Discussion of 7th Year Report for CalStateTEACH
May 2021

Overview
This report provides information on the 7th year report for CalState TEACH.

Recommendation
This is an information/action item. Because CalState TEACH was granted **Accreditation** with no stipulations, no action is required beyond accepting the report from CalState TEACH.

Background
CalState TEACH hosted an accreditation visit in fall 2019. The COA granted a status of **Accreditation with a 7th Year Report** to the institution in February 2020. The full team report may be found here CalState TEACH Accreditation Report.

The 7th year report was to focus on actions taken to address issues identified by the team for Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement, Induction Program Standard 3 Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans Within the Mentoring System, and 6 Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services all of which were determined to be **Met with Concerns**.

2019-2020 Team Findings and Actions Taken by CalTEACH
The information provided below includes a summary of actions taken to address Common Standard 4. The full response to Common Standard 4 is available in an insert available at CalState TEACH Assessment Plan. Additionally, the actual responses from CalState TEACH to the two induction standards that were met with concerns are also included below.

Summary of Actions taken by CalState TEACH

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement
2019 Team Finding
Interviews indicated that there were frequent informational conversations with employers, district personnel, and principals regarding the quality of the preparation; however, evidence was lacking that there were formal processes for reporting the results of these informal conversations back to the program or unit for appropriate analysis and possible action. The continuous program improvement process is largely based upon informal and relational evidence and does not appear to include a formal and systematic process. The unit has noted that this is a goal for them as they implement the new curriculum in the Multiple Subject program, continue to expand the Induction program, revise the vision and mission and adapt to new program leadership and structures.

Summary of 2021 Response from CalState TEACH

CalState TEACH provided a response outlining its current continuous improvement system. A detailed description of the types of data collected with a description of the process for analyzing the data as well as examples of the manner in which the data were used to inform programmatic changes is included in the report.

The full response to Common Standard 4 which may be accessed here: XXX includes a description of the primary sources of data that the unit relies upon to inform programmatic decisions. These include qualitative data from its 325 district partners and advisory board recommendations, data collected through the CalState TEACH Administration Manager (CAM) database, Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) data, performance assessment (CalTPA) data, and Commission surveys.

Induction Program Issues:

Induction Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans Within the Mentoring System – Met with Concerns

2019 Team Finding:
The mentoring approach implemented by the program includes the development of an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP). Interviews with candidates and employers revealed that school principals are generally not providing input on the development of the ILP.

2021 Response from CalState TEACH:
The Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) document was revised before the start of the Spring 2021 term to allow for principals to include their feedback on the actual ILP document that has now been combined with the signature page. This allows for the principals' input on the ILP to be documented and considered as the induction teachers make plans towards meeting their ILP goals. The induction teacher has the opportunity to revise their ILP using the ILP addendum assignment at the start of the Spring term of Year 1 and the start of the Spring term of Year 2. The principal, school site coach, and university mentors are all asked to give input and signatures to finalize the triad meeting. This revised process encourages and supports ongoing communication about the induction candidates' growth and progress of the ILP goals. At the close of each term, the site administrator is sent a survey and asked to answer the following questions:

Site Administrator End of Term Evaluation

1. What is your role? (induction teacher, school site induction coach, administrator, faculty mentor)

2. The induction teacher is in .... (Year 1, Year 2)

3. The emphasis on an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) encourages development and growth of the Induction Teacher's professional and personal goals. (strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree)

4. The Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) is collaboratively developed with the candidate, the administrator/employer and mentor. (strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree)

5. The Induction Teacher has sufficient access to professional development, resources, and materials to address the ILP professional goals. As you respond, consider the following: school related professional development, department meetings, faculty and coach conversations and feedback, and other means of professional growth. (strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree)

6. The Induction Teacher's experience includes valued ongoing conversations with colleagues and timely faculty assistance. The dual system of support is helpful. (strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree)

7. The individualized CalStateTEACH Induction Program is sufficiently rigorous as a Clear Credential program. (strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, strongly disagree)

8. Is there anything else you would like to tell us? (short answer text)

<u>Induction Program Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services – Met with Concerns</u>

2019 Team Finding:
The program appears to effectively address issues brought up by candidates, coaches and/faculty mentors on a case by case basis, but it is not clear how the program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates. The evidence does not clearly define how Induction program leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work.

2021 Response from CalState TEACH
At the end of each term, each induction candidate evaluates their university faculty mentor using an anonymous faculty evaluation. The results of the faculty evaluations are individually shared by the Regional director with each faculty. The induction faculty meets twice each term to review all of the evaluation data and make program improvement plans. The induction candidates do not evaluate their school site coaches because they are colleagues who work together at their school sites and are often both members of the same collective bargaining unions.

The induction candidate's employer selects the school site coach and the university confirms the employer's selection. If the initial pairing is not supporting the induction candidate's ability to complete program requirements, clear procedures are established for reassignments when either the candidate or Induction coach is dissatisfied with the pairing. The steps are outlined in the CalStateTEACH Induction Program Handbook. "Induction Coach Reassignment process is as follows: 1. Induction candidate contacts Faculty Mentor to clarify issues surrounding the reconsideration of Induction Coach assignment. 2. Based on the expressed concerns, the

Faculty Mentor will propose in writing a remedy which may involve any of the following: a. Facilitating a meeting between the Induction candidate and the Induction coach to resolve presenting problems. b. Working with the employer to facilitate assigning a new Induction coach. c. With agreement from the Induction candidate's employer, assigning an Induction coach from another school or district to conduct formative observations and to collaborate on program assignments. The proposal will be jointly agreed upon and signed by the faculty mentor and Induction candidate. Upon receipt of the signed agreement, the faculty mentor will take the agreed upon action to provide for a new Induction coach assignment in a timely manner.