

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

Pasadena Unified School District

January 2023

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Pasadena 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	Not Met
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met with Concerns
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns
4) Continuous Improvement	Not Met
5) Program Impact	Met with Concerns

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction	6	2	1	3

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: Pasadena Unified School District

Dates of Visit: November 14, 2022 - November 16, 2022

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
June 2015	Accreditation with Major Stipulations
May 2016	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 General Institutional Preconditions have been determined to be Met. Out of the six Teacher Induction Preconditions, one was found to be not in compliance: Precondition 4 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.

Program Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that the following Teacher Induction Program Standards are **Met: 1 and 2**, the following Teacher Induction Program Standard is **Met with Concerns: 4**, and the following Teacher Induction Program Standards are **Not Met: 3, 5, and 6** for Pasadena Unified School District.

Common Standards – (Corrected)

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that Commons Standards 2, 3, and 5 are Met with Concerns and Common Standards 1 and 4 are Not Met for Pasadena Unified School District.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of Pasadena Unified School District's Teacher Induction program documents and conducted interviews with candidates, completers, mentors, site administrators, advisory board members, program personnel, and district leadership. Based on the findings from this review and from the interviews, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

1. Teacher Induction Precondition 4: That evidence is provided that Pasadena Unified School District immediately establish, implement and enact a plan to develop goals for each participating teacher within the context of the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) within the first 60 days of the teacher's enrollment in the program.

Within one year the institution take action on the following:

2. That the institution develop and implement a comprehensive continuous improvement process in which both the unit and the teacher induction program regularly assess their effectiveness and make appropriate modifications based on findings. This process must include the systematic collection, analysis, and use of candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operation and include multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter and are retained in the professional practice and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.
3. That the unit actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for the teacher induction program.
4. That the institution provide evidence that it 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.
5. That the unit provides sufficient resources to allow for the effective operation of the teacher induction program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, monitoring and professional development.

6. That the program evaluates and demonstrates how it is having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence.
7. That the program demonstrate how it is meeting the requirements of Program Standard 3 Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System. This includes that the program demonstrates how the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) addresses the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and provides the road map for candidates' Induction work during their time in the program along with guidance for the mentor in providing support.
8. That the program has a system based in the Individual Learning Plan by which the program assesses candidate competency and progress toward mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, with guidance and feedback from program staff on progress given to the candidate.
9. That the program demonstrates that it is meeting all the responsibilities of assuring quality of service including, that the program assesses the quality of mentor services provided to candidates and provides formative feedback to mentors, that site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated, and recognized in a systematic manner and that the program regularly assesses the services of the mentors to candidates and retain only qualified persons to provide support to candidates.
10. The program demonstrate that mentors receive training and support in the program's design, the ILP purpose and within the requirements of Program Standard 3.

Additionally, it is recommended:

11. That Pasadena Unified School District not be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation until the stipulations have been lifted.
12. That Pasadena Unified School district provide quarterly written documentation to the Commission documenting steps taken to address to address the stipulations noted above.
13. That within one year Pasadena Unified School District host a revisit to confirm all stipulations have been addressed.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- Pasadena Unified 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.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential program and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements: Teacher Induction Program

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Dr. Melissa Meetze-Hall
Riverside and San Bernardino County
Offices of Education

Common Standards:

Gina Smith
Stanislaus County Office of Education

Documents Reviewed:

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
PUSD Accreditation Website
Candidate Advisement Materials
Candidate Orientation PowerPoint

Programs Reviewers:

Elizabeth Heinberger
Sutter County Superintendent of Schools

Staff to the Visit:

Karen Sacramento
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Candidate Portfolios
Precondition Responses
Candidate Folders
Program Overview PowerPoint
Collaborative Logs
Accreditation Data Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	25
Completers	7
Site Administrators	13
District Leadership	6
Program Director	1
Mentors	13 <i>(Corrected)</i>
Professional Development Providers	8
IHE Partners	3
Credential Analysts and Staff	2
Advisory Board Members	1
TOTAL	4
	70

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

Situated against the mountains of Los Angeles County, Pasadena Unified School District serves Induction teachers from within the Human Resource Department of this mid-size district (14,200 ADA). Across all student groups there are 24 languages spoken by students and their families. The student-focused value of the District is evidenced by the variety of academics and programs, including (STEAM Magnet schools, multiple International Baccalaureate (IB) Schools, dual immersion for Spanish, French, Mandarin and Armenian). District personnel and partners are proud of the rich access to the arts and technology in the region.

Education Unit

The Pasadena Unified School District Induction program is housed in the Human Resources Division. The program is led by the Chief of Human Resources. The district has adopted a mentoring system that includes full-time classroom teachers, generally serving as mentors to one or two candidates. Induction mentors are assigned to candidates within 30 days of enrollment in the program on a continuous basis. At the time of the site visit there were 71 induction candidates. For the 2021 - 2022 school year there were fewer than ten credential candidates recommended for the clear credential.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2021-22)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2022-23)
Teacher Induction	22	77

The Visit

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 with the exception of the following:

- Precondition 4 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. Evidence reviewed and interviews conducted indicated that there is not a defined program process in place for this to occur and be confirmed.

PROGRAM REPORT

Teacher Induction

Program Design

The two-year Teacher Induction Program of Pasadena Unified School district is run through the Human Resources Department, as the director of Human Resources for the district is also the Teacher Induction Coordinator, coordinating and managing mentors and staff and supported by an administrative assistant, a credential analyst, and a Teacher on Special Assignment for Teacher Residency Programs. The Induction Coordinator works closely with the Coordinator of Professional Development and the administrative assistant. Review of evidence confirms that the program coordinator is involved in both planning and monitoring every step of a candidate's program from the time of entry to when they are recommended for the clear credential.

Interviews with program and district leadership confirm that there is regular communication within the program and with the institution. For example, at the beginning of the year administrators are emailed names of new teacher induction candidates at their sites as well as a list of important dates and followed with reminders about those dates. One administrator interviewed appreciated the personalized approach, "In the past Dr. R. would reach out one on one." Another site administrator had a need for mentor reassignment and reached out to Dr. R and the administrator assured that the candidate was reassigned a mentor. Additionally, candidates and mentors both feel confident in reaching out to the program coordinator as needed, such as one candidate who requested mentor reassignment by the program coordinator and the situation was promptly remedied. However, no evidence of a clear mentor reassignment policy in place was in evidence.

Candidates begin their two-year induction journey with communication from the Human Resources department, which also houses the Teacher Induction Program, as new teachers are hired and the credential analysts check on individual credential statuses. Those flagged as needing Teacher Induction to clear a Preliminary Teaching Credential are enrolled and matched with a mentor very soon thereafter, as evidenced by candidate and mentor interviews and documented enrollment and mentor matching dates. When asked about the program's Early Completion Option, one candidate referred to this as the "sped up option" that was mentioned

in the beginning of the program meeting with the program coordinator, as is evidenced by a Google Slides Presentation.

The mentoring design uses the Plan-Teach-Reflect-Apply-focused inquiry cycles as central to the hourly weekly meetings between mentors and candidates. In these, they collaborate and provide just in time support as they work towards completion of their Portfolio Requirements. Interviews confirm that candidates develop an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) and that mentoring support for candidates includes both just in time support and longer-term analysis of their teaching practice to help candidates develop enduring professional skills. Candidate feedback in interviews was overwhelmingly positive towards the support that they are provided by their mentors, a sentiment that is supported by the Commission's Accreditation Data System agency level data in that all respondents reported that "I would describe my mentor's skills in meeting my needs as" either Skilled or Highly Skilled.

Mentors are hired through recommendation by site administrators or on the recommendation of other mentors. Applicants must complete a process that includes submission of at least two evaluations, a letter of recommendation by the site administrator that includes their understanding of the Continuum of the Teaching Profession, and a recommendation from the Human Resources Director. Mentors are matched with candidates based on credential held and/or teaching location. Interviews confirmed that this process includes verification of the mentor teacher's credential by the credential analyst. Additionally, there are many veteran mentors who return from one school year to the next, having previously completed this application process.

When hired and assigned, mentors attend an orientation for new mentors at the district office, where one mentor shared that they "went over all the files and the paperwork that we had to go through to learn about the folders and timing to put in." Interviews corroborate that mentors also attend monthly virtual Mentor Seminars, during which they receive professional development regarding certain mentoring practices. One mentor mentioned that an "expert in the district ...comes and talks to us about the entire coaching cycle." This training supports the topics of transformational coaching and adult learning theory, as evidenced in a Mentor Induction Meeting slide deck. In interviews, the professional development coordinators confirmed that in the monthly mentor meetings, the use of research-based theories, including the work of prominent educational experts Elena Aguilar and Jim Knight, serve as the basis for the Mentor Seminars. Additionally, a strength of the mentoring system is the collegial support amongst the mentors, as new mentors are offered guidance of veteran mentors.

However, there was no evidence of the program providing required training for mentors in the standards based areas of: goal-setting; the use of appropriate mentoring instruments; ongoing best practices in adult learning; support for the candidates in accordance with the ILP; facilitation of candidate growth and development through modeling; guided reflection on practice and feedback on classroom instruction; connecting candidates with additional resources to support their professional growth and accomplishments of the ILP, as well as periodically reviewing the ILP with candidates and making adjustments as needed.

Stakeholder interviews indicated that the program leadership is open to receiving feedback. One site administrator interviewed reported that the program leadership has invited any principals who want to give feedback to do so in a small group.” There are informal opportunities for gathering information through conversations and mentor collaboration time during Mentor Seminar monthly. However, there is no evidence of a cycle of continuous improvement based on data to support programmatic decisions, including how the program provides a coherent overall system of support through the collaboration, communication and coordination between candidates, mentors, school and district administrators, and all members of the teacher induction system.

At this time there is no systemic implementation of continuous improvement in place in the program through which induction program leaders are able to provide formative feedback to mentors on their work, on the quality and perceived effectiveness of support provided to candidates in implementing their Individualized Learning Plan, and on the opportunity to complete the full range of program requirements. When asked about how feedback is given to mentors based on the quality of their services, one mentor shared that “no news is good news” and indicated that if she’s hired back, she’s doing okay.

There was no evidence that ILP-based candidate work is evaluated for effectiveness or candidate competency measures to assess candidate progress towards mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession to support the recommendation for the clear credential. Additionally, there is no evidence on how program changes are uniformly sought, analyzed, or implemented.

In the Pasadena Unified School District Teacher Induction Program, all monthly required mentor meetings and candidate meetings are virtual. This shift occurred due to the nature of the recent pandemic, but because of the increased rates of attendance at mentor seminars and candidate meetings, virtual meetings have continued. Additionally, all candidate assignments have moved to a virtual platform and are now housed in Google Drive.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

There is no evidence of the Individual Learning Plan serving as the foundational course of study document for candidates in the teacher induction program. The primary assessment for measurement of candidates is the completion of an extensive set of Portfolio Requirements during their program journey. An Individualized Learning Plan (ILP), on which candidates develop professional goals for three of the CSTP, is created in the fall and includes the next steps but does not include evidence of ongoing use and implementation by the candidate and mentor.

Candidates initially develop an ILP based on their needs with input from the site administrators. As reported in interviews, site administrators provide input on the selection of the CSTP goals in development of the ILP and then carry forward to the candidates’ portfolio assignments. The CSTP is the central focus of the initial ILP goal setting and the portfolio assignments and then the portfolio assignments drive the candidate and mentor interactions. While the ILP is used in the fall for goal setting this document does not serve as the foundation to drive the growth

experience. According to 20-21 Completer Survey Data, 14/16 candidates reported that their ILP goals were strongly aligned to their mentor's input. The ILP includes three growth goals and a description of how the candidate will work to meet those goals. However, there is no evidence that the ILP is developed with the required guidance from the program staff. Coursework listed on the Portfolio requirement checklist includes: a Class Profile, two pre-assessment Icebergs (one for each Case Study Student), a School, Family, and Community Resources page, monthly Collaborative Assessment Logs (CALs), initial ILP goals, Fall and Spring Inquiry Pre-assessments, Fall and Spring Inquiry Post-Assessments, initial, mid-year, and end of year self-reflection on the Continuum of Teaching Profession (CTP), Fall and Spring Lesson Plans, Fall and Spring Mentor Observations and Post-Observation Collaborative Assessment Logs (separate from monthly CALs), and Spring Inquiry Action Plan.

Candidates engage in reflective cycles of inquiry throughout the program. In the spring, candidates complete an inquiry activity where they provide a comprehensive reflection on their practices. The program leadership recognizes the need to bring the reflective process into a streamlined Individual Learning Plan for candidates, as currently, these reflective components are engaged within separate sections of Portfolio activities. Programmatic documentation evidence and in interview the Human Resources Director substantiated that the program is "in the process of recreating our ILP to be inclusive of all the components of the program as one document instead of having the Inquiry process documents separate from the ILP to be more aligned with the program standards."

There is no evidence to verify defined and measurable outcomes for the candidate in the Individual Learning Plan goals to meet these goals, nor planned opportunities to reflect on progress and modify the ILP as needed. Additionally, professional learning is solely connected to the Portfolio activities that are broken into eight sections to complete over the course of the year, four sections per semester.

Candidates attend monthly Professional Development sessions provided by the district and required by the program on topics pertaining to areas of district initiative that include but are not limited to Socioemotional Learning, educational technology tools, and literacy in secondary education. Additionally, candidates are provided with two calendar days a year to observe colleagues if they choose to do so, but are constrained by a high substitute teacher shortage, as reported in interviews. There was no evidence of programmatic resources in connection to the ILP process.

Mentor teachers provide support and guidance intermittently to candidates in completing the portfolio documents. The candidates are encouraged to devote their time to the self-reflection of their teaching practices to support their instructional program and build their own teaching portfolios through numerous activities, one of which includes developing three goals in the ILP document, but there is no evidence that the ILP is revisited by candidates and mentors over the two-year program.

Assessment of Candidates

There are four clear sections of growth-driven activities that must be completed prior to submission of the online portfolio of documents in December and another four clear sections of growth-driven activities that must be completed prior to submission of the online portfolio documents in May. Rubrics are used to assess the understanding of the varying assignments through reflective connection between instructional practices and identified needs of students. At the mid-year mark in December and again at the end of the year in May, mentors from the PUSD mentor cadre team up to review the work of others' induction candidates. If areas on the rubric are scored Approaching Standards or Below Standards, they are returned to the candidate with feedback directing revision needs, after which work is submitted to the program coordinator for review. All portfolio documents and activity requirements must be completed in order to pass. Candidates are provided with an opportunity to rewrite and resubmit documentation to satisfy both the portfolio and reflection documents. There is no evidence that candidates are assessed on progress towards master of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession or within an Individual Learning Plan process. There is no evidence of the standards-based requirement that the documentation of candidate progress must reflect the learning and professional growth goals indicated within the Individualized Learning Plan and evidence of the candidate's successful completion of the activities as outlined in the ILP. In May there is a Colloquium that year two candidates are required to attend to share their progress and insights from the teacher induction program.

Review of evidence indicates that candidates are recommended for a clear teaching credential once they have completed all Portfolio documentation and met Portfolio program requirements. Once a candidate has completed this program requirement, they must complete two forms: Request for Professional Teacher Credential Recommendation Form and Induction Evidence Affidavit demonstrating that the teaching portfolio submitted is by the candidate teacher. These forms are submitted to the Director of Human Resources, who signs them for approval and then provided to the credential analyst to recommend to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing 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 Program Standards 1 and 2 are Met, Program Standard 4 is Met with Concerns, and Program Standards 3, 5 and 6 are Not Met.

Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System – Not Met

There is no evidence to verify that the Individualized Learning Plan provides the road map for candidates' Induction work during their time in the program, nor required guidance on the ILP from program staff. There are no defined and measurable outcomes for the candidate in the ILP goals, nor planned opportunities to reflect on progress and modify the ILP as needed. Within the ILP, there are no professional learning and support opportunities that are identified for

each candidate to practice and refine effective teaching practices. The program leaders do not have access to Induction candidate documents until they are turned in, and thus cannot assist the candidate and the mentor with assuring the availability of resources necessary to accomplish the ILP. There is inconsistent evidence that the program ensures dedicated time for observations of colleagues and peers by the candidate.

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

There is inconsistent evidence that the Teacher Induction Program provide mentors with guidance and clear expectations on providing support for candidates in accordance with the ILP, facilitation of candidate growth and development through modeling, guided reflection on practice, and feedback on classroom instruction, connecting candidates with available resources to support their professional growth and accomplishment of the ILP, and periodic review of the ILP with candidates to make adjustments as needed.

Although the Teacher Induction Program provides mentor training, there is insufficient evidence that the program provides ongoing training and support for mentors in the areas of goal-setting, use of appropriate mentoring instruments, and best practices in adult learning.

Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation – Not Met

There is no evidence to verify that the Teacher Induction Program assesses candidate progress towards the mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession in order to support the recommendation for the clear credential, nor are learning and professional growth goals within the Individualized Learning Plan. While candidates complete the ILP document and create goals, there is no evidence of the candidate’s successful completion of the activities outlined within the ILP.

Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services – Not Met

There is no evidence to verify that the Teacher Induction Program has an established system in place to regularly assess the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates. There is no evidence that program leadership provides required formative feedback to mentors on their work nor is there evidence of clear procedures in place for the reassignment of mentors. Although all stakeholders are positive about the Teacher Induction Program, there is no evidence to verify that the program provides a coherent overall system of support through the collaboration, communication and coordination between candidates, mentors, school and district administrators, and all members of the Induction system.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

As a program sponsor, Pasadena Unified School District provides a Teacher Induction Program which is a job-embedded program that provides wrap-around support to the district’s beginning teachers. The intentionality of the district to diversify the educator workforce is evidenced by the ongoing partnerships with multiple residency programs that support both the recruitment and retention of teachers from diverse backgrounds. Beyond recruitment efforts, candidates, coaches, and site and district administrators all commented on the positive relationship they experience with the program leader. Furthermore, groups identified the program leader as also having excellent communication skills and program expertise, which was seen as crucial to program operations. Because of these skills and practices, the program leader was clearly seen as central to this program’s success.

In contrast to the relationships, there was a paucity of evidence provided regarding structure and expectant resources. There was no evidence that the institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for the teacher induction program.

Interview groups could not provide comment or evidence at the unit level of program organization, including data collection and analysis. While the human commitment to the teacher induction program was evident, the site visit team found multiple sources of evidence that showed systemic operations for the program were less complete. Processes were in place yet, were not supported with written process statements nor were there handbooks or manuals for candidates or mentors. The program is heavily reliant on an individual rather than functioning, articulated systems.

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.	Inconsistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Not Evidenced

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.	Not Evidenced
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.	Inconsistently
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.	Inconsistently
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.	Inconsistent
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: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Personnel within the Human Resource department are involved with the identification, advisement, onboarding and credential recommendation processes for the teacher induction program. This Unit Leadership Chief Human Resources Officer has full responsibility and authority to address the needs of the educator preparation program.

During interviews, district leadership and education unit leadership were able to articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning, and this vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted

standards and curricular frameworks. However, there is no evidence of the articulation of this vision.

Reviewers could not confirm that the institution involves faculty and instructional personnel in the collaboration and decision making for the educator preparation program. Through document review and interviews conducted during the site visit, reviewers found no evidence that the faculty and instructional personnel, such as program mentors or advisory board members systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, colleges and university units, and the broader educational community toward improving educator preparation.

While documents and interviews confirmed that the unit leadership has the authority to address the needs of the preparation program, the required institutional support does not currently provide for sufficient human resources. The inclusion of relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and governance of the program is not currently evident in the Pasadena USD Induction program. There have been initial steps in forming an advisory board to address program coordination and enact data-based decision making for the educator preparation program. The composition of the advisory board and areas of focus are not yet clear, given that there are no minutes or agendas to date. While a group interview included those who were identified as members of the advisory group, the members confirmed that they had not met this year; could not recall meeting last year; and were not able to provide evidence of agenda topics. Therefore, reviewers were unable to find evidence of “ongoing” or active involvement.

The site visit team reviewed written evidence of the requisite qualifications for faculty and other instructional personnel and found no evidence that the program regularly assesses the quality of service provided by the coaches, nor evidence that coaches received formative feedback on their work. Evidence for these areas was also not found during interviews. In addition, there was no evidence that the unit monitors the credential recommendation process.

Reviewers found recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring of faculty who represent and support diversity. While qualified persons are hired based on employment criteria, there was no evidence of a systematic evaluation process for the determination of retainment. Due to the lack of feedback to both mentors and professional development providers it could not be confirmed that these efforts support excellence.

Rationale for the Finding

Evidence indicates that Pasadena Unified School District’s infrastructure lacks requisite elements of the Common Standard. Specifically, there was no evidence that:

- The institution involves faculty, instructional personnel and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making;

- The faculty and instructional personnel, systematically collaborate with the broader educational community;
- The advisory board has met to provide decision making for the program;
- The retention of mentors is based on qualifications (given that mentors are not assessed once assigned);
- The unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Furthermore, there was inconsistent evidence that:

- The institution and education unit articulate a research-based vision;
- The institution provides the unit with sufficient human resources for the effective operation (given the lack of replacement of the induction coordinator position);
- The institution retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development

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.	Inconsistent
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Inconsistent
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 with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Rationale for the Finding

Evidence indicates that Pasadena Unified lacks requisite portions of the four elements of the Common Standard. Specifically, there was inconsistent evidence that:

- The institution’s advice to candidates assists in the retention of candidates in the profession
- Appropriate information is clearly identified and accessible

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.	Inconsistent
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.	Consistently
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.	Not Evident
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Inconsistent

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 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

Reviewed documents and interviews of educational partners presented evidence that the program has a sequence of coursework and experiences in place for candidates to develop skills needed to educate and support students. One example of this is the summer training offering curriculum and frameworks. In addition, candidates work with the professional development providers to “lay groundwork and consistency and give further support in their work” for curriculum alignment. The program offers a course of study to support candidate growth which is integrated into fieldwork and clinical practice.

PUSD has created a mentor teacher's roles and responsibility document to share the criteria needed to apply to be a mentor in their induction program. Mentors meet on a monthly basis for professional development focused around evidenced based mentoring, including work from *The Art of Coaching* and *Coaching for Equity*, Elena Aguilar, as well as work from Jim Knight and Paul Bambrick. Reviewed documents provided evidence of a mentor meeting schedule. During interviews a professional development provider made reference to the solicitation of feedback from mentor events, yet there was no feedback evidence to confirm this statement.

Mentor interviews indicated that the clinical practice/feedback for candidates was/is taking place in school settings that reflect California standards and the diversity of California’s students. There was limited documentation evidence to provide confirmation of who attended or the content of training. There was not sufficient evidence in place to provide a full understanding of how mentors are evaluated in fieldwork and clinical practice. There was no consistent data to support the measurement of effectiveness of implementation and evaluation of fieldwork and clinical practice which is a cause for concern.

Rationale for the Finding

Evidence indicates that Pasadena Unified lacks requisite evidence of the elements of the Common Standard. Specifically, there was no evidence that:

- Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

Further, there is inconsistent evidence that:

- The programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.

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.	Not Evidenced
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.	Not Evidenced
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
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 constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Not Evidenced

Finding on Common Standard 4: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Reviewers find no comprehensive continuous improvement cycle at the unit or program levels. Some data collection efforts were referenced during the Common Standard Review Process, but there was no evidence of the instruments (such as surveys from program candidates and completers and feedback from mentors) nor were processes described for data analysis and resultant decision making. While there is physical evidence of mentor and candidate comments gathered during a meeting, the unit does not have evidence of a system to regularly collect or analyze data to identify program effectiveness and make modifications. Across multiple constituent groups, Interview participants were unable to identify either sources of data, analysis processes nor reporting, or decision making based on the data.

Reviewers recognize Pasadena’s plan to implement an advisory board made up of various educational partners who will analyze data and provide feedback to the unit; however, there is no evidence this board has started to meet at the time of the site visit. During interviews, a future advisory board member shared their eagerness of being involved in the process. Interviews with program leadership and site administrators further affirm that this is an area that they will address moving forward.

Rationale for the Finding

Evidence indicates that Pasadena Unified School District’s Teacher Induction Program lacks all requisite elements of the Common Standard. Specifically, there was no evidence that:

- The education unit has developed and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.
- The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness as outlined in the standard.
- The education unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.
- The education unit systematically uses or analyzes data to make modifications or to communicate with the employer and community partners.

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.	Inconsistent
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.	Inconsistent

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

PUSD induction program prepares candidates to serve as professional personnel by providing them with skills necessary to educate and support all students in their classrooms. In partnership with professional developers, candidates participate in monthly meetings where they are presented with district focused themes and frameworks to support their growth. 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. However, this ongoing training and assessment of candidates is based on work and that includes questions and responses within the portfolio, not on Commission competency programmatic requirements.

Interview responses primarily indicate anecdotal perception data. For example, reviewers heard from candidates that, “The program has done a really good job in supporting us with

great mentors”. An additional comment by a year-two candidate stated that the program leadership “helped guide me to create the right type of ILP questions and made me feel comfortable” Interviews with a variety of educational partners expressed that they know that they are making an impact but they were not able to cite or provide data based processes or evaluative measures to support their claim.

Program level quantitative data is found within the ADS completer surveys. When responding to the question, “Overall, how effective was your induction program at helping you develop the skills, habits, or tools you needed to grow your teaching practice?” 85.7% to 87.5 % responded that the program was either effective or very effective.

Rationale for the Finding

Uniform and consistent evidence from the Pasadena Unified School District was not present in the following areas:

- That the assessments used indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards
- That the unit and its programs evaluate the impact on candidate learning.