

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

Monterey County Office of Education

Professional Services Division

October 2023

Overview of this Report

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

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Clear Administrative Services Credential	5	1	1	3
Teacher Induction	6	1	4	1

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Documentation and Evidence
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: Monterey County Office of Education

Dates of Visit: October 10-12, 2023

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
Date: April 2016 Link to team report	Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Probationary 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, completers, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit’s operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All preconditions are aligned with the exception of precondition 5 of the Teacher Induction program which is **not met**.

Program Standards

Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC) program standard 5 was met, program standard 1 was met with concerns, and program standards 2, 3, and 4 were **not met**.

Teacher Induction Program (TIP) standard 3 was met, program standards 1, 2, 4 and 5 were met with concerns and program standard 6 was **not met**.

Common Standards

Common Standard 3 was met with concerns and Common Standards 1, 2, 4, and 5 were **not met**.

Overall Recommendation

The overall recommendation for the Monterey County Office of Education is **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**, based upon the findings of one Common Standard as met with concerns and four Common Standards as not met; one program standard met, one program standard met with concerns, and four program standards not met for the Clear Administrative Services Credential program; and one program standards met, four program standards met with concerns and one program standards not met for the Teacher Induction Credential program.

The evidence from the visit verified a program for induction candidates in the Clear Administrative Services Credential and Teacher Induction programs not aligned to current program standards which were adopted in 2016 for both the Teacher Induction and Clear Administrative Services Credential programs.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

1. By November 6, 2023, the program provides systemic evidence of compliance with the Induction Program precondition 5 that the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) developed and implemented by the candidate in collaboration with their mentor is not used for evaluative purposes.
2. Within one year, the program provides evidence that they have fully transitioned to the 2016 Induction Program Standards for Teacher Induction and the 2016 Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC).
3. Within one year, the institution provide evidence that it:
 - a. has developed and articulated a research-based vision of teaching and learning that is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. (CS 1)
 - b. actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituents in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. (CS 1)
 - c. ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community. (CS 1)
 - d. employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to provide professional development and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. (CS 1)
 - e. establishes a credential recommendation process that ensures candidates recommended for the credential have met all requirements. (CS 1)
4. Within one year, the institution provide evidence that it
 - a. applies clearly defined criteria for acceptance into programs prior to candidates' participation in the program. (CS 2 – CASC)
 - b. uses evidence aligned to competency and performance expectations to guide candidate advisement and support efforts. (CS 2)
 - c. has and uses a clearly defined process to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies. (CS 2)
5. Within one year, the institution provide evidence that
 - a. site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. (CS 3)
 - b. demonstrates that programs are effectively evaluating field work and clinical practice. (CS 3)
6. Within one year, the institution provide evidence
 - a. of a comprehensive continuous improvement process that includes multiple sources of data at both the unit level and within each of the programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings. (CS 4)

- b. that it assesses the effectiveness of the programs related to fieldwork and clinical practice and support services for candidates based upon regular and systematic data collection and analysis. (CS 4)
 - c. that it ensures that feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of preparation is included. (CS 4)
7. Within one year, the institution provide evidence that
- a. it ensures that candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support students with assessments that indicate whether they meet Commission adopted competency requirements. (CS 5, CASC, Teacher Induction)
 - b. The unit and its programs are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools. (CS 5)
8. Within one year, for the Clear Administrative Services Credential program, the institution provide evidence that
- a. it ensures that professional learning employs competency indicators that support a recommendation for the clear credential.
 - b. it ensures that assessment of candidate competence is grounded in the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) proficiencies.
 - c. it collaborates formally with education organizations through partnership agreements to establish a professional education community structure that facilitates and supports induction activities.
 - d. each partner’s contributions to the design and implementation of candidate preparation and certification are outlined through mutual contract or agreements.
 - e. it establishes regular communication with partners to ensure that each candidate builds a coherent individualized learning program.
 - f. it identifies the reporting relationships between personnel in educator preparation programs.
 - g. it assesses the quality of professional learning offerings using criteria that includes participant feedback and direct observation.
 - h. its program evaluation includes multiple measures.
 - i. formative feedback that program leaders provide to professional learning providers.
 - j. the use of a well-defined criteria that is used to select, prepare, assign, support and supervise coaches.
 - k. implements effective training for coaches at all sites.
 - l. provides ongoing support for individual coaching challenges and reflection on coaching practice.
 - m. has clear procedures that are in place for the reassignment of coaches.
 - n. the program is regularly assessing the quality of services provided by coaches to candidates using criteria identified in the standard.
 - o. induction program leaders provide formative feedback to coaches.
 - p. an initial assessment, on-going formative assessment, benchmark and summative assessments are components of the induction program.

- q. the candidate's performance goals consider both employer priorities and individual job responsibilities.
 - r. the program provides a minimum of forty hours of job-embedded coaching activities to support the development of leadership competencies.
 - s. candidates are able to select (not require) professional development offerings or opportunities that align with their goals as outlined in their IIP.
 - t. the professional development provided aligns to the CPSELs.
 - u. assessments are developed to measure candidate competence and performance.
 - v. multiple measures are used to inform the initial assessment.
 - w. the formative assessment that is used measures the candidate's progress towards mastery of the CPSELs.
 - x. use of a benchmark assessment conducted by the program midway through the program that evaluates the candidate's progress towards demonstration of competencies.
 - y. the program determines a candidate's level of competence that merits possession of a Clear Administrative Credential.
 - z. the program has a procedure for candidates to repeat portions of the program, as needed.
9. Within one year, for the Teacher Induction program, the institution provide evidence that
- a. a robust mentoring system that supports candidate work to meet the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) is in effect.
 - b. the program articulates the Plan, Teach, Reflect and Apply cycle that is used as the basis for the mentor work for effective implementation that allows the candidate to demonstrate growth in the CSTP.
 - c. the development of the Individualized Learning Plan is driven by candidate needs.
 - d. ongoing training and support for mentors is provided that includes coaching and mentoring, goal setting, use of appropriate mentoring instruments, reflection on mentoring practice and program processes designed to support candidate growth and effectiveness in the CSTP.
 - e. the program is assessing candidate progress towards mastery of the CSTP.
 - f. the program is providing formative feedback to mentors on their work as individuals.
 - g. the program is providing 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.
10. Provide quarterly written documentation to the Commission consultant documenting all actions to address the stipulations above.
11. Within one year, the institution will host a focused revisit to verify required changes have been made in the program design and implementation aligned to the Common and Program Standards for both educator preparation programs offered.

12. Until all stipulations have been removed, Monterey County Office of Education is not permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

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

**Clear Administrative Credential Program
Teacher Induction Program**

In addition, staff recommends that:

- Monterey County Office of Education must submit within 10 days of COA action its plans and policy changes to ensure that Precondition 5 will be implemented in the Teacher Induction program.
- Monterey County Office of Education will notify all candidates in all credential programs in writing of its accreditation status.
- Monterey County Office of Education continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Amanda Baird
Orange County Department of Education

Programs Reviewers:

Kitty Fortner
CSU Dominguez Hills

Common Standards:

Christina Mendez
Los Angeles Unified School District

Lisa Gault
Sutter County Superintendent of Schools

Staff to the Visit:

Sarah Solari Colombini
Stephanie Morgado
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Course Syllabi
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website

Individual Induction Plans
Candidate Files
Individual Learning Plans
Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Precondition Responses
Accreditation Data Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

Constituencies	TOTAL
Candidates	47
Completers	16
Employers	6
Institutional Administration	3
Program Coordinators	6
Mentors/Coaches	19
Program Advisors	7
Credential Analysts and Staff	4
Professional Development Providers	5
Community Partners	2
TOTAL	115

Note: Only the actual number of individuals interviewed are included in this chart.

Background Information

Monterey County is a region of great demographic, economic, and cultural diversity and spans 3,300 square miles with Santa Cruz County to its north and San Luis Obispo County to the south. The Monterey County Office of Education was established over 150 years ago and provides resources to 74,700 students and over 11,000 school staff members in 135 schools inclusive of 24 school districts and eight charter schools countywide. The Monterey County Office of Education is located in Salinas, which is the largest city in Monterey County. Of the students in Monterey County, 36.7% are English Learners, 75.5% are socioeconomically disadvantaged, 12% are student with disabilities, 11.2% are homeless youth, and 4% are migrant education students. When examining achievement data, 39.7% of students in Monterey County meet or exceed state standards for English Language Arts and 27.4% meet or exceed standards for Math while 84.5% graduate with a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Education Unit

The Monterey County Office of Education (MCOE) offers a Clear Administrative Services Credential Program and a Teacher Induction program. Both programs are housed in the Educational Services Division of the county office which is led by an Assistant Superintendent. Each induction program has its own leader who is responsible for the daily administration of the program. The Teacher Induction Program (TIP) serves over 130 candidates each year at the 24 districts served by MCOE and the Administrator Induction Program (AIP) serves around 25 candidates each year, however in the current year (2023-24), there are 56 candidates. For the TIP only, there are program advisors at each of the larger districts who serve as a liaison between program leadership at MCOE and the candidates at the school district.

Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2022-23)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2023-24)
Clear Administrative Services Credential	24	56
Teacher Induction Program	79	130

The Visit

This site visit was conducted virtually. Institutional and program constituencies were interviewed via technology. The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols with the exception of the following:

- Incomplete documents and evidence provided on the website for team review on the CASC program addendum prior to the visit.
- Limited number of candidates and mentors for the Teacher Induction program available for interviews to provide adequate representation for the districts served by Monterey County Office of Education.
- Lack of feedback from stakeholder groups and partners outside of the county office.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met with the exception of the following:

Teacher Induction Precondition 5 - The team finds that candidates' work with the mentors related to the implementation of the Individual Learning Plan is shared with the school board in at least one of the local educational agencies that is served by the Monterey County Office of Education.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Clear Administrative Services Credential

Program Design

The Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC) program at the Monterey County Office of Education (MCOE) is known as Administrative Induction Program (AIP). According to the AIP handbook (2022-2023), the program's mission is to build administrative leadership capacity through coaching support, professional development, and technical assistance. However, interviews with program personnel, candidates, completers, and coaches do not confirm the distribution or use of the program handbook resulting in the inability to verify that constituents involved with the program understood or implemented information provided in the handbook. The program design aligns with the mission in that during the two-year job-embedded program candidates are placed with a coach who provides technical assistance and individualized coaching focused on building the candidates' administrative leadership capacity. A review of documentation and interviews with program personnel, candidates, and completers indicated that the program is designed for full-time administrators in the early stages of their careers who possess a Preliminary Administrative Credential and have been in their position for less than one year. Interviews with organizational leadership and a review of documents confirmed that the program is primarily coaching-based. Interviews with the superintendents, program leadership, and credential analyst indicated that the program director has been in the position for four years and during that time has created processes that they feel have benefited the program. Candidates, coaches, and trainers all confirm that the program director is supportive and responsive to their needs.

There was no evidence presented that identified the theory and research that the program is based on from the interviews or review of documents. The design of the program allows for enrollment within one year of starting an initial administrative position. Administrative assistants reported that interested persons are recommended by candidates' district human resources departments upon hire, receive a flier from the AIP at their place of employment, or get information by word of mouth. The interested person will complete a Candidate Information Form (CIF) on the Order Management System (OMS) which is "a questionnaire completed by the candidate in the context of school, district, or county office (depending on location of administrative position)" (Handbook 2023). This form registers the candidate for the AIP orientation, which is considered the first meeting of the cohort. This process was confirmed

by the program leadership in interviews. Additionally, program leadership confirmed that there was no formal email about acceptance/admittance into the program. All who complete the Candidate Information Form are automatically considered AIP candidates. Required eligibility documents are discussed during the first orientation meeting, and the eligibility documents are collected at the second meeting with the candidate's coach. At this meeting, if a participant does not meet eligibility requirements, program leadership will meet with them and refund their tuition. This practice does not align with the "Phase 1 Admissions Requirements" process found in the AIP Handbook (2022-2023).

Professional learning is offered through formal and informal partnerships and all candidates are mandated to engage in the same eight professional development sessions. Interviews with trainers verified that these professional development sessions are California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL)-focused and designed to train candidates and help them demonstrate their leadership ability to:

- Facilitate a shared vision of learning
- Build and sustain a positive school culture focused on teaching and learning
- Ensure a safe and effective learning environment
- Create culturally proficient and responsive schools
- Develop professional transformative leadership capacity
- Demonstrate the connection of school success to a larger context

Interviews with program leadership, coaches, and candidates indicated that these sessions are connected to the CPSEs and support the candidates in developing skills related to the CPSEs. However, in review of the candidate reflection logs which are completed after each professional development session, and the course syllabus which has a description of each professional development session, there is no evidence that the CPSEs are connected to professional development sessions. Interviews with the program director, completers, candidates, and coaches indicated informal partnerships were established with the districts where candidates are working. However, no documentation of evidence was available for review such as MOUs with districts. There was no evidence found to indicate that AIP maintained communication on a regular basis with community partners. AIP provides a variety of professional development opportunities for candidates to choose to go to that can enhance and support their leadership growth. Through interviews with the director, completers, and candidates, it was reported that AIP completers have free lifetime access to the professional development offerings.

A review of the organizational chart and AIP Handbook (2022, 2023) verified individuals responsible for the program and key personnel, but there was no documentation that provided evidence of the reporting relationship. The program leadership shared during the interview process that in addition to the 7 other programs that they managed, the key responsibilities for AIP include admission, advisement, participant support and assessment, coach preparation, and program evaluation. However, there was no evidence of written processes and procedures for these responsibilities. The model that AIP uses for the individualization of professional learning is through the coaching process. AIP candidates and coaches meet but there was no

documented evidence that individualization includes employer, partner, and high-quality professional learning approved by the provider. There was no evidence that the program regularly assesses the quality of their professional learning offerings except by AIP candidate reflection assignments which are completed at the end of each mandated professional learning opportunity. Professional learning providers stated during their interviews that they do not have an opportunity to view candidates' reflections on the session. Additionally, from the interviews with the program leadership and the professional development trainers, it was stated that no direct observation of offerings was completed, and that the program does not provide formative feedback to professional learning providers on their work.

While the center of the AIP is the administrator candidate, the coach is a critical component, committed to ensuring highly personalized coaching for the AIP candidate. Their support to candidates includes guiding as to which CPSEL elements to focus on based on the candidate's self-assessment and need, and support for individual goal setting and leadership task selection. These activities are done collaboratively and facilitate building trust and rapport between the candidate and coach leading to deep reflection and conversations around best practices in educational leadership. AIP candidates and completers who were interviewed spoke very favorably about their coaching experience, stating they valued the experience of the coach, that their coach had no other agenda than to support their role as a leader, and the work is relevant and applicable. AIP candidates and completers expressed the value they found in having an expert administrative coach guide their practice for their first two years, and many completers stated that they had maintained the relationship with their coach after completion of the program and that it was very beneficial.

Interviews with program leadership, coaches, and candidates reported that the assignment of coaches to candidates based on areas of expertise has resulted in strong bonds and the coaching relationship is very positive. The review of documents provided no evidence of well-defined criteria for the selection, preparation, support, and supervision of coaches. The coaches all stated that they were recruited by program leadership because of the expertise that they possessed. There was no documented evidence indicating requirements for the position, initial training materials, support, or assessment materials. The interviews of the coaches and program leadership reported that little to no initial training took place. Per Standard 5, initial training should include the development of knowledge and skills of coaching, goal setting, use of appropriate coaching instruments, and processes of formative and summative assessment designed to support candidate growth in the leadership competencies. Coaches are strongly encouraged to attend AIP professional training to refine coaching skills and engage in ongoing professional learning, research, and policy changes. This is not mandatory, and some coaches have participated in the training and spoke highly of the benefits. According to interviews, there have been no individual coaching challenges identified, and no need for one-on-one personal support for any coach. It was stated, "All of our coaches have been here for 10 or more years, and they know how to coach." However, interviews with coaches included two coaches hired within the past two years, and one coach hired within the past four months. The program provided no documented evidence of any program-initiated measurements of the coaching practice. Interviews with the coaches indicated that opportunities for networking took

place at coach meetings. There was no documented evidence of a defined criteria for matching the coach and candidate. However, during the interviews with coaches, completers, and candidates it was shared that they believe there are a variety of components that are used to assign coaches like proximity, expertise, and familiarity with a particular district. There was no evidence of clear procedures in place for the reassignment of coaches if the candidate/coach pairing was not effective. There was documented evidence of AIP candidate feedback to the coaches, however, there was no documented evidence of the use of the feedback or any other regular assessment of the quality of services provided by the coaches. There was no evidence that the induction program leaders provided formative feedback to coaches on their work.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The “Completion Checklist” serves as the foundational document to monitor candidates’ completion of program assignments, including tracking coaching, professional learning, and the Individual Induction Plan (IIP). Program leadership, candidates, and coaches confirm that the checklist is central to coaching meetings and the AIP’s documentation to recommend candidates for their clear credentials. There is no evidence of certified demonstration of candidate proficiency for the requirements listed on the “Completion Checklist” to meet the areas of leadership articulated in Standard 5. As part of the checklist, candidates use the Individual Induction Plan (IIP) to develop their annual professional goals. The program provides opportunities for candidates to collaborate with their coaches to develop an annual IIP that considers individual job responsibilities.

The candidates’ required form, “Information on the Candidate submitted by Immediate Supervisor” collects employer feedback, however, there is no evidence that this form or any other process ensures that the IIP considers employer priorities. Program leadership, coaches, and candidates shared that all six CPSELs are met across both years of induction. However, in the review of program completer materials provided in individual digital folders, there is no evidence that all cleared candidates have documentation confirming that all six of the performance expectations were met. Conflicting information from coaches and program personnel shows that some candidates are expected to complete all six CPSELs each year, while other candidates complete three or four each year. Program leadership was not able to confirm why, and the program has no evidence of coaching training to calibrate the IIP’s expectations around CPSEL standards.

Candidates, completers, and coaches shared that the IIP is reviewed at each coaching session, however, there is no evidence provided to demonstrate the expectation of the use of the IIP as an on-going assessment that is cyclical in nature. Candidates complete a self-assessment of the CPSELs three times per year. There is no evidence showing how the self-assessment is used by the coaches or program. There is no evidence to verify defined and measurable outcomes for the candidate in the IIP goals or self-assessment to meet these goals, nor planned opportunities to reflect on progress and modify the IIP as needed. There is evidence of summative reflection provided at the end-of-program colloquium presentation grounded in the six CPSELs, however, there is no evidence of ongoing formative assessment and feedback beyond informal conversations with coaches grounded in the CPSELs. Interviews with program personnel, coaches, and candidates confirmed that there are no rubrics or methods to assess candidates’

competencies to ensure all six CSPEs are met, stating that coaches only “check off that they have had conversations that it’s done.”

The program coaches are expected to meet with candidates every two weeks, with some flexibility based on the candidate’s work schedule. There is no documented evidence of an implemented research-based coaching model, with a sound rationale. Coaches shared that program leadership “lets us do our own thing,” and shared that they are “well calibrated.” However, there is no documented evidence that coaches attend coaching calibration sessions. Candidates and coaches share that the coaching process is individualized for each candidate’s needs. Several candidates expressed that the coaching part of the program has been the “most helpful,” as coaches have been “flexible,” and can rely on them for “emotional support.” However, there is no clearly documented evidence that the coaching sessions have a common focus of developing leadership competency. Candidates and coaches confirm meeting regularly and are flexible throughout the two years, however, there is no evidence in the provided coaching logs or coaching invoices to confirm that a minimum of 40 hours is met annually. Outside of candidate and coach interviews, there is no evidence documenting that the coaching process is one that requires confidential collaboration between coaches and candidates. With the exception of COVID-impacted years, there is no clearly documented evidence that indicates coaching is enhanced with technology supports, and that sessions are primarily in person and at the site. Additionally, there is no documented evidence of coaches observing or gathering data regarding the learning, impact, and leadership performance of their candidates.

The program includes eight required professional development opportunities led by AIP trainers and ten additional hours of self-selected professional development for an annual total of 40 hours. There is no evidence that differentiated learning opportunities are provided to support a candidate’s IIP, as the required sessions are not aligned to the CASC program standards that allow candidates to select offerings based on individualized needs. As of the 2023-24 year, the program has updated the “Completion Checklist” to begin tracking the additional and personalized ten hours of professional development outside of the AIP’s required sessions. There is no evidence that reflection assignments after the required or self-selected professional development sessions require candidates to reflect on their current practice, direct instruction in research-based best practices, modeling, problem-based practice, and opportunities for planning and adaptation to current leadership responsibilities. Program leadership and candidates confirm AIP’s professional development provides opportunities for candidates to develop professional networks that share best practices and challenges and garner collegial support. Candidates and completers shared they appreciate the opportunity to “network and get help from other admin struggling with similar stuff.” Beyond information gathered from the interviews, there is no evidence or documentation to confirm this regularly occurs as part of AIP’s professional development plan.

Assessment of Candidates

Competency and growth of candidates are measured through candidate self-assessment which was reported through interviews with the program leadership, coaches, completers, and candidates as well as in the review of documents. Outside of the candidate self-assessment, the

program has no evidence of the use of assessments to measure candidate competence in the CPSELs. No evidence of assessment tools such as rubrics for the purpose of determining candidate competence were shared. There are opportunities for coaches and candidates to engage in collaborative conversations about the AIP candidates' perceptions of CPSEL growth and development as evidenced during interviews with coaches and AIP candidates. The initial self-assessment is designed to measure the candidate's entry-level competence and provide baseline information to determine growth. There was no documented evidence of multiple measures that informed the initial assessment.

Formative assessment is provided by coaches and during the mandated professional development sessions, however, there was no evidence of how the program measures the candidates' progress and performance on the CPSELs during the formative assessment. AIP candidates gather evidence through reflection at the end of each professional development session and coaching conversations are placed on a coaching log but there is no documentation of measurement of the candidates' learning or leadership impact grounded in the CPSELs. When reviewing the completed reflection logs from the professional development session, there was no evidence of the collection of information about CPSELs. In the review of the coaching logs, there was no evidence of the collection of information about the CPSELs. There was no evidence of multiple measures used in a benchmark assessment. There is no evidence of a summative assessment given by the program or the coaches. The program uses a checklist that identifies that the candidate has completed all items on the checklist as a summative measure. It is based on the completion of activities/items, but not around observed and documented evidence. It is not clear that there are competency expectations, and no documentation was reviewed that supported the existence of measurement tools for competency. Once an AIP candidate completes the program requirements which includes the uploading of Forms 1-13 from the checklist, coaches verify that all forms on the checklist are complete and uploaded. In review of the completers uploaded file there was no evidence that this process was clearly understood as there were several files in the review process that had incomplete, empty, and missing forms. According to interviews and the review of documentation, the coach signs off that AIP candidates have completed the checklist, and all items are uploaded for the program leadership who writes the letter of recommendation for the candidate along with the next steps in the process to apply for their application with the credential analyst. Program leadership reported that reliance on the coaches to complete the checklist with the candidates is a critical component as it determines that a candidate is ready for recommendation. The Certificate of Completion is awarded once the checklist is submitted and signed by the candidate and the coach. The credential analyst waits for the candidate to contact them and then they work with the candidate to apply for the credential. The credential analyst reported that they did not receive a list or any other form of confirmation from the AIP that candidates have completed all program requirements. They receive from the candidate the AIP Certificate of Completion as evidence for recommendation.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers,

coaches and program leadership, the team determined the following findings for the Clear Administrative Services Credential program:

Standard 1: Program Design and Rationale – Met with Concerns

Although the program provides embedded coaching support, a review of program documentation, evidence, and interviews did not provide evidence of the theory and research on which the program is based. In addition, candidates are required to complete specific professional development which may not be related to the candidate’s Individual Induction Plan. Program documentation, evidence and interviews led the team to the conclusion that the professional learning offered does not employ competency indicators that support a recommendation for the clear credential. Outside of a candidate’s self-assessment and a checklist of competencies, there are no performance measures used to demonstrate growth and competence in the CPSEs. While the Individual Induction Plan (IIP) includes the competencies, there is no measurement of competence or proficiency.

Standard 2: Program Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination – Not Met

After a review of program documents, evidence, and interviews the team determined that there is no formal collaboration with education organizations that facilitates and supports induction activities. In addition, the existing mutual contracts or agreements with partners do not outline each partner’s contribution to the design and implementation of candidate preparation and certification. Interview data confirmed that there is informal communication, however there is no evidence that the CASC program maintains communication on a regular basis with partners to ensure that each candidate builds a coherent individualized induction plan. Documentation provided verified the individuals responsible for program coordination, but it is not clear what the reporting relationship is between personnel. There was a lack of evidence that program coordination includes participant assessment, coach preparation, and program evaluation. The program does not directly observe professional learning offerings and use candidate reflection as feedback about the professional learning opportunities. There is no evidence that program leaders provide formative feedback to professional learning providers on their work.

Standard 3: Selection and Training of Coaches – Not Met

No evidence was provided that could confirm that there are well-defined criteria to select, prepare, support, and supervise coaches. Program documentation included an orientation power point, but it could not be confirmed that all coaches were provided with training to support candidate growth in the leadership competencies and implementation of the components of the program. There is a lack of evidence that the program provides reflection on coaching practice. The team could not find evidence to show that the program matches the candidate with a coach according to defined criteria. There was no evidence of clear procedures for the reassignment of coaches if the candidate/coach pairing is not effective. While evidence is gathered from the participants at the end of their induction experience, there is no evidence of direct observation of coaching, growth of candidates on established criteria and compliance with program requirements. Formative feedback is not provided from induction program leaders to the coaches on their work.

Standard 4: Professional Learning – Not Met

While the induction program provided individualized coaching, there is no evidence that an assessment of skills outside of the candidate's self-assessment is conducted. The components of the induction experience do not include benchmark or summative assessments. While the candidates and coaches collaboratively develop IIPs, it is not clear how there is consideration for employer responsibilities and individual job responsibilities. There is a lack of evidence that the program implements a research-based coaching model with a sound rationale. Interview data identified that coaching practice was inconsistent, and no documentation of the coaching model could be found. While interviews with program constituents confirmed that a minimum of forty hours of job embedded coaching activities to support the development of leadership competencies, there was a lack of program documentation and evidence to verify that a minimum of forty hours. In addition, the program provides professional development offerings but requires candidates to participate in certain offerings which are not aligned to the CASC program standards that allow for candidates to select offerings based on individualized need. Interviews with constituents provide evidence that the professional development is designed to support the application and demonstration of program competency outcomes and the attainment of IIP goals but the reflections that candidates complete after participation in a professional learning opportunity do not address the CPSELs and the syllabi provided for the professional development does not include evidence of CPSELs.

With respect to assessment, there is no evidence that the program uses assessments to measure candidate competence beyond the candidates' self-assessments. No assessment tools to measure leadership performance and to determine candidate competence were evidenced. Clear information was not provided to show that data is gathered by the coach, the candidate, and the program to conduct assessments. Multiple measures are not used to develop the initial assessment. There is no evidence that the program measures a candidate's progress and performance on the CPSELs. Evidence is gathered and discussions with coaches occur but there is no evidence of documentation of the candidate learning and leadership impact. There is a lack of evidence that the formative assessment used includes an analysis of leadership performance. There is no evidence of a benchmark assessment with a measurement that is reviewed and recorded by the program. While the program uses a checklist to verify completion, there is no evidence that shows that the program determines that each candidate has reached a level of competence meriting possession of a Clear Administrative Services Credential. There is no evidence of a procedure for candidates to repeat portions of the program, as needed. Competency expectations for performance have not been identified.

Standard 5: California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders – Met

Teacher Induction Program

Program Design

The Monterey County Office of Education (MCOE) Teacher Induction Program (TIP) is a two-year, job-embedded system of mentoring. The vision of the TIP program is to build teacher pedagogy and capacity through coaching support, professional development, and job-embedded practice to positively impact teacher and student success. The program is overseen by the Educational Administrator, new to the position in 2022, under the direction of the Director of Leadership and School Services. In addition to certificated management members, MCOE TIP has a full-time administrative assistant who provides clerical and budgetary support for the program.

With assistance from district representatives, known as program advisors, the TIP administrator supports the participating teachers (PT) and mentors, referred to as Induction Coaches (IC). As shared by the administrator and confirmed in multiple interviews, MCOE TIP primarily communicates with PTs and ICs via email, or the Canvas platform used by program participants. In addition, ICs can receive support at the bi-monthly office hours offered by the Educational Administrator. Other stakeholders are satisfied with the MCOE TIP communication, as per employer and program advisor interviews. Information gathered from interviews from program advisors included the following statements: “Communication is back and forth; fliers, Professional Development offerings, shared documents in Google Drive. Communication always starts early.” “Everything is so available, and I can always reach out to the program leader.” MCOE TIP meets with program advisors on a quarterly basis to discuss program updates and to conduct status checks to determine how the districts see the impact of the MCOE TIP on their teachers, recommend modification(s), verify colloquium preparation, and build collaborative relationships with the member districts in the county. Following the quarterly meetings, the program advisors disseminate any program updates to their district coaches. Evidence of the topics covered during these trainings is accessible in the presentations shared by the program and was corroborated by the interviews with program advisors. The program advisors verified that they oversee the assignment of the Induction Coaches (IC) with the assistance of both site principals and in some districts, teachers on special assignment (TOSAs). Program documents (MOU, Handbook) state that the districts identify and assign an induction coach to each participating teacher within the first 30 days of the participant enrollment in the program matching the induction coach and participating teacher according to grade levels and/or subject area, as appropriate to the participating teachers’ employment. Program advisors shared that as new teachers are hired, they match the teachers with a mentor as soon as possible.

MCOE TIP mentoring system follows the plan, teach, reflect, apply cycle (PTRA) as a basis for learning and refining pedagogy. The PT assignments, in collaboration with support from their coach, are designed for the teacher to engage in a continuous improvement cycle by selecting an area of focus tied to the California Standards of the Teaching Profession (CSTP), planning a series of lessons and strategies to apply, teaching using the identified standards and strategies, then reflecting on the outcomes to drive next steps.

With the support of the induction coach, PTs develop a series of Individual Learning Plans (ILP) after determining a focus based on growth needs of the CSTPs. There is evidence in the ILP that candidates are encouraged to reference their preliminary program Transition Plan when considering growth needs prior to writing a goal. However, MCOE TIP does not have a system in place for the site administrator to consult on the development of the ILP.

Coaches meet with their PT individually, for a minimum of one hour a week, to provide job-embedded, just-in-time support, along with supporting and advising district policies and procedures. This one-hour requirement is documented on a collaborative log, completed by the coach, and uploaded in the PT's Canvas account monthly. The program expectation of meetings of one hour per week is also provided in the handbook and on MCOE's website in addition to the Induction Coach Agreement/Responsibilities form. One district does require the induction coach to plan for at least 90 minutes per week with the PT as referenced in an induction coach (Pool) document. Interviews with candidates and coaches confirmed that weekly meetings consistently occur, and several candidates mentioned that they meet with their coach daily for just-in-time support. The PT interviews indicated the positive impact the IC support is having for the new teachers, sharing: "My coach has so much experience; she's available; she really helped me achieve the goal that I wanted to."

As outlined in the MOU and TIP Handbook, the program has systems in place that provide guidance and clear expectations for the mentoring experience. However, this system looks different depending on the district. Program documentation and interviews confirmed that there are a variety of ways coaches are selected in MCOE TIP consortium. The program administrator stated that "we share the coach agreement with the districts, and they pair their teachers with coaches. It works nicely because they know who is on their campus and who is compatible." While some districts have an application process in selecting coaches, other coaches shared: "I was selected because I worked with the teacher the previous year and we are in the same grade level; I volunteered as I mentored in another state previously; my district has an application and interview process".

MCOE TIP provides four trainings for coaches every year while some of the districts host their own trainings. Although the trainings offered by MCOE TIP do support individual mentoring challenges and opportunities to engage with peers in professional learning networks, ongoing coaching and mentoring training is not evident. Program leadership agreed that the program does not provide ongoing training specific to coaching and mentoring using appropriate mentoring instruments.

While the induction program has communication systems in place such as ongoing email communication, messages on Canvas, well-defined assignments, bi-weekly office hours, opportunities to participate in trainings as well as professional learning opportunities, there is not substantial evidence 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.

Surveys are completed twice a year by both PTs and ICs. Data is shared with ICs who attend MCOE's spring training, but there is no system in place to provide formative feedback on the quality of the individual coach's work. During a coach interview, one coach shared, "Our inductees give us feedback if we ask for it. We learn from each other. That is part of the feedback." Other coaches agreed with the comment provided by the fellow coach.

Some modifications to program resources have been made based on feedback from surveys as well as other communication. For example, one program advisor shared that, "With the switch from Moodle to Canvas, there were issues with some of the documents. Rather than waiting for the survey, I emailed the administrator and changes were made. The program administrator provides opportunities for program feedback." The program administrator also worked on modifying expectations of a final product to include more universal design for learning (UDL) practices, giving PTs a variety of options in completing certain assignments.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is collaboratively developed at the beginning of induction by the participating teacher (PT) and the induction coach and includes a description of how the PT will work to meet professional growth goals. The ILP is divided into three parts. Part 1 focuses on the context for teaching and learning. PTs review their student groups, school cultures, district policies and procedures, as well as resources they may need. Part 2 focuses on the assessment of teaching. In collaboration with the coach, PTs review their self-rating of the CSTP and are encouraged to add information gained from the candidate's preliminary credential Transition Plan to determine an area of focus for the CSTP, observations (by coach and of colleagues), and inquiry work. Part 3 is the inquiry into teaching and learning. PTs reflect on the success of the goal developed earlier in the year, effective strategies implemented, and on student growth. PTs are also provided a space to record any changes in the PT's growth goal.

Coaches are expected to collaboratively develop the ILP with the PT at the beginning of Induction and revisit the ILP as needed. As shared by program leadership it is suggested that PTs open the ILP during meetings with the coach and discuss the progress as they reflect on strengths and areas of growth. Some participating teachers shared that they send their coach the document to review while others said they open the ILP when it needs to be completed. During coach interviews, it was shared that "There are questions on the form [ILP] that guide us. We ask probing questions to help them [PTs] develop it [ILP]."

Within the ILP, candidates have opportunities to identify and refine effective teaching practices for all students through focused cycles of inquiry. The plan, teach, reflect, apply cycle is woven throughout the ILP. MCOE TIP also provides a menu of optional professional development hosted by MCOE's Education Services Division.

Participating Teachers are required to self-select six modules, or units of study, from a list of options provided by MCOE TIP. At the end of each module, PTs discuss what they learned with their coach and provide a reflection of the impact this work had on their students and teaching. These reflections are submitted and graded in Canvas. Participating Teachers were provided an opportunity to share thoughts of the modules and how the modules apply to the ILP. While one

PT shared that they could take some ideas away from the modules to use in their classroom and enjoyed the session on engaging students, another stated, “I felt the modules were repetitive--we did a lot of work on documents.” During a coach interview it was shared that “the modules and essays are a “daunting task” as my teacher came to California with years of teaching experience”. These professional learning resources are separate from the ILP but can be used in the reflection on the PTs teaching practice if it applies. There is an opportunity within the program design for the coach to play a role in the ILP process.

Coaches shared that they meet weekly and discuss successes and challenges. This was verified by the candidates. There is evidence to indicate that the mentoring process is designed to support each candidate’s practice of reflection on the effectiveness of instruction, analysis of student and other outcomes data, and the use of the data to further inform the repeated cycle of planning and instruction. Candidates are required to plan a series of lessons and collaborate with their coach in planning the lesson, strategies being used, and reflecting on the lesson after delivery in Part 2 of the ILP. Lessons are designed collaboratively prior to the coach observation, which occurs twice a year.

Assessment of Candidates

Listed in the program summary, and verified by program leadership, candidates are required to complete a checklist mid-year and end-of-year showing that all required assignments have been completed. Both the induction coach and the program advisor for each individual teacher signs off on these checklists. The MCOE TIP Leadership reviews the completion of the checklist for each PT, however, they do not review the ILP specifically for evidence of growth on the CSTP. The program does have a document titled “Growth Over Time” in which PTs work with their coach at the beginning and end of each year to discuss the standards and at what level they believe they are working. However, the specific evidence used to measure the growth over time is not documented.

Within the ILP, PTs reflect on successes and challenges over time but based on the coach and program advisor interviews, the program determines the participating teacher’s competence based on completion and scores of assigned tasks, which include six modules provided by MCOE and reflection of those modules.

In regard to the “grading” or “scoring” of assignments, during the program advisor interview it was shared that “there are choices offered by MCOE as to who is doing the grading. You can be the program advisor who does all the grading, or you can have a grader from MCOE. We pay MCOE to grade; it is a smooth and seamless process being in Canvas. Canvas gives me notifications of who didn’t meet a deadline.” If a PT is unable to complete the assignments within the allowed time frame, they can continue to work on their assignments through the summer or retake a partial year course.

At the end of the two-year program (one for Early Completion Option), participating teachers attend a colloquium. It serves as the graduation for the induction program and includes a ceremony at which time each PT receives the documentation needed to apply for their Clear Credential. As referenced in the Colloquium Guidelines, after all requirements for the induction

program have been reviewed and confirmed by the program advisor and MCOE TIP administrator, the PT schedules an appointment with one of MCOE's credential analysts to complete the Commission on Teacher Credentialing paperwork necessary for a clear credential to be issued.

Interviews with the administrative assistants, credential analysts, and program leadership confirmed that the induction program verifies the candidate has completed all program activities and requirements. The credential analysts rely on the PT's verification of program completion in recommending the clear. If the candidate is not satisfied with the recommendation, the program added a written appeal process to the program's handbook for the 2023-24 academic year.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, mentors and program leadership, the team determined the following findings for Teacher Induction:

Standard 1: Program Purpose – Met with Concerns

There is a lack of evidence that there is a consistent system of mentoring, as many of the districts have autonomy and the program has not implemented a common system of mentoring support that helps each candidate work to meet the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

Standard 2: Components of Mentoring Design – Met with Concerns

The program's mentoring design is based upon the plan, teach, reflect and apply cycle. While documentation shows that candidates self-assess using a description of practice and forms show the elements of the CSTP, in interview with candidates, it was not clear that they understood that the ILP is related to their individual professional growth. Instead, the candidates believe that the ILP was to improve student learning.

The ILP has been divided into three parts. Part 1 of the ILP is focused on having the candidate explore their context for teaching and learn more about the students and families represented in their classroom. The second part of the ILP is inquiry based. Candidates are encouraged in the ILP to consider the CSTP standards and elements of focus when writing the goal. A series of lessons are designed around the inquiry. The candidate gathers feedback from the coach, based on observation and conversations about whether the lesson's objective was met and what the next steps will be. These lesson reflections and progress towards the goal within the lessons are documented in the third part of the ILP, however it is unclear if the goal supports evidence of growth in the CSTP.

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

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

There was a lack of evidence that the program provides ongoing training and support for mentors that include coaching and mentoring, goal setting, use of appropriate mentoring instruments, support for individual mentoring challenges, and reflection on mentoring practice.

Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation – Met with Concerns

While the induction program checks for completion, there is no evidence that shows how the induction program assesses the candidate toward mastery of the CSTP.

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

While interviews and documentation confirmed that collective feedback based upon candidate surveys on mentor work across the program is shared with mentors, there is no evidence that program leaders provide individual formative feedback to mentors on their work for the purpose of improving mentoring practice. In addition, there is no evidence that the program provides a coherent overall system of support through collaboration, communication and coordination between candidates, mentors, school and district administrators and all members of the induction system.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Monterey County Office of Education (MCOE) has a consistent theme of support. Candidates feel supported by their mentors, program staff feel supported by the institution and the unit supports the induction programs. In addition, MCOE as an institution is committed to promoting diversity, equity and inclusion throughout the county. An example of this is hosting the *Equity for All* conference. There are four growth opportunities noted by the review team. It is believed that adjustments to program operations will allow for a more cohesive system with both programs. First, it is critical that MCOE establishes a clear process with credential analysts to confirm that only qualified candidates can be recommended for the clear credential. Second, to implement continuous improvement for the educator preparation programs offered at MCOE, leadership needs to establish a system that allows for the collection of multiple sources of evidence, including the feedback from all (candidates, mentors, program advisors, leadership at the various partnering agencies, IHE representatives, etc.) impacted by these specific programs. Third, improvement is needed to consistently implement ongoing mentor training and goals setting processes for all partnering districts so that there is consistent implementation of each program. Finally, to ensure the quality of program services and provide candidates with an experience that meets their individual needs, the TIP and AIP programs must update program requirements to reflect the 2016 teacher induction and 2016 administrative services induction standards to appropriately measure candidate competency.

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.	Not Evidenced
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Inconsistently
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	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.	Consistently

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

Finding on Common Standard 1: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The Monterey County Office of Education (MCOE) Teacher Induction Program (TIP) and Administrator Induction Program (AIP) programs identified a research-based vision of teaching and learning in the evidence submitted on their accreditation website. However, this vision of teaching and learning was not clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. Evidence submitted for individual programs did not match evidence submitted in Common Standards and when constituents in the program were asked about the vision of the program, no consistent theme emerged. Therefore, there is limited evidence to confirm the articulation of the vision within each program. After careful review of the accreditation website, evidence submitted and interview data, there is no evidence to indicate the TIP and AIP programs are implementing the 2016 program standards. Evidence is lacking that the institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. Interviews confirmed the leadership team regularly communicates, however, communication with others appears to be an informal process through isolated conversations. The review team was unable to confirm the involvement of faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the decision making for all preparation programs. The MCOE program was unable to provide evidence that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues. In the evidence provided, a narrative was provided to discuss networks like the Instructional

Leaders Network, the Tri-Counties Human Resources Network and a Steering Committee. However, there was no tangible evidence or confirmation through interviews that these groups were meeting for the purpose of collaborating on the educator preparation programs offered by MCOE. The narrative and artifacts provided as evidence on the accreditation website was incomplete in several places. In addition, during the site review the Advisory Board interviews were canceled due to a lack of participants. It was explained that a lot of change has occurred with partners and a new team has not been established. This could not be confirmed and the community partner that was interviewed informed the team that they have been at a local IHE for eight years and have had representation from MCOE on the advisory boards the institution has for the programs offered at the IHE.

The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of the induction program. District administration confirmed that TIPS and AIP are fixed initiatives within the district budget. The unit leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs. Interviews and document reviews confirmed they make every effort to provide opportunities to increase candidate capacity and further their practice. This was evidenced through employing high quality mentors, making program improvements, and increasing professional development opportunities. County office leaders reported they support the TIP and AIP induction programs through communication, collaboration, and capacity building. Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. During interviews, several groups discussed MCOE's efforts towards the recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce. One example of this is through the annual *Equity for All* conference. With respect to the employment of qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and serve as mentors to candidates, interview data was the only source of evidence available to the team. While there is consistent evidence that shows there is a process for employing and assigning mentors and coaches within the partner districts, there is no evidence to confirm coaches and mentors are retained based on performance feedback or on-going development. In addition, two coaches were recently hired for the AIP however, no evidence was available to confirm qualifications for the two positions. Therefore, the team was not able to verify through documentation that only a qualified individual is providing coaching to a candidate. There is no evidence of a formal hiring process for professional development providers.

The education unit demonstrates inconsistent monitoring of a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. It is the responsibility of the candidate to notify the recommending agency that they are ready to be recommended for a clear teaching credential. It was not evident how the education unit monitors a credential recommendation process as staff in the educator preparation programs were not able to articulate the process that was consistent with the process shared by program leadership.

Rationale for the Finding

Common Standard 1 requires that 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. The team could not find consistent evidence of a research-based foundation to the design of programs, nor a reflection of how that design supports coherence among programs. Program documentation and interviews did not show evidence that the institution actively involves faculty (mentors, coaches, and training providers) and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. Program documentation and interviews did not show evidence that the education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community. The team could not find evidence that the institution employs and retains only qualified persons to supervise field based and clinical experiences. The team could not find evidence either through program documentation or interviews of the qualifications of faculty. It was not evident how the education unit monitors a credential recommendation process as interviews with all involved in the process provided conflicting information.

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.	Inconsistently
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.	Not Evidenced

Finding on Common Standard 2: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

With respect to the recruitment and support of candidates, evidence did not indicate that the education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria. Interviews with personnel indicated that advisors from the local education agencies served by

the MCOE induction programs send a referral form to MCOE and then MCOE staff create an eligibility form. MCOE staff confirms that the prospective candidate has a preliminary credential and then gives the eligibility form to program leadership. The advisor from the referring LEA receives notification about whether a candidate is eligible for the early completion option (ECO). Candidates in the AIP program are referred to MCOE from the human resources department within their employing LEA. A flyer with registration information about the AIP is sent to the referred AIP candidates. If interested in the program, AIP candidates complete the registration and information about the program is sent to the candidate upon registration. Applicants attend an orientation and then meet with their assigned coach. According to interviews, it is the coach who meets with the candidate and determines if the candidate is qualified to participate in the program.

Interviews confirmed that recruitment occurs. It was stated, "In terms of recruitment they hold an annual recruitment fair and then we go there to match the candidates with our needs." 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. As stated in a program leadership interview, "We tend to have more educators that are Hispanic than Black but it is representative of our demographics. We are always trying to recruit teachers. Grow your own."

Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements. The institution provides contact information and program requirements to respective candidates, mentors, program advisors and administrators via their program handbooks, MOUs and meeting materials. During an interview, an employer shared, "MCOE leadership has been really accessible." In candidate interviews, it was stated that, "I have weekly meetings with my coach. Talk about successes, things I need and things I want help with." Another shared, "We meet once a week. I see him everyday. I ask him about my credential and homework. He always helps me." When asked about experiences with the induction program, a participating teacher shared, "If I miss a professional development, the program will provide an alternate assignment. I may get to view a recording of a missed session, or I meet with program mentor or leadership to determine what else I can do."

Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts was not provided. When interviews asked how the institution monitors progress on the Individual Learning Plan (ILP)/ Individual Induction Plan (IIP) and goals, program personnel shared that there isn't a system and that the program relies on mentors/coaches. While interviews with candidates confirmed that they were receiving support for their work from coaches, it was not determined that there is not enough information to verify that the use of the ILP is for a candidate's professional growth. Instead, the candidates and induction coaches are focused on the identification of the lesson objective and goals related to the students in the classroom and not how that extends to the candidate's growth on the CSTP.

Rationale for the Finding

Common Standard 2 requires that the unit accept applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications. With respect to the Clear Administrative Services Credential program, evidence gathered by the team showed that applicants are accepted into the program prior to the submission of required documents that determine whether a candidate is qualified. After candidates attend an orientation where they self-identify whether they meet the admission requirements, they then have an initial meeting with their coach who reviews the candidate’s qualifications and determines whether the candidate is eligible for participation based upon the criteria identified for program admission. In addition, both educator preparation programs monitor completion and progress towards completion of assigned tasks but do not provide the candidates with information about progress in meeting competence of the respective performance expectations. The team was not able to find evidence of a clearly defined process to identify and support candidates who need assistance in meeting competencies (not completion of program requirements). Evidence showed that time extensions were allowed for those candidates who could not complete assigned tasks by the established due dates, but there was not a formal or documented process for supporting candidates struggling to meet competencies.

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.	Inconsistently
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	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

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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.	Inconsistently
For each <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

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. Candidates in the teacher induction program develop an ILP, candidates in the administrator induction program develop an IIP. In interviews with teacher induction candidates, one shared, “With regard to inquiry, we have the ILP Parts 1-3. ILP Part 1 is introduction to the community. The teacher describes their community and the students in their classroom. ILP Part 2 is about planning and lesson planning. ILP 3 is mainly the inquiry project and reflection.” In various stakeholder interviews, both coaches and candidates shared that teacher induction candidates participate in “six modules a year and two professional development opportunities” in addition to completing the three parts of the ILP. Candidates in the administrator induction program meet with their coach to develop their IIP. “ Their coach will ask participants what their areas of responsibilities are and have a conversation about it to match it to the CPSELs. The goal is to cover all CPSELs in two years,” explained a member of MCOE leadership.

Evidence did not indicate that 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. Evidence did not indicate that 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. When asked about a method to ensure candidates meet all six CPSELs, during an MCOE leadership interview the following response was provided, “No, not explicitly stated. Just check off that they have had conversations that it’s done.”

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. The institution prioritizes site-based selection of clinical personnel and supervisor whenever

possible. When asked how they were selected or became a coach, coaches stated during interviews, “I worked closely with the previous admin”; “I was selected because I worked with the teacher a prior year” another reason provided was “I am a former resource teacher and there was a need for special education.”

The institution stated that candidates experience issues of diversity that affect school climate by, “Learning who their students are and selecting students they support (subgroup) such as [students with] special needs or English Learners [and by] completing ILP and learning about school climate,” MCOE leadership shared. Additionally, candidates experience issues of diversity that affect school climate by participating in professional development, “80% of IIP plans include a school climate goal. I do a session in Year 2 and I make sure I hit it well,” stated MCOE leadership. When asked how candidates have experienced issues of diversity that affect school culture, one shared, “I had a teacher help by observing my class and giving me feedback to learn more about my students.” Another candidate stated, “I ask students to bring in examples of diversity into the classroom. We talk about culture- where I come from, my background, where they come from. I documented some of this in the modules where it asks for reflections.”

Artifacts and experiences were limited in demonstrating that site-based supervisors are trained, evaluated, and recognized in a systematic manner. Interviews with coaches indicated, “We [coaches] get together to discuss best ways to help trainees. Our district leads the training.” A coach in a different district shared, “Coaches support each other, they are not really formal meetings.” A third coach reported, “Some districts do not work directly with the county.”

It was not evidenced that all programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice. During a coach interview, coaches stated that they receive feedback mostly, “...from the [candidate] teacher. When she has questions and I offer a suggestion, she’ll send me a picture of her implementing my suggestions, like parent communication, and how it worked.” Another candidate concurred stating, “...usually get feedback from the teacher saying this worked really well in my classroom”. A third candidate shared, “Typically no news from administrator or director is good news. When something is not being completed then you hear from MCOE.”

Rationale for the Finding

Common Standard 3 requires that the unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study grounded in current research on effective practice. There was a lack of evidence that the unit and its programs were grounded in research. Program documentation and information gathered from interviews did not lead the reviewers to a consistent conclusion about a research base that was used across the two educator preparation programs. In addition, evidence gathered via program documentation and interviews showed that the training in supervision, orientation to the role of mentor/coach was inconsistent and that neither program evaluated nor recognized in a systemic manner the role of the mentor/coach. No evidence was provided that evaluation of fieldwork and clinical practice was occurring. Candidates conducted self-assessments but did not use multiple measures. The program did not provide an

assessment of the fieldwork and clinical practice based upon the competencies, instead the program confirmed completion of required components for candidates.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Inconsistently
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	Inconsistently
Both the 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.	Inconsistently
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

Evidence supporting that 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 was lacking. It was shared that, “Based on conversation with administrators, coaches and professional development presenters, things were moved from year 2 to year 1. I brought in experts from the field based on feedback.” When asked how data is collected from districts and how it informs the program, MCOE leadership explained that before the pandemic they were “on it and always had a survey after each session” and now it has changed to reflection logs.

While it was stated during candidate interviews that, “We receive anonymous surveys at midyear and at the end of the year and a Google survey at end of professional development offerings where we tell what we really liked, what we learned from the meeting, or if we have any suggestions for improvements or other modules.” The team could not confirm via evidence on the accreditation website or through artifacts that this occurred for all programs. There was a lack of evidence that 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. Interviews with program trainers indicated that training topics are determined, “based on a conversation” with MCOE leadership. Program trainers stated they are provided with feedback on their professional development by “listening to the conversations” that take place during the trainings as “the level of questions and the follow up tells the experience or

the struggles [the audience] has.” Another trainer “engages audiences to see if the audience is glazed over or needs to make adjustments”.

Evidence supporting both the 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 was missing. In interviews when LEA representatives were asked how the program provides them with data or completion data to make improvements during an interview it was stated that, “We receive data on those that complete. They provide names of completers to us. We have three or four that complete the program.” Another LEA representative explained, “We get numbers of those at risk of not completing the program, so we are able to act on it.”

There was limited evidence supporting that 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 varied between programs. Interviews with LEA members confirmed that there is “frequent communication with MCOE leadership” and that “MCOE shares things with us at the district level and then I pick up the phone call MCOE leadership and we often collaborate and share resources”. Other communication with LEAs from MCOE consists of “reminders and flyers about who is required to attend.” The evidence gathered by the team for continuous improvement all pointed to informal measures that were not captured or documented for analysis by a larger group for the purpose of feedback.

Rationale for the Finding

Common Standard 4 requires a continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs. There was no evidence that there is a comprehensive continuous improvement process that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings. While evidence gathered from interviews confirmed that there were informal measures used to capture stakeholder feedback that included conversations via phone calls, there are not regular assessments that include the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice and support services for candidates. Interviews with mentors and coaches were not able to provide the team with evidence to conclude that the unit and its programs analyze and use candidate data or that the program uses multiple sources of data that includes feedback from constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of preparation.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Inconsistently
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.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

The review team was unable to find evidence that the TIP and AIP programs provide feedback on assessments based on the program standards and performance expectations to confirm candidate competency. There is inconsistent evidence in the TIP and AIP programs that shows the programs evaluate and demonstrate the impact on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students. Evidence collected during interviews with personnel within the institution, LEA partners, mentors and coaches confirmed that those involved with the program believe that the candidates are making a positive impact on students. LEA partners posited that a sign of positive impact was candidates who return to become mentors when eligible. However, evidence was not provided to indicate that the programs gather information that might show evidence of the impact the programs are having on the professional learning of the candidates.

Rationale for the Finding

Neither educator preparation program provides feedback on assessments to candidates based upon the adopted performance expectations and competencies, the team was not able to find evidence that the institution ensures that candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and effectively support all students. In addition, there was inconsistent evidence between interviews and documentation that the unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and on teaching and learning in schools.