not Met**.

Overall Recommendation
Based on the fact that the team found that four Common Standards were **Met with Concern**, one Common Standard was determined to be **Not Met**, one program standard was **Met with Concern** and one program standard was found to be **Not Met**, the team recommends **Accreditation with Major Stipulations.**

The team recommends the following stipulations.

That within one year of COA action:
1) The institution demonstrate that it actively involves faculty, instructional personal, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for the Teacher Induction program
2) The education unit demonstrate that it monitors and communicates a defensible credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements including commission-adopted expectation of documenting evidence of growth toward mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession
3) The program provide evidence that progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts, with a clearly defined process to identify and support candidates who need assistance to meet competencies
4) The program provides evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive, continuous improvement process in which both the unit and its program regularly assess their effectiveness and make appropriate modifications based on findings.
5) The program provides evidence documenting the process through which it ensures that all candidates know and demonstrate the knowledge and skills required by the standards prior to recommendation for a credential, and that the unit and induction program demonstrate that they have a positive impact on teaching and learning in California's schools.

Further, the team recommends that:
● The institution submits **quarterly** written reports to the COA documenting all progress made towards meeting the goals set forth in the stipulations noted above.
● Milpitas Unified School District not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

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

In addition, staff recommends that:
● The institutions' response to the preconditions be accepted.
● Milpitas Unified School District continues 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 Lead:
Julia Dewees

Capistrano Unified

Common Standards:
Gail Calhoun

San Gabriel Unified School District

Programs Reviewers:
Stacy Shasky

Merced County Office of Education

Staff to the Visit:
Roxann Purdue

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Program Summary
Participating Mentor Agreement
Portfolio Checklist
Participating Administrator Letter of
Agreement
Portfolio Requirements
Participating Teacher Proof of Advisement
New Teacher Induction Handbook
Transition Document
Precondition Document
ILP Roadmap
Unit Level Data
ILP Workshop with Mentors and Candidates
Unit Level Assessment
PowerPoint Reviewing Induction Program
Common Standards Document
Digital Portfolios
Common Standards Addendum
Mentor Standards Spring Reflection
Program Standards Document
Feedback to Mentors on Coaching Video
Program Standards Addendum
MUSD Program Description
Collaboration Logs
MUSD TIP Stakeholders (2018-2019)
Continuum of Practice Year 1
MUSD TIP Stakeholders 2019-2020
Continuum of Practice Year 2
Annotated Stakeholder Roles
Self-Reflection on Inquiry

Faculty Participation in Schools, Teacher
MUSD General Preconditions
Mentor Assignment/MOU
ILP Cycle Forms
MUSD Teacher Induction Brochure
Induction Master Calendar of Event 2018-
19SCCOE Recruitment Fair (March 30, 2019)
ILP Deadlines
MUSD TIP Website
Exit Interview Powerpoint
Program Requirements
Recruitment Induction Flyer
Organization Structure
Faculty Presentations
MUSD Teacher Handbook
New Teacher Induction Handbook
Proof of Advisement 2019-2020
Mentor Resumes
Admin Agreement forms 2019-2020
Surveys: MUSD Induction Program 2017-18
Continuous Improvement
List of Candidate/Mentor matches with
credentials
Ongoing PD/Training for Mentors/Coaching
MUSD Induction Program-Roles and
Responsibilities
Year 1-Induction Mentors (2018-2019)
Survey Results
Measure of Program Effectiveness (2017-
2018)

CTC Feedback RE: MUSD Transition Plan, 2017

Feedback Regarding 2017-2018 Professional Development

Standards for General Education Induction Program

Teacher Leadership Self-Assessment Professional Development Plan

Revised California General Education Induction Program Preconditions and Standards

Common Standards Document, MUSD Transition Plan June, 2015

Common Standards Document, MUSD Transition Plan April, 2017

MUSD Teacher Induction Mission, Vision, and Core Values

MUSD TIP Response to California General Education Induction Program Preconditions and Standard

Interviews Conducted:

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	22
Completers	12
Institutional Administration	18
Program Coordinators	2
Mentors	11
Credential Analysts and Staff	1
Advisory Board Members	8
Professional Development Providers	5
TOTAL	**78**

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
Milpitas Unified School District serves the educational needs of nearly 10,000 kindergarten through high school students. It has an annual budget of approximately $76 million and nearly 900 employees. The Milpitas Unified School District has a very diverse student population. There are nearly 50 different languages and dialects spoken in the District. The student ethnic distribution is 40% Asian, 22% Hispanic, 20% Filipino, 9% White, 4% Black, and 5% other.

The District is comprised of ten elementary schools (Burnett, Curtner, Pomeroy, Randall, Rose, Sinnott, Spangler, Weller, Zanker and Mattos), two middle schools (Rancho and Russell), and one comprehensive high school (Milpitas High School). In addition, the District has a continuation high school (Calaveras Hills High School), a Child Development Center (Rose Center and Sunnyhills Center), and an Adult Education facility.

The Milpitas Unified School District is a high performing school district with an overall Academic Performance Index (API) score of 831. The District currently has 9 of 12 eligible schools with an API score above 800 (Sinnott 890, Curtner 885, Pomeroy 879, Russell 872, Zanker 866, Rancho 856, Burnett 853, Spangler 852 and Rose 821).

Since 2003, the District has been received many accolades – 7 of its schools have been selected as California Distinguished Schools (Rancho Middle School, Russell Middle School, Burnett Elementary, Curtner Elementary, Sinnott Elementary, Spangler Elementary, and Zanker Elementary).   Calaveras Hills High School had distinguished itself as a California Model Continuation High School, and Rancho Middle School had been selected three times as a "Schools to Watch" middle school in 2005, 2008, and again in 2011.

Education Unit
Milpitas Unified School District New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) resides within a single district. The program is under the guidance of the Assistant Superintendent of Learning and Development with oversight from the Director of Elementary Education and Teacher Induction. Daily operation of the program is the responsibility of the Teachers on Special Assignment. The Teachers on Special Assignment are supported by an administrative secretary. The Teachers on Special Assignment are responsible for identifying, matching and training mentors with input from the site administration.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2018-19)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2019-20)
Teacher Induction	24	36

The Visit
The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS
After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be **met**.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Teacher Induction

Program Design
Milpitas Unified School District New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) resides within a single district. Teachers on Special Assignment serve as Program Coordinators and oversee 29 part-time release mentors.

Interviews and documentation confirmed that the program communicates with stakeholders in a variety of ways. The Induction Advisory Council meets annually during the school year with membership derived from various district departments, site administration, university representatives, and mentors. Teachers on Special Assignment meet twice annually with Institutes of Higher Learning and Teacher Induction (CITI) and meet monthly with the Induction/IHE professional learning community. Documentation indicates that the Milpitas induction staff hold weekly meetings. Interviews confirm that regular communication happens between program staff and site administration.

Interviews with program staff and mentors confirmed that mentors are selected based on program need, credential held, school site, grade level or department and expertise and on their ability to communicate effectively and collaborate with beginning teachers. Mentors meet weekly with their credential candidates to work on both "just in time" needs as well as longer term individual learning plan (ILP) goals. They are supported and trained through professional development opportunities provided by program and district staff. Mentors are trained on topics such as coaching conversations, questioning techniques, candidate support, and induction documentation. Mentors reported during interviews that the recent reduction in documentation and focus on mentoring individual teacher needs is the result of feedback provided to the program. A review of documentation indicates that mentors self-report areas of mentoring proficiency and areas of need in addition to annually submitting video evidence of their coaching practice with specific feedback provided by the program.

Documentation and interviews indicate that stakeholder input is collected within the Milpitas Induction program. Although the Advisory Committee meets annually evidence supports that the primary purpose of this meeting is to share program information with limited opportunity for feedback used to guide the program. All participants in professional development opportunities and mentor training are surveyed for quality of services and interviews substantiate that this information is shared with the Program Director and Teacher on Special Assignment in order to modify future training as well as determine training needs moving forward.

Interviews as well as a review of the documentation confirmed that the program surveys stakeholders about their experiences and opinions on professional development and future training needs. Teacher candidates are questioned around issues such as meetings with mentor, observations, adequacy of time, mentor match, the ILP, program responsiveness to needs, and administrative support. Mentors are surveyed around many of the same topics as the candidates. While site administrators are questioned around their experiences working with candidates, mentors, and program staff. Documentation shows that survey results are reviewed at weekly induction meetings between program staff.

Significant change has occurred in this program in the last year. A review of the documentation indicates that between the 2018-19 academic year and the 2019-20 academic year the induction program moved from a largely FACT-based experience with significant documentation requirement and limited candidate choice to a much more individualized experience. The program has also experienced change in that the Induction Director was on medical leave in the 2018-19 academic year, and the Teacher on Special Assignment responsible for induction was out on medical leave for a portion of the 19-20 year. The position is temporarily filled by a Teacher on Special Assignment who is somewhat new to induction. Interviews with both candidates and mentors revealed that the change in program has been very positive, and that it is much more focused on the mentoring relationship.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
Documentation and interviews substantiate that credential candidates are identified based on surveys given to all new teachers hired by the district. If the credential analyst determines that a teacher qualifies for induction, they are enrolled, paired with a mentor, and are invited to attend an orientation meeting. At orientation, candidates learn the purpose of induction, the program processes and activities, criteria for completion, and sign an induction participant's agreement. Mentors begin meeting with candidates to get to know them, determine instructional support needed, and build positive mentor/mentee relationships. Candidates report that the mentor is the key factor in their success; one candidate said, "I don't think I would have made it through without my mentor." Interviews confirm that the ILP is developed after an initial CSTP self-assessment and a review of the preservice transition plan, if available. The ILP goals are shared with site administration during a triad meeting in which administration provides feedback on candidate goals. Mentors continue to meet weekly with candidates to provide individual mentoring in support of the teachers' professional growth goals. Professional learning opportunities are made available to candidates through both the induction program as well as district providers. Interviews confirm that candidates participate in a significant number of professional developments however, the team was not able to verify that professional development was linked to candidate's ILP goals.

Assessment of Candidates
After review of the documents, completion of interviews with candidates, mentors, completers, advisory board members and site administrators, and extensive interviews with program leadership, the team determined that a defensible process for reviewing completion

documentation was not in place. An end-of-year checklist is utilized to assess completion of program requirements, however the team determined that the program does not assess candidate competency in relation to growth in the CSTP to support the recommendation for the clear credential.

Findings on Standards

Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation – Not Met
After review of the documents, completion of interviews with candidates, mentors, completers, advisory board members and site administrators, and extensive interviews with program leadership, the team determined that a defensible process for reviewing completion documentation was not in place. An end-of-year checklist is utilized to assess completion of program requirements, however the team determined that the program does not assess candidate competency in relation to growth in the CSTP to support the recommendation for the clear credential.

Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services – Met with Concern
The team was unable to confirm with evidence and interviews that the system of support in place coherently ensures collaboration, communication, and coordination in regard to candidate competency in relation to growth as measured by the CSTP.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	*No response needed*
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.	**Consistently**
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Consistently**
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.	**Consistently**
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.	**Consistently**
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Inconsistently**
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	**Not Evidenced**

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met With Concern

Summary of information applicable to the standard
As stated in their Vision, Milpitas Unified School District's Induction program prepares candidates by implementing a formative assessment process that "provide(s) new teachers with essential supports and a rewarding experience that builds professional skills, fosters lifelong peer relationships, and establishes positive instructional practices that will impact the lives of all students and their families."

The program collaborates with the broader educational community through biyearly collaboration of Institutes of Higher Learning and Teacher Induction (CITI) to discuss best practices and vertical planning between preservice and Induction programs. They also attend meetings with their Cluster 2 Programs. The program shares survey data and program changes with the Advisory Board members who support Induction and give limited feedback.

Interviews with the district administrators confirmed that sufficient resources are allocated for the effective operation of the Program. The Superintendent stated that the funding for Induction is a priority and protected in the LCAP.

Recruiting a diverse teacher workforce is achieved through the collaborative effort of the MUSD management team. Activities include attending job fairs in neighboring districts to enlist qualified candidates to support the district's diverse student population. The Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources shared that he felt that the Induction Program is a "selling point in recruitment."

Mentors are at the core of the program, guiding candidates. The program emphasizes coaching, guidance and relationship building within the context of continuous cycles of inquiry. Both mentors and candidates appreciated that their induction work is job-embedded, streamlined for the development of the teacher, and not focused on paperwork.

Interviews with the Credential Analyst and program leadership demonstrated that the credential recommendation process ensures that candidates have met all requirements.

Rationale for the Finding
The team was unable to confirm through interviews and documents reviewed that there is a consistently implemented, ongoing process for decision making informed by data and stakeholder feedback.

Interviews and documents reviewed demonstrate that the unit does not consistently delineate between induction program requirements and expectations and employment conditions for all new teachers. Data sets are not disaggregated for induction program participants only.

Interviews with unit managers and program leaders demonstrate significant variability about how the institution's recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity.

The program leadership has not established a working definition of candidate competence or exit criteria for program completion and as a result is unable to communicate expectations to candidates, mentors, and administration.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	*No response needed*
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	**Consistently**
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.	**Consistently**
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Not Evidenced**

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met with Concern

Summary of information applicable to the standard
Candidates are identified by the credential analyst and advised regarding their eligibility for induction and the requirements to clear their preliminary credential by the Program TOSA. Support, advice, and assistance promote the candidate's successful entry and retention in the profession as evidenced by interviews with candidates who discussed how valuable the mentoring relationship is to their practice. A year one candidate said, "My mentor gives me strategies, emotional support, and all her wisdom."

Candidates are matched with a mentor within 30 days. At orientation, candidates and mentors are provided handbooks and detailed information about the program, requirements, and processes.

During the two-year, job-embedded induction program, or one-year Early Completion Option program if applicable, induction candidates receive feedback about their ILP work from program leadership.

Rationale for the Finding

The program has not defined candidate competencies, and evidence is not available to demonstrate that program requirements are tied to candidate growth towards mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Program leadership has not clearly defined a process to identify and support candidates in need of additional assistance to meet competencies. Evidence has not been provided regarding monitoring candidate progress to guide advisement and candidate support.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Inconsistently**
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	**Consistently**
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	**Inconsistently**
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	**Inconsistently**
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	**Inconsistently**

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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.	**Consistently**

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concern

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The program requires two cycles of inquiry (ILP) each year. However, the assessment criteria inquiry cycles, is currently subjective and measures completion, not growth. Mentor credentials are well matched to candidates' to provide optimal support in the context of the candidate's job assignment. Mentors are trained in supporting candidates completion of the ILP and given feedback on their mentoring via a digital video system (Torshe).

Documents and Interviews with candidates and mentors confirm that weekly site-based work and mentoring interactions frequently exceed minimum hourly program requirements. Candidates report that mentoring support is very positive. One year 2 candidate reported "For me, collaboration is key."

Rationale for the Finding

Mentors are required to be trained and oriented to their role, and self-assess their practice twice a year. Interviews and documents demonstrate that feedback to mentors about their mentoring practice is provided, but not based on program expectations or defined competencies. Training does not include instruction on the program's exit criteria nor the definition of candidate competence. Recognition, evaluation and retention of mentors is not systematic.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
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.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Consistently**
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	**Not Evidenced**

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
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.	**Not Evidenced**

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met with Concern

Summary of information applicable to the standard
The unit and program regularly collect data in the form of mentor and candidate surveys. Anecdotal evidence is commonly reviewed in weekly program meetings between the Director and Teacher on Special Assignment and often leads to program improvement. Professional development providers participate in the creation of surveys and review of district-level feedback. Mentors and candidates interviewed noted the mid-year surveys and end-of-year surveys as methods of program data collection.

Rationale for the Finding
Based on the documentation provided and interviews during the site visit, the team was unable to determine that candidate competence is assessed in all areas by the program.

The program collects data that is often aggregated with district level information. For example, district data about the impact of professional development is not disaggregated for induction program outcomes. Interviews confirmed that stakeholders were not involved in the analysis of data and are not able to articulate program core competencies to define quality preparation.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
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.	**Not Evidenced**
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.	**Not Evidenced**

Finding on Common Standard 5: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard
Individual Learning Plan evidence in digital portfolios, provides examples of candidates' engagement in the development of skills necessary to effectively support students in meeting

the state adopted academic standards. Interviews with site administrators showed that they felt that having their new teachers supported by mentors led to positive classroom outcomes.

Rationale for the Finding
Program leaders state that the program anticipates that this year's candidates will meet the commission-adopted competency requirements, but the team was unable to find supporting documentation to show how candidates will be assessed nor how competency of growth will be measured.

The program does not employ a metric to calibrate candidate competency. Anecdotal evidence shared by candidates, mentors, and site administrators indicate that they believe that the program has a positive impact on California's students, however the program and unit lack systems of evaluation that yield data to confirm the program's impact on candidate learning competence.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The unit acknowledges the importance of the program and allocates sufficient resources to ensure that the induction program is fully staffed. District level managers stated in interviews that they value the program and prioritize protecting funding for it. The Director of Learning and Development oversees the Teacher on Special Assignment in the coordination and implementation of the Induction Program. The MUSD Induction Program has experienced significant change in the last year both in program leadership and design. Last year, the Director was on medical leave, and this year the unit hired an interim TOSA who has worked with the Director, while the regular TOSA has been on maternity leave. In addition to the personnel changes, this year saw the implementation of an ILP that aligns with the new Induction Standards, replacing the FACT cycles of inquiry used in the previous year.

The preconditions have all been met, ensuring unit-level stability of the program. Candidates feel supported and value the personal relationships with mentors. Mentors, candidates and administrators describe mentors as the "heart of the program" which they state is a "big improvement" over the previous year's program requirements.

Interviews during the site visit confirmed that the program lacks consistent systems for data-based decision making, assessment of candidate competency, and evaluation of mentors. The team was unable to confirm that relevant stakeholders are included in the decision-making process. Feedback from stakeholder groups is inconsistently gathered and analyzed. Program leadership describes their decisions on candidate competency to be based on anecdotal evidence and discussions between the Director and Teacher on Special Assignment. The exit interview and completion of portfolio requirements appear to be the sole indicators of program completion. There is no evidence of consistent criteria for assessing candidate competence as measured by growth in the CSTP, nor is there a defined system to identify or provide additional program support for struggling candidates. Consistent policies for mentor selection, retention, and evaluation are not clearly defined or systematically implemented.

Program leadership report that the accreditation process has been a growth opportunity for the program; they saw the site visit as a formative process. Feedback from the site visit has already prompted plans for program improvement. The team feels confident that the program will continue to make program modifications and systematic improvements to better align with current standards.