

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Grossmont Union High School District

Professional Services Division

January 2024

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Grossmont Union High School District**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. Based on the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

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

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

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Teacher Induction Program	6	5	1	0

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

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

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

Institution: Grossmont Union High School District

Dates of Visit: October 16-18, 2023

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
04-04-2016	Accreditation

Rationale:

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

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

Program Standards

Program Standards for the Teacher Induction Program were **met** except for Program Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System which was **Met with Concern**.

Common Standards

Common Standards for the Grossmont Union High School District were **met** except for Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation and Common Standard 5: Program Impact which were **Met with Concern**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found one standard for the Teacher Induction credential program Met with Concern and that two Common Standards Met with Concern, the team recommends **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

1. That within one year, the institution submit documentation of all actions taken to address the stipulation(s) noted below.
2. That evidence be provided that Grossmont Union High School District ensures a system that includes regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units, and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation. (CS 1)
3. That evidence be provided that the unit and its Commission-approved programs demonstrate that they have a positive impact on teaching and learning in California's schools. (CS 5)
4. That evidence be provided that the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) development process includes input from the employer regarding the candidate's job assignment. (PS 3)
5. That the institution provide evidence that professional learning and support opportunities are included within the ILP document. (PS 3)

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

Teacher Induction

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institutions response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Grossmont Union High School District be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Grossmont Union High School District continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Ursula Estrada-Reveles
Riverside County Office of Education

Common Standards:

Cheryl Dultz
San Juan Unified School District

Programs Reviewers:

Michael Gomez
Capistrano Unified School District

Staff to the Visit:

Gay Roby
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Accreditation Data Dashboard	Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Assessment Materials	District's Accreditation Website
Candidate Advisement Materials	Mentor Qualifications
Candidate Files	Precondition Responses
Candidate Handbooks	Program Review Addendum
Common Standards Addendum	Program Review Submission
Common Standards Submission	Survey Result

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	25
Completers	8
Employers	9
Institutional Administration	5
Program Leaders	2
District Specialists/Professional Development Providers	6
Mentors	22
Credential Analysts and Staff	3
Advisory Board Members	9
Collaborative Education Partners	3
Leadership Team	9
TOTAL	101

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

Background Information

The Grossmont Union High School District (GUHSD) is a public school district located in eastern San Diego County, California, serving high school, adult school, and Regional Occupational Program (ROP) students in the cities east of San Diego. Formed in June 1920, the district operates 11 high schools (nine regular, one charter, and one continuation) three special education academies; a regional occupational program (ROP); and adult education services.

At the time of the district’s inception, their location in eastern San Diego County was much more rural and isolated from the city of San Diego, with La Mesa and El Cajon existing as newly incorporated cities. Beginning in 1952, the school district underwent an expensive, rapid period of development to accommodate for the suburbanization and consequent growth in population of the area. Six more schools were established in a period of ten years, with four additional schools subsequently built after 1962. Three charter schools joined the district beginning in 1998.

With 2,300 employees (approximately 800 teachers) and hundreds more hourly employees, GUHSD is the largest employer of eastern San Diego County. GUHSD is also very ethnically diverse. Of the 24,000 students who attend schools in the district, approximately 53% are white, while 47% identify as one or more of the following: Latino, African American, Asian, Filipino, Pacific Islander, and Native American. At the school level, these statistics vary significantly. In fact, some schools comprise minority-majority populations. The district reports that it provides staffing resources at a ratio of 35 students to one teacher.

Education Unit

The teacher induction program is housed in the Education Services Department. The Assistant Superintendent of Education Services oversees the program, while a director, a lead mentor, and an administrative assistant are responsible for the day-to-day direction of the program. The program has 93 candidates in 2023-24, with 60 completing the program in June 2023. The district employs 40 mentors for their teacher induction candidates.

Program oversight is included in their collective bargaining agreement with the Grossmont Education Association, with joint oversight by a Teacher Induction Program (TIP) Committee. The TIP Committee serves in an advisory capacity, reviewing data sets and providing input regarding the potential pool of mentors annually.

In addition to serving eligible candidates at all Grossmont UHSD schools, the district has authorized two independent charter schools, including an agreement for those teachers to participate in the Grossmont UHSD TIP.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2023-23)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2023-24)
Teacher Induction Program	60	93

The Visit

This site visit was conducted virtually. The institutional and program constituencies were interviewed via technology. The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

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

PROGRAM REPORTS

Teacher Induction

Program Design

The Educational Services Department, with oversight provided by the Assistant Superintendent provides day-to-day program implementation/operations is led by Educational Services' Director of Learning and Innovation and a lead mentor. A lead mentor works closely with the program director to lead the program. The program director meets regularly with the GUHSD Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services through cabinet, educational services, and one-on-one meetings to provide oversight on program issues. The superintendent shared, "Our purpose statement and our core values align with the goals of the induction program. Mentors help actualize that with our new teachers. By its design, induction is caring, collaborative, and innovative... we no longer hand them the keys and tell new teachers 'Good luck'; we mentor them, help them grow, keep them from being overwhelmed, and encourage them." The program and its leadership are held in high regard, as evidenced by comments from various interviewees; they find the program's director and lead mentor to be highly responsive, helpful, and approachable.

The program director provides regular induction updates to all principals and gathers annual feedback. Principals stated that they see their support of the TIP as more indirect than overt, as the principal's vision is always to "help our staff equip students to build for the future." Charter principals shared that TIP "provides a growth model for teacher's professional growth. It is less directive and more collaborative and self-directed. Allows for professional development that meets all teachers' needs."

The Teacher Induction Program offers two pathways—traditional and Early Completion Option. The GUHSD TIP has five stages that allow the candidates to sequentially move through the program - self-assessment, goal development, supporting inquiry cycles, and reflective self-assessment. While Year 1, Year 2, and Early Completion Option candidates follow the same general progression through the five stages, the specific experience is based upon each individual's needs. A candidate shared, "The program asks us to reflect a lot. It has been really nice. I could see my growth. Seeing where I was and now where I started at the beginning of this year. It's a nice benchmark check-in."

The GUHSD TIP mentors are critical components of the program. Mentors complete an extensive vetting process and receive training before and during their assignment. Evidence reviewed indicated a preference is given to mentors with the same credential and at the same site as the candidates. According to the collective bargaining agreement, mentors serve for two-year terms, which can be renewed twice, serving up to six consecutive years. Mentor

qualifications are published and distributed annually, and the district follows the selection process outlined in the bargaining agreement.

In addition to two full-day trainings annually, two 90 minute after-school mentor meetings are held each semester. During interviews mentors shared, “Mentor training helps me see the overview and what is expected for the next chunk of time. We look at research for what it is like to be a new teacher, the cycles they go through as new teachers, and how to respond to the changing needs. We have learned about the difference between venting and needing advice and how we respond to those needs in the moment. Training helps me to contextualize program information.”

Mentors play an essential role in candidates’ program progression, providing day-to-day coaching support, facilitating the candidate’s induction work, assisting with developing and completing the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP), helping identify appropriate professional learning, and documenting work with the candidate on a monthly coaching log. Reviewing candidate work samples and interviews confirmed mentors provide at least one hour per week of support-through in-person or Zoom meetings. One candidate shared, “Since [my mentor] was at my site, I had a lot of support; she is in the classroom next to me. All I had to do was open the door to pop in, always open to helping me tweak my teaching. This year, we are at separate sites a little different, but we use technology, text, and video messages [to make it work].”

The program has a robust feedback system to gather input and make adjustments that improve the induction experience of their candidates and mentors, including regular surveys and workshop evaluations. A candidate shared the “program is an open book, getting back to you within 24 hours. Feedback on assignments is all timely.” All collected data is used to drive future professional development options, identifies areas for mentor development, and refine program elements. TIP Committee, program leadership, and the district leadership review multiple data points and program components to make improvements and adjustments. All professional learning is thoughtfully aligned and mapped to reflect district and site priorities, ensuring candidates receive individualized contextual support.

In 2019, the program director led the TIP in updating the program design to align with the 2016 new Teacher Induction program standards. Numerous constituents expressed support for the changes in program design since 2019, stating that the program is more candidate-driven, cohesive, and supportive of new teacher needs.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Upon a review of program resources, candidates progress through five sequential stages during each year with the support of an assigned mentor and self-selected professional development. During a mentor meeting, the candidate completes a CSTP self-assessment. Using the CSTP Continuum. After a mentor observation of candidate teaching, the candidate and mentor cross reference the self-assessment and the initial observation to identify CSTP with potential growth areas for the school year. The candidate selects one CSTP element for the first inquiry cycle and writes a measurable goal in the ILP document. A mentor shared this: “[in] cycle of Inquiry, we use the self-assessment, and then create a goal from there. That goal helps us focus on strategies.”

In subsequent stages, the candidates conduct action research, work through implementation, and embed reflection. In the action research cycle, candidates fulfill related professional learning, through a variety of methods. The candidate then implements a research-based strategy, using mentor meetings to debrief and adjust that implementation. At the end of the cycle, a reflective process occurs. In stages three and four, candidates complete additional cycles of inquiry continuing their first goal or developing a new one. In stage five, reflection, candidates once again rank themselves on the CSTP self-assessment and prepare an end-of-the-year presentation to showcase their growth over the year. A mentor shared the “cycle of inquiry naturally shows candidate growth and success of the lesson.”

Either separately or as part of their action research, candidates complete at least two peer observations per semester. While the program requires professional development and peer observation, they are not expressly a part of the ILP. Interviews with program staff, mentors, candidates, and completers indicated that while professional development and peer observation requirements are often connected with the ILP, evidence was not found that they were consistently and explicitly within the ILP. A mentor commented, “Peer observations are beneficial to judge against other teachers with the same curriculum. It ignites teachers to do better, to try new things.”

While the program provided extensive evidence and corroboration that the ILP is collaboratively developed at the beginning of Induction by the candidate and the mentor with guidance from the program staff, there needs to be a formalized, documented method for the employer to provide input in the ILP development. During interviews, principals shared that according to the program’s design, they “cannot see the ILP, but I can see and know their goals.”

The program provides multiple methods for monitoring candidate progress. The first level of monitoring of candidate progress involves the mentors. If a candidate needs help beyond the time, role, or capacity, the mentor informs the lead mentor and the Program Director who then meet with the candidate. Based on the situation, the department chair, principal, or the Human Resources Department may be informed of the situation to ensure the candidate has the support needed.

The second level of monitoring of candidate progress involves five official check-ins for each program stage, ensuring candidates are on track to complete the program successfully. At each check-in, candidates submit documents to the learning management system, Schoology. Candidates shared, “Schoology has embedded deadlines, with reminders sent.” Another added, “Documents are there, ordered, and easy to use.” The lead mentor and program director review submissions for completion and quality. Submissions that satisfy the requirement are marked as accepted while candidates with submissions needing a revision are notified, with resubmissions expected within one week.

Assessment of Candidates

During the site visit, program leadership confirmed their assessment of candidates on an ongoing basis. Candidate progress is tracked throughout the program each year which is tracked through Schoology. Elements of the program that do not meet a general standard are returned with an expectation that any insufficient parts are reworked. The program provides feedback and offers opportunities to meet with candidates or mentors.

At the end of the two-year program (or one-year ECO program), candidates are required to present their learning and growth during their time in the GUHSD Teacher Induction Program at the Induction Showcase. They share evidence related to their progress on ILP goals, areas of strength, and areas of growth. A panel of peers, mentors, and administrators give feedback on the presentation. If the candidate does not meet proficiency, they are provided suggestions and expected to create an updated screencast. The lead mentor and program director review any resubmitted presentations. Principals and mentors reported this was a very positive culminating experience for both candidates and employers.

After the showcase, a final review is made, and all candidates who have satisfactorily completed the program's expectations are recommended for a clear credential. Working with the TIP administrative assistant, the GUHSD Human Resources department submits the online recommendation form to the CTC. Human Resources Department shared, “If there is ever a question, then [program director] is in contact with teachers to make sure they meet all the requirements.”

Findings on Standards

After review of all available information, including interviews with candidates, program completers, program personnel, mentors, coaches, and other educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Grossmont Union High School District Teacher Induction Program except for the following:

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

Evidence could not consistently be found that the ILP development process included input from the employer. Further, the team could not find evidence that the ILP document included a place for documentation regarding the professional learning and support opportunities used by the candidate to provide evidence of completion.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Educational Services unit of the Grossmont Union High School District provides oversight of the Teacher Induction Program (TIP). The program has a leadership team of three: a program director oversees the Teacher Induction Program as one of his many other district responsibilities, a part-time teacher on assignment (who teaches for four periods per day), and an administrative assistant who works with multiple district initiatives. The team determined that some of the common and program standards were not fully implemented due to the time constraints of the leadership team members: establish collaborative relationships with other educational partners, develop structures to determine the program’s impact on student learning and local education, and address implementation of ILP design and collaboration amongst principals, mentors, and candidates.

The program director has established strong relationships throughout the district and maintains positive communication with the union, who, per the collective bargaining agreement, serve as members of an advisory committee to the Teacher Induction Program. The culture is one of open communication throughout the program, amongst all its constituent groups. As the accreditation website confirms, the Grossmont Union High School District maintains a research-based vision via the works of Laura Lipton and Jim Knight. The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for the Teacher Induction Program. During interviews with various groups, constituents talked about their ongoing meetings with the program director.

The collective bargaining agreement determines both the criteria to serve as a mentor as well as the length of time they may serve. The teacher induction program monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that every candidate recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	Consistently

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Consistently
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
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.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

During interviews with candidates and coaches, the influence of Laura Lipton and Jim Knight was evidenced in the program’s research base. Mentors talked about their work with the candidates and how important it was for them to maintain their coaching stance and to avoid responding to their questions and instead leading candidates to their own conclusions through this reflective process. It was also evident throughout the interviews that various constituent groups throughout the organization engage in ongoing conversations and influence decision-

making for the teacher induction program. However, no evidence of regular and systematic collaboration with educational partners could be found. According to the program director and a San Diego faculty member, the program has recently established a collaborative relationship between them which they hope to grow into a regular and systematic collaboration; more frequent attendance and involvement in the local induction network is also planned.

The accreditation team found abundant evidence that the program director and lead mentor are highly regarded in their work with the teacher induction program and the district innovation and learning unit. Many of the constituents interviewed commented that both the program director and lead mentor are highly organized, interactive with all program personnel, and responsive to their constituent needs.

The district provides institutional support for the program which was evidenced in interviews with the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of educational services. They both commented that the decision to hire a district teacher for part of each day to support the program was driven by the program director's request for assistance and support. However, no evidence was found that the program fosters collaboration with other educational partners (CS1) or seeks out information regarding the positive impact of the program (CS5).

It was evident the Grossmont Union High School District makes every effort to hire diverse mentors for their candidates. They work directly with an organization called "Diversity in Education" to seek out diverse employees, as noted on their website.

Mentors supervise field-based and clinical experiences after receiving targeted professional development as evidenced in the interviews with mentors. They commented on the role of the CSTP in supporting candidates and demonstrating their current knowledge of the frameworks and accountability system. Evidence highlighted the innovative ways the district has found to engage in challenging conversations to ensure the success of all students through, for example, Universal Design and ongoing professional development focused on English Learners.

During the interviews with credential analysts, it became evident that they monitor a credential recommendation process that ensures those recommended for a credential have met all requirements. This process is monitored by an administrative assistant who was formerly in the personnel office but is now in the induction program: she monitors that candidates complete each requirement before the recommendation is made.

Rationale for the Finding

The site visit team could not locate evidence that "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."

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Grossmont UHSD has established a uniform list of criteria to identify eligible candidates for their teacher induction program, which is applied to all new hires. Once identified, candidates are quickly oriented to the program and enrolled as participants. Interviews with candidates confirm that all new hires with a preliminary credential are immediately offered enrollment in the district’s induction program, with mentoring support beginning concurrently.

The human resources department strives to recruit a diverse workforce through collaboration with the Diversity in Education organization who sends out information to over 3,500 Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU). Human Resources personnel explained that they attend job fairs throughout San Diego County to expand their recruitment efforts for diverse candidates. Interviews also confirmed that one of the top initiatives for the San Diego County Office of Education, in partnership with Grossmont Union High School District, was “recruiting diverse populations into the teaching profession.”

Mentors are assigned by the program director with support from the TIP advisory committee, and a priority is placed on matching candidates with mentors who have experience in the same subject. Mentors participate in professional learning, trained to continually assess their candidates' status, and differentiate their support based on current needs. Documentation and interviews confirm that candidate support and mentor needs are the focus of the professional development offerings. Feedback to mentors is provided through candidate survey results and

one-on-one feedback from the lead mentor. Candidates reported that their work with a mentor is “extremely valuable as it is the only forum I have to vent and talk about induction and my first-year teaching stresses.” Mentors expressed deep appreciation for the program director and lead mentor. From screencasts explaining how to use the digital tools of the program to constant availability, mentors felt supported and valued by the Induction Program Leadership.

The TIP program reviews candidate evidence regarding their progress in meeting competency and performance expectations; results are then used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. Candidates have five official check-ins, one for each of the program stages. At each check-in, the lead mentor, and the program director review candidate submissions on the Schoology platform for completeness and quality. If a submission meets the standard, then it is marked as accepted. Should it not meet standards, the candidate is notified and has one week to revise their work. If the submission is far below expectations, the program’s additional support process, identified in the program handbook, is initiated to provide targeted support to the candidate.

Candidates develop an Individual Learning Plan to drive their experience in the two-year induction program. Candidates then work with their mentor to complete the ILP, as the document provides the roadmap for their induction work and mentor support. The ILP includes annual identification of CSTP foci, peer observations, and three cycles of inquiry. The ILP and the candidate’s annual induction work culminate in a demonstration of growth via a Flipgrid reflection for Year 1 candidates and an End of Year Showcase for Year 2 candidates.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	Consistently
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors, and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	Consistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Consistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
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

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The GUHSD TIP implements a planned sequence of work for its program participants, facilitated by highly trained, skilled mentors. Induction activities are centered around the candidate’s Individual Learning Plan (ILP). The ILP includes the establishment of candidate goals, self-assessments, professional learning, peer observations, action steps, reflections, and inquiry cycles, determine the candidates’ induction experience and CSTP growth areas. Research-based professional learning options, consistent mentoring, and an end-of-the-year showcase complete the candidate requirements. Both mentors and candidates shared that the program requirements were “clear, relevant, and laid out in an organized way.”

The program handbook outlines five program stages involving goal setting, action research, and professional learning ending with a reflective activity. Candidates are encouraged to focus on diversity as one of their cycles of inquiry and are expected to participate in an English Language Learner workshop which is customized by subject-specific groups to increase relevance. In interviews, candidates consistently praised the program leadership for their responsiveness and availability. Candidates also shared how valuable they found the reflection component of the program to be. One candidate stated, “The program asks us to reflect a lot. I can see my growth from the beginning of the year until now.”

Mentoring is the foundation for the Induction Program. The teacher induction program committee completes the selection process after reviewing applications that ask mentors to share their professional experiences, personal philosophy around professional learning, and how they approach personal growth as a teacher. Candidates shared that the support from their mentors was “incredible,” “valuable,” “meaningful”, and “amazing.” Repeatedly, constituent groups shared that the district’s onsite mentoring model allowed for just-in-time support and a “wealth of information” for the majority of the district’s participants.

Documents and interviews confirm mentors are site-based, holding the same credentials teaching the same subject area as candidates. These pairings are intentional, designed to provide candidates access to content pedagogy and universal access teaching strategies. Mentors receive extensive training in Laura Lipton’s “Mentoring Matters” and Jim Knight’s “Impact Cycle” in full-day trainings and emphasized in after-school meetings. Mentors described the quality of their training and the recent improvements in the program. Examples included individual support from the lead mentor and the addition of Powerful, Emotionally Compelling, Easy, Reachable, Student Focused (PEERS) goals.

The mentor is involved with the ILP process through the self-assessment process, observations, and feedback, coaching, support through the inquiry cycle, and the end-of -year showcase. Mentors also use a targeted video observation platform called “Sibme” where mentors can watch and comment on the lesson and provide feedback to the candidate.

Feedback to the mentors on their work is provided through candidate surveys and individual lead mentor meetings. In interviews, the candidates shared if they felt that their mentor was not a good match for them, they would email the program director for immediate support. The responsive leadership from the program director was also frequently mentioned in all interview groups.

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

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The GUHSD TIP’s effectiveness is regularly assessed as part of continuous improvement cycles through surveys, interviews, focus groups, and data review conducted by the program director, lead mentor, and the induction committee. Data is gathered from multiple sources, including mentor, site administrator, and candidate surveys, as well as informal conversations throughout the year. Multiple interviews confirmed that the program regularly collects, disaggregates, analyzes, and uses data to improve program services. The program director analyzes data with the leadership team (program director, lead mentor, administrative assistant) and then shares it with the induction committee (ten district employees), which provides feedback on program changes. Mentors recounted instances where they suggested regarding a program change or addition that was later implemented by program leadership. Several interview groups commented on the program leadership’s responsiveness, availability, and openness to suggestions, which fosters group ownership of the program and its activities.

The program director, lead mentor, and the induction committee meet regularly and review data from their assessment tools. The tools include but are not limited to mid-year and end-of-the-year candidate surveys, mentor surveys, end-of-the-year mentor debriefings, completion data, site administrator surveys, the end-of-the-year induction showcase and exit tickets from all professional learning sessions. Program leadership looks for trends, discusses feedback and suggestions, and adjusts the program accordingly.

While the continuous improvement cycle solicits feedback from a wide variety of district constituents, the site visit team could not establish that feedback was gathered from community partners regarding the quality of preparation from the Grossmont Union High School District Induction Program.

Professional development was widespread and offered to all candidates to support their Individual Learning Plan. The district specialists and professional development providers shared in interviews that they look at the preliminary teaching credential programs’ transition plans in planning for the year, but they use the Individual Learning Plans as the major data source for planning. To determine professional development, the ILP goals are coded by pattern and trends and then crafted into workshop topics. One provider shared that their professional development is not “one and done, but multiple opportunities” throughout the year.

The continuous cycle of improvement is evident in the data that the program gathers regarding satisfaction with the program. 90% of program completers reported that the program was effective or very effective in helping them develop the skills, habits, or tools, to grow their teaching practice. Program completers reported during interviews that the program highlights included, “the mentorship was meaningful” and that the program was “100% relevant.”

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 effectively support all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	Not Evidenced

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard.

Candidates enrolled in the GUHSD TIP are provided growth opportunities through a variety of interactions and processes. Their ongoing relationships with a designated mentor, their participation in self-directed professional development, and their work in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession intertwine to develop pedagogical knowledge that allows them to both educate and support students in achieving California’s academic standards.

Interviews with both mentors and candidates confirmed they use the CSTP as a common language tool to discuss and monitor the candidate’s growth, via both candidate self-assessments and monthly coaching logs, where mentors chronicle candidate skill levels. The candidates reported, “We go over the standards, talk about where we think we are, and where we can grow.” In the program completer interviews, a candidate mentioned how their participation in the induction program impacted their professional practice through the development of strong habits of reflection, saying, “all the practices I worked on during induction, I still use them today. For example, increasing student talk is something that I continue to focus on today and I learned that directly from the CSTP.”

Professional development is also designed to equip candidates to educate and support students to meet the state’s academic standards. Candidates first develop ILP growth goals, then chose professional development that targets those areas. Program leadership works with workshop presenters to align candidate ILP goals to the district priorities and professional development offerings. Survey data results show 90.9% of candidates report that there was moderate to strong cohesion between the on-site/district professional development and their induction

program goals and activities. Mentors reported in interviews that they also support integration through things like "video analysis, candidate self-assessment and goal setting, data collection, and peer observations." One mentor shared that "program leadership is always looking for ways to improve." The result of these targeted supports is both the growth and the retention of GUHSD's new teachers.

Candidates demonstrate their knowledge and skills as outlined in the CSTP through periodic self-assessment in the Continuum of Practice document. Upon enrollment, at the halfway mark of their two years of enrollment, and at the conclusion of their induction experience, candidates reflect on their professional practice and indicate their current level of expertise. The majority of candidates assess themselves as growing in each of the six CSTP during their induction experience.

The team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrated or evaluated the positive influence on candidate learning competence and/or teaching and learning in their local schools. While the program and the unit gather a myriad of feedback throughout the academic year, there is no instrument or process that identifies how the program is a positive addition to the local educational environment.

Rationale for the Finding

No evidence was found that "the unit and its program 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."