

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at

Imperial County Office of Education

Professional Services Division

June 2022

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Imperial County Office of Education**. 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**

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met with Concerns
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns
4) Continuous Improvement	Met
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction	6	3	3	0

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: Imperial County Office of Education
Dates of Visit: April 25-27, 2022
Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
March 2014	Accreditation Letter

Rationale:

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

Program Standards

Teacher Induction Program Standards 1, 4, and 5 were found to be **Met**.

Teacher Induction Program Standards 2, 3, and 6 were found to be **Met with Concerns**.

Common Standards

Common Standards 2, 4, and 5 were found to be **Met**.

Common Standards 1 and 3 were found to be **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of the Imperial County Office of Education’s Teacher Induction program documents and conducted interviews with candidates, completers, mentors, district leads, advisors, site administrators, district administrators, professional development providers, program personnel, and county office leadership. Based on the findings from this review and from the interviews, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

Within one year, Imperial County Office of Education's Teacher Induction Program will provide evidence that:

1. Site administrators and mentors are collaborating with candidates at the beginning of the induction process by providing input into the development of the goals for the candidate's Individual Learning Plan (ILP).
2. A system of collaboration with IHE partners has been established that includes mentors and professional development providers.
3. Mentors are being regularly assessed and evaluated on the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates, using criteria that include:
 - a. candidate feedback,
 - b. the quality and perceived effectiveness of support provided to candidates in implementing their ILP, and
 - c. the opportunity to complete the full range of program requirements.
4. Only mentors who represent and support diversity and excellence are retained.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- Imperial County Office of Education's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Imperial County Office of Education be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Imperial County Office of Education 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.

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

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Valerie Saylor
Bakersfield City School District

Program Reviewer:

Robyn Zohbon
Stockton Unified School District

Common Standards:

Sean McCarthy
Murrieta Valley Unified School District

Staff to the Visit:

Roxann Purdue
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Individual Learning Plans (ILP)
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Accreditation Data Dashboard
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
ICOE Website
Mentor Logs
Partner District MOUs
Candidate Files
ILP Guidance Document
ILP Rubrics

Induction Program Handbook
Mentor Training Materials
Survey Results
Induction Program Presentations
Precondition Responses
Candidate and Mentor Matching Document
District Lead Professional Agreements
Induction Advisor Professional Agreements
Assessment Cycle Schedule
Program Changes due to COVID-19
Candidate Progress Monitoring Document
Organizational Charts
Exit Interview Evaluations
Colloquium Evaluations

Interviews Conducted

Constituencies	TOTAL
Candidates	80
Completers	11
Site Administrators	21
District Administrators	11
Program Director	1
Mentors	41
District Leads	9
Program Advisors	7
Institutional Administration	3
Human Resources Committee	8
Credential Analyst and Staff	2
Curriculum Network/Advisory	10
Professional Development Providers	9
IHE Partners	3
TOTAL	216

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

The Imperial County Office of Education (ICOE), located in the southeast corner of California, is bordered on the north by Riverside County, on the west by San Diego County, on the south by Mexico, and on the east by the Colorado River. As of July 1, 2021, Imperial County has a population totaling 179,851 with approximately 75% of individuals speaking languages other than English in the home. Agriculture represents 25% of the local economy and supports one of every six jobs in Imperial County.

The ICOE is comprised of 16 school districts along with an alternative education program, charter school, and special education program through the county office. The countywide enrollment reaches 36,607 students with a 93.1% Hispanic or Latino population and 38.4% of their students identified as English learners. Approximately, 77% of students qualify as socioeconomically disadvantaged while 11.7% qualify for special education services.

Education Unit

In the ICOE Teacher Induction Program this year there are 120 candidates being supported by 101 mentors across 39 school sites. Those mentors and candidates are further supported by 12 district leads across the 16 school districts and ICOE schools/programs, along with 8 induction program advisors. The program is led by a program director who also provides direct support to candidates, mentors, district leads, and advisors.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2020-21)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2021-22)
Teacher Induction	33	120

The Visit

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team and institutional stakeholders were interviewed via technology. 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

Program Design

The Imperial County Office of Education (ICOE) operates the Imperial County Office of Education Teacher Induction Program which incorporates 16 school districts and schools/programs through the county office of education. The ICOE's Curriculum Network, comprised of administrators from each district in the consortium and led by the Senior Director of ICOE's Curriculum and Instruction Department, acts as the Induction Program Advisory. The Induction Director leads the day-to-day operations of the program with the assistance of induction advisors and district leads. The Induction Director reports to the Senior Director of Curriculum and Instruction. The induction advisors, employed by the program part time, oversee a reasonable caseload of enrolled candidates and participate in Individual Learning Plan (ILP) assessment and feedback calibration and program decision making via monthly meetings with the Induction Director. District leads, employed by districts as an extra duty, act as liaisons between the program and the consortium districts. District leads hold monthly advice and assistance meetings for candidates and mentors and may also provide professional development at these meetings as determined by district administration. District leads are instrumental in providing ongoing communication and collaboration with site and district administrators regarding administrator roles and responsibilities. Assigned by consortium districts, classroom-based mentors guide candidates through their ILP, assist with individualized goal development, and optimize their candidates' development as professional educators.

The program does a thorough job of communicating with candidates, mentors, administrators, district leads, advisors and program staff. Communication occurs through regular meetings, emails, and informal conversations. Interviews across constituency groups emphasized the availability of the program director via phone, text, or email. Interviews confirmed the program director has regular meetings with induction advisors and district leads. The program director provides talks to the local institution of higher education preliminary program candidates during seminars at the beginning of their college coursework, as well as at the end of student teaching, to assist in their transition to induction. Through interviews, site administrators conveyed that most communication goes through induction advisors and district leads but they do have a direct line to the program director if needed.

Mentors attend timely professional development with their candidates to ensure their ability to assist the candidate in effective classroom application. This also ensures mentors build their mentoring skills as the program embeds opportunities for the mentors to practice having reflective conversations and relay observation evidence. Mentors also meet and reflect with candidates for a minimum of one hour each week to allow candidates to improve their professional practice over time with focused, on-the-job application of the California Standards

for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Doing so allows candidates to provide their students with effective instruction to master the state-adopted content standards at high performance levels in the context of the candidate's grade level/subject matter emphasis and district policies and initiatives. The work of induction assists candidates with the work of the district, including "just in time" coaching to provide the highest quality instruction to all students. The program director also offers virtual mentor support, monthly meetings with mentors and published ILP and skill builder topics on the agenda.

ICOE states a requirement for mentors to submit an application, resumé, and letter of reference to the program director in order to become a mentor for their district; however, program documentation and interviews confirm that there are a number of ways mentors are selected – varying by district – which may not follow the ICOE requirements. Candidates are matched with mentors by credential and subject area and whenever possible by district and school site. Through interviews, candidates, previous mentors, and personnel suggestions are taken into consideration when matching them with induction mentors. One district administrator stated, "we work with department chairs to find the best mentors for candidates." While in other cases, candidates found their own mentors who were later reviewed for qualifications by the program. Mentors attend monthly support meetings where different aspects of the ILP are addressed, a skill builder is presented, and they have a question-and-answer period. All trainings are recorded and provided to mentors for review if wanted or needed. Mentors and candidates together attend self-selected professional development sessions throughout the year.

Based on interviews with mentors, mentors receive informal feedback, but the program does not evaluate mentors' effectiveness using formal criteria. Induction program leaders do not provide feedback to mentors regarding their establishment of collaborative relationships.

Constituent input is important for the continued effectiveness of the program. ICOE assesses the quality of the services provided through a variety of surveys throughout the year. Mentors and candidates complete surveys after professional development sessions and at the end of inquiry cycles for the ILP. Feedback data is analyzed and then provided to the constituents to discuss trends, common issues, and possible solutions across the districts. A district lead stated in an interview, "The program director displays the data for us and the comments from the candidates and mentors. We can see common issues that we go over as a team. I would go over the data and see what pertained to our district and what we can do to improve within induction."

Reflective roundtable sessions occur at the end of each "Plan, Do, Study, Act" (PDSA) cycle. They are led by induction advisors and consist of mentors and candidates coming together to collaborate around predetermined topics. Mentors and candidates do not have to attend together. One completer said, "I got the most out of the roundtable discussions and being able to talk to experienced teachers, I learn better from talking to people than reading from books." The program collects input from all candidates, mentors, and administrators each year and a recurring theme was the request that there be structured time for candidates to talk to other candidates and mentors to reflect with other mentors. The roundtables offer this opportunity.

The program developed an Induction Handbook this year to support participants in the program. An induction lead noted that “the handbook is a great resource instead of pulling out papers and trying to locate something, it’s now all in one place.”

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The ILP is made up of two Inquiry cycles using the PDSA cycle. Traditional candidates completing induction in two years will complete four cycles total, with each cycle focused on the CSTP candidates choose to work on to better meet the needs of their current students. Early Completion Option (ECO) candidates will complete two cycles over the course of one year. Mentors and candidates shared that weekly meetings last no less than one hour and “just in time” support is provided along with completing the relevant ILP activities. A year two candidate said, “We go over any difficulties or struggles first then the ILP. I’m going to miss those meetings.”

The development of the ILP asks that candidates review their Individual Development Plan (IDP) when considering focus standards for each inquiry cycle. Input from the employer varies between districts. Some district administrators took an active role in the development of candidate goals, while others indicated that they were not part of the process of creating goals.

Professional development strands are offered to candidates who determine which to attend based on their own identified needs from their IDP, input from their mentor, and their own reflections on their practice. Candidates also consider the immediate needs of their students when choosing a strand. The ILP is then developed by the candidate and mentor based on the needs of each individual candidate. Mentors conduct an initial observation of their candidates and then are able to facilitate conversation to support the development of the ILP goals.

Assessment of Candidates

Competency and completion are assessed using a rubric that is completed by the induction advisors. Multiple mentors stated that they use the rubric to ensure that candidates are on target and that it is a great way to learn where support is needed. The ICOE’s Teacher Induction Program ensures only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential using a candidate progress monitoring document referred to as the Induction Gradebook. Program advisors evaluate candidate ILP work and indicate completion or issues in the gradebook. Candidate ILPs with feedback, as well as colloquium and exit interview evaluations, are linked to this document. When candidates complete the program, they participate in a colloquium where they highlight their best practices. Multiple groups of education partners, including the County Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, induction advisors and professional development providers, attend in celebration of the candidates. Candidates also participate in exit interviews to illustrate their competence in the CSTP before they are recommended for their clear credential.

Another practice that ensures only qualified candidates are recommended for the clear credential is the program director does not make the recommendations, but instead completes the I-41 Verification letter and submits it to the candidate and the ICOE credentialing department. The credentialing department will not make the recommendation if they haven't

received the verification letter from the program. Additionally, if candidates have remaining credential requirements on their preliminary credential, the credentialing department ensures all requirements are met prior to recommending for the clear credential.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional reports, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, mentors, program staff, induction advisory and other relevant constituents, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the ICOE Teacher Induction Program except for the following:

Standard 2: Components of Mentoring Design – Met with Concerns

The Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is inconsistently developed in consultation with the site administrator across districts within the program. Some districts include input and collaboration with the site administrator while others do not.

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

The ILP must be collaboratively developed at the beginning of induction by the candidate and mentor with input from the site administrator regarding the candidate's job assignment, and guidance from the program staff. Input from the site administrator during the beginning development of the ILP is inconsistent across districts.

Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services – Met with Concerns

The program must regularly assess the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates, using criteria that include candidate feedback, the quality and perceived effectiveness of support provided to candidates in implementing their ILP, and the opportunity to complete the full range of program requirements. Induction program leaders must provide formative feedback to mentors on their work, including establishment of collaborative relationships.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Imperial County Office of Education (ICOE) Induction Program is a consortium of 16 school districts across the county as well as additional schools/programs run through the county office of education. An experienced and dedicated program director heads the daily work of the program. Candidates are matched with mentors who guide them through the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) which includes cycles of inquiry evidencing growth in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). District leads work at the district level as the key point of contact for the program and communicate regularly with the mentors and candidates in their home districts including a monthly meeting for check-ins and professional development. Induction advisors work at the program level and are assigned approximately 15 candidate/mentor pairs. The advisor oversees the progress of the candidate and is an on-call support if the candidate or mentor needs any input regarding progress through the induction program. Additionally, the advisors provide ongoing feedback as candidates progress through their ILP goals using an established rubric. Candidates’ growth over the course of the program is tracked and ultimately, after exit interviews and a colloquium, the candidates who have met all requirements are recommended for the California clear credential.

ICOE Induction is a well-established program as noted by the positive survey and interview feedback from the experience of mentors and candidates. Over time, some program elements have become systemized, while other areas are left to the discretion of the district which causes some inconsistencies depending on which district employs the candidate. Program leadership has been working to address these areas, but some areas remain that require further work to fully meet Common and Induction standards.

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:	<i>No response needed</i>
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.	Consistently

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
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.	Inconsistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

ICOE Teacher Induction has an established vision for the program that is articulated across education partner groups. Interviews evidenced that the range of constituents – from the superintendent to the candidates – know the vision and purpose of the program. The program is led by one director who reports to the Senior Director of Curriculum and Instruction and oversees district leads (district-employed, providing oversight, training, communication to candidates and mentors), induction advisors (program-employed, providing oversight of program progress and candidate competency), mentors, and candidates as each fulfill their individual roles in the induction program. The program director, with input from the Senior Director of Curriculum and Instruction, has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all the induction program, its candidates, and other constituents.

There is a structure to ensure constituents have input into the organization, coordination and decision making of the program. The county Curriculum Network which serves as the Induction Program Advisory meets monthly to review data and provide advice regarding the induction program. Other groups including induction advisors and the county Human Resources Committee have avenues to provide feedback to the program. A district level administrator described the increased communication between districts and the program over the last several years as, “we’re dancing better together now, and we are aiming for the same goal.”

Districts in the ICOE consortium provide funding to the county office for each induction participant in the district. Funds support induction personnel and professional development costs.

Checkpoints throughout the program and at completion ensure candidates have met all requirements of the induction standards before being recommended for the clear credential. The program director works closely with the credential analyst in ICOE Human Resources throughout the recommendation process. Interviews confirmed a close working relationship and ongoing regular communication between the program and the credential analyst. Candidates shared in interviews that they know the requirements of the program and receive regular feedback via their ILP rubrics and emails from their assigned advisors.

Rationale for the Finding

While the program has made some attempts to ensure 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, they have not yet established a system to meet this standard. One IHE partner regularly participated in collaborative meetings with the program until two years ago and reestablishing that relationship has been challenging. Additionally, new IHE partners have come aboard, but the current communication occurs only between an IHE contact and the Induction Director, not with the mentors and professional development providers.

Inconsistent practices regarding the recruitment of mentors by district partners in the consortium have led to the inability of the program to evidence recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. In interviews, candidates and mentors shared district practices ranging from a district lead assigning a qualified mentor to candidates having to seek out a mentor and then ask the program to determine if the mentor was qualified. The program allows districts to decide how to recruit and retain mentors with little oversight from the program. Most districts have established recruitment efforts to hire and retain mentors who represent and support diversity and excellence, but this is not consistent across all districts in the consortium.

Reviews found evidence in documents and interviews that the institution employs and assigns only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences; however, because there is not a systematic way to evaluate

mentors, there is no evidence that the institution retains the most qualified and effective mentors.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Data from the Accreditation Data Dashboard, confirmed with interviews by site leadership and the credential analyst, along with a review of other program evidence, demonstrates that the program has established and communicates a clear process for enrolling eligible candidates into the teacher induction program. A comprehensive advisement process that involves the program director, human resources personnel, district leads and advisors, and site administrators ensures each candidate attends a program orientation and is appropriately matched to a mentor within 30 days of enrollment, which was affirmed during interviews with candidates. According to the Commission’s Completer Survey data from the past two years, approximately 87% of candidates identify themselves as Hispanic or Latino, which closely matches the diversity of the student population for the consortium. Interviews with human resources personnel suggest that an increase in the capacity to recruit more diverse teachers was the result of the ability to attend virtual job fairs and provide information to universities across the country electronically. Candidate competency is documented through the ILP and further evaluated during the Colloquium experience and Exit Interview process. The process is carefully monitored by district leads, induction advisers, and program leadership who provide ongoing feedback to candidates and mentors. Candidates and mentors can also track progress in a Google Document that serves as an “induction gradebook” where they can check their

completion status at any time and access feedback on completed items. Mentors and district leads are also available to provide additional support for candidates through a process outlined in the ICOE Induction Handbook for any candidate who is struggling due to extenuating circumstances.

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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The ICOE Teacher Induction Program has developed a sequence of events centered around the CSTP that builds upon foundational knowledge and skills from the preliminary preparation programs. Mentors guide candidates through a PDSA cycle of inquiry and action research based on their ILPs, which support formative assessment and reflection and multiple opportunities to apply and develop their knowledge and skills within their teaching context in support of diverse populations of students. The process is highly individualized and designed to support growth toward mastery of the CSTP. One teacher shared, “I was anxious and thought it would be more work to do, but it has been awesome. It has been a great experience for me. The program is not something that has added to my tasks. It is just something I am doing, and it has been really relevant to my practice. The flexibility of being able to choose has been really helpful. This helps me in my practice.” Another clear feature of the program is the relationship with the mentors, who guide the candidates through the ILP process and also provide substantial “just in time” support for candidates, who frequently commented about their mentors’ availability as a hallmark of the program. One candidate said, “My mentor's informal support was texting no matter what time of day with issues I didn’t know how to handle. She’s become my go to—she will respond the moment I need her. I have been so lucky. I have lunch with my mentor every day and it’s an awesome opportunity to debrief.” Another strong feature of support is the observation experience. Candidates observe their mentors, or other colleagues, and then are observed by their mentors as part of their ILP experience. One candidate remarked, “My mentor would do the modeling for me. Then, I would present my lesson and then she would give me positive feedback. The modeling helps me apply the professional development but the ILP holds me accountable and forces me to reflect.” Candidates also self-select professional development strands as part of the ILP process. The strands are developed in conjunction with the county Curriculum Coordinators and aligned to district initiatives and candidate needs. They provide an array of topics and choices for candidates to select from during each cycle, enabling candidates to explore such elements as academic support, social-emotional learning, interventions, engagement, technology, classroom management, and more. Candidates and mentors receive ongoing feedback on the ILP from district leads, advisors, and program leadership, and can track progress through their Google document in order to monitor progress.

Rationale for the Finding

Although there was some evidence of collaboration with IHE partners outside of the consortium, this collaboration has been inconsistent and there is no evidence that the interactions have been used to inform program development. Additionally, while mentor teachers receive informal feedback during the course of their work with candidates, there is no evidence of a systematic evaluation process in place for mentors.

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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The ICOE Teacher Induction Program has created a culture of continuous improvement by providing multiple opportunities for all constituents to provide feedback through a wide variety of data tools collected and analyzed systematically. A review of evidence and interviews indicated that program leadership, district leads, advisors, and the curriculum network group analyze and review data from midyear, end-of-year, Commission Completer Surveys, and professional development evaluations to inform decision-making and make program adjustments. They also examine data from completed ILPs, and rubric scores from colloquium and exit interviews, to monitor program effectiveness. Multiple constituents commented during interviews that they felt they were listened to and that the program responded to their feedback and suggestions. One candidate remarked about immediate changes to the format of the professional learning sessions based on feedback provided from an evaluation. District and site administrators have reported that the changes in the induction program have positively impacted their candidates’ abilities to support the full range of learners in their classrooms as a result of the program’s responsiveness. Mentors shared that their feedback has led to streamlining of many processes, and both mentors and candidates indicated that their feedback has resulted in more virtual support opportunities, from the use of Google tools for ILP feedback to live and asynchronous professional development opportunities. A district leader commented that the program listened to their feedback during COVID to pivot professional learning support for candidates to “virtual instruction” and then “shifted back to engagement and social-emotional learning needs that we were experiencing” when schools opened in-person.

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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

One district leader said, “As new teachers they are going to change the world and knowing that they have this whole community behind them gives them the confidence to do it.” This was a sentiment echoed by many of the district and site leaders team members interviewed about the impact the ICOE Teacher Induction Program is having on teachers and students in the county as a result of its program design. The program has crafted a sequence of experiences through the ILP, the Colloquium presentation, and the Exit Interview process that ensure each candidate is able to demonstrate growth toward mastery of the CSTP before being recommended for a clear credential. The program has an organized and efficient tracking system to know where a candidate is in their progress toward a clear credential. Candidates and mentors clearly identified ways in which the ILP helped them progress toward mastery of the CSTP throughout the induction experience, with feedback from district leads, advisors, and program leadership, and additional support available when needed.

Interviews with candidates, mentors, site administrators, and district leadership all confirm that induction is making a positive impact on candidates’ competency and ability to support the full range of learners encountered in their classrooms. Both administrators and candidates shared the impact of induction work on equity in classrooms. One candidate described the impact of observing her mentor and “seeing how she differentiates instruction. It is one thing to read but when you get to see what it looks like that is really eye-opening.” One administrator said that being partnered with a mentor is the difference between whether a new teacher “sinks or swims.” All administrators agreed that the mentoring the candidates received was “right on point” with their site goals. Completer survey data also suggests a high correlation between the impact site administrators are seeing and the improvement candidates self-report. These results are consistently above the state mean when asked, “How well the ILP goal activities prepared you to...” meet on each of the six CSTP.