Discussion of the 2nd Quarterly Report for
Monterey County Office of Education

March 2024

Overview of this Report

This agenda item provides information on the second quarterly report submitted by Monterey County Office of Education addressing stipulations resulting from their October 2023 site visit. Following its decision, the Committee on Accreditation directed the Monterey County Office of Education to provide updates to Commission staff at quarterly intervals documenting the progress made toward addressing the stipulations in the October 2023 Accreditation Report. Information is included in this second quarterly report related to how the institution continues to work at addressing the requirements of each stipulation.

Staff Recommendation

Commission staff recommends that the Committee on Accreditation (COA) review the evidence submitted in the second quarterly report for the purpose of determining sufficient progress towards meeting the stipulations as outlined in the accreditation site visit report of October 2023.

Background

A site visit was held virtually for the Monterey County Office of Education on October 10 -12, 2023, and the accreditation report of that visit was presented to the COA at its October 2023 meeting. Following discussion and deliberation of the report, the recommendations of the site visit team, the COA determined that the institution be granted **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**. The stipulations are listed below.

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(CASC) 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.

First Quarterly Report Submission

At the January 2024 COA meeting, the [first quarterly report](#) for the Monterey County Office of Education was presented and discussed. It is available here: [MCOE Quarter One Report](#). In addition to the narrative report, the Monterey County Office of Education provided the following table that included a list of evidence of the actions taken: [Stipulations Table](#). Both links included the institution's responses to the stipulations with actions taken and links to evidence that supports the action.

At the COA meeting, it was suggested that the Stipulation Table be split into two columns, one for the Administrator Induction program and another for the Teacher Induction program. In addition, the COA directed the Monterey County Office of Education to return the March COA meeting with the following information included in their second quarterly report:

1. Individual Learning Plans and Individual Induction Plans that are time stamped.
2. Information about what mentors (Teacher Induction) and coaches (Administrative Services Induction) are doing.
3. Information about what teacher leaders are doing.
4. Evidence of coach training (sign-in sheets, agendas, materials, and feedback)
5. Feedback from candidates.
6. Focus group data from candidates, mentors, coaches, employers, and partners.
7. Data to show continuous improvement.
8. Continuity in documents (where descriptions were inconsistently described, ensure there is consistent information).

9. Hyperlinks evidence to the specific standard – materials, agenda, sign-in sheets and feedback all should link directly to the standard it is addressing.

Second Quarterly Report Contents

At the January 2024 COA meeting, the COA directed the Monterey County Office of Education to provide specific pieces of evidence for its second quarterly report. In response to the COA's request for the information that is outlined above, the Monterey County Office of Education has prepared the MCOE Quarter Two Report that is provided in narrative format and a Stipulations Table to address the information as requested by the COA. Staff are providing some analysis in addition to guidance to where evidence may be found for each of the requested items from the January COA meeting.

1. **Individual Learning Plans and Individual Induction Plans that are time stamped.**
Due to the sensitive nature of the information requested by the COA with respect to the Individual Induction Plans (IIP) for the Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC) program, Individual Learning Plans(ILP) for the Teacher Induction program (TIP), and the coach/mentoring logs, staff reviewed a sample of five candidates from each of the three cohort years (2021, 2022, and 2023) to gather information sought by the COA.

The ILPs provided for the TIP program for the 2023 Cohort – which represents the current academic year candidates – still show a disconnect between the growth over time on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the formative assessment assignments that candidates complete multiple times on Canvas. There are no dates on the ILP, no mid-program dates, so it is unclear when candidates have completed work on their ILPs. The ILPs contain numerous scripted questions that are not candidate (self) directed. Part 1 of the ILP is 14 to 15 pages in length. Part 2 requires candidates to set a SMART goal. It is not clear how the questions that candidates must respond to are related to the CSTP and assist the candidate in showing growth over time. Candidates must select modules to complete which does not align with the intent of the 2016 Teacher Induction Program standards which were developed to ensure that candidates experienced a two-year, individualized, job embedded system of mentoring, support and professional learning based on needs determined by the candidate grounded in the CSTP. Ultimately, the ILP model shared still reflects the old paradigm of formative assessment and does not allow the candidates show progress towards mastery since the prompts on the ILP are extensive and the same for all candidates. The evidence still mirrors what was found at the site visit. To date, there is no evidence that MCOE has updated their ILP forms in accordance with the stipulations and to align with the standards.

The IIPs provided for the CASC program for the 2023 Cohort – which represent the current academic year candidates – reflect the baseline assessment that was conducted in the fall of 2023 with the exception of one candidate that has a self-assessment that was completed in September of 2022 and a mid-year assessment in April of 2023 likely making this candidate a year 2 candidate as opposed to a newly enrolled candidate. The IIPs that were submitted were difficult to analyze since they were all completed in different manners. The information included on each varied in depth and complexity. This suggests that the CASC coaches and candidates have not received information or training about what information should be

included on the IIP. When examining the five samples that MCOE submitted for the 2021 and 2022 cohort years, there were significant gaps. For candidates who had completed the program, IIPs did not address all of the CPSELs even though that is a requirement for successful completion of an induction program. Completion forms for one of the 2022 Cohort candidates indicated that they had addressed all six CPSELs in year one however, the IIP only showed evidence of addressing two of the CPSELs. Another one of the submitted samples for a 2022 Cohort candidate shows all CPSELs as complete but lacks evidence. All of the IIPs, across the fifteen samples provided, lack consistency in the information provided and indicate that a review process for quality assurance does not exist. Consistent across the submitted IIPs is that in the column titled, "How does this action address the CPSEL?" does not include response from candidates. The evidence still mirrors what was found at the site visit.

2. **Information about what mentors (Teacher Induction) and coaches (Administrative Services Induction) are doing.**

With respect to the teacher induction program, for the 2023 cohort, of the five candidate samples submitted one of them did not start the program until October. The files show that three of the 2023 Cohort candidates have met with their mentors on a weekly basis since the start of their program through January 31st. The remaining two candidate files show that the candidates met with their mentors from the start of their program through December 11, 2023. Evidence was submitted to Commission staff for review on Wednesday, March 6, 2024. All of these candidates are in their first year of the Teacher Induction Program. The five sample logs that were provided for the 2022 Cohort candidates and the 2021 Cohort candidates all supported the original findings of the team as some candidate files were missing entire months of mentor and candidate interaction. From the evidence submitted for the 2023 Cohort, three of the candidates have regularly met with their mentor, however, there is a lack of evidence to show that the other two candidates have met with their mentor beyond December.

For the Clear Administrative Services Credential Program, there were 15 sample candidate coaching logs provided. The samples were inconsistent and do not show evidence of time accrued. Several examples have several month-long gaps, duplicated coaching logs, multiple meeting dates included in one log, and/or multiple logs for the same date. Candidates start coaching sometime between August and October. Overall, it is not clear how the forty-hour requirement is being met. In the coaching logs, CPSELs that were addressed with candidates are not explicitly referenced outside of identifying a CPSEL by number, so it is not clear what coaches are specifically doing with candidates to support the CPSELs. The evidence still mirrors what was found at the site visit.

3. **Information about what teacher leaders are doing.**

Specific evidence related to teacher leaders was not submitted. This may be because it is not clear who COA was referring to with the term "teacher leaders" and what additional information was being sought. If by teacher leaders the COA meant mentors, then that information is included in the response to #2 above. If teacher leaders refers to the program advisors at the districts then this information is not presented as part of the evidence. The COA may wish to provide additional direction for the next quarterly report on this topic.

4. **Evidence of coach training (sign-in sheets, agendas, materials, and feedback)**
The evidence that MCOE provided for #4 can be found on the Stipulations Table 8k and includes a running record of all the meetings held individually with CASC coaches. While dates and a brief summary of the topics addressed were provided, no sign-in sheets, agendas, or other information requested by the COA is available. On August 21, 2023, a training for the collective group of coaches was held, however, there is not a sign-in sheet to verify that all coaches attended. Additionally, the Coach Fieldwork Feedback Form template that was shared as evidence in the first quarterly report did not have supporting documentation to demonstrate its use to support coaches. The feedback form designed to be used by the program administrator to provide feedback to the coaches on their work with candidates has not been utilized. So, it is not clear how coaches receive feedback from the program about the work they do with candidates.

With respect to the teacher induction program the evidence that was submitted to verify training of teacher induction mentors was evidence of a power point from September 2022 and an agenda from September of 2023. In addition, a one-hour meeting was held on February 7, 2024. No sign in sheets were provided for either meeting, even the meeting that was held after the January COA meeting when direction had been given to collect sign in sheets. The teacher induction mentors during the 2023 school year have attended three whole group meetings for a duration of one hour each. In addition to the whole group meetings with mentors, office hours are held weekly, and three individual and two small group sessions were held.

5. **Feedback from candidates**
Evidence for #5 which references feedback from candidates might be found in 8g and 81, however, the information there refers to CASC candidates' responses to sessions they attended, so this evidence does not include any teacher induction feedback. Therefore, MCOE might consider the Mid-Year Survey and Focus Group Data Report as evidence for feedback from candidates. There were 70 respondents to the mid-year survey, of which, 34 were candidates across both programs that serve 186 candidates collectively. Approximately 18% of their candidates are represented in the results for the mid-year survey. The remaining respondents of the mid-year survey were coaches and program advisors.

6. **Focus group data from candidates, mentors, coaches, employers, and partners.**
Evidence for #6 can be found on the stipulations table next to #6. There is a link to a data report for both the teacher induction and clear administrative induction programs that was published based upon the collection of evidence from six focus groups that averaged six people per group. Focus group participants only included participants (candidates), advisors and coaches. No employers or partners were included. It is not clear how the results from the focus group report will generate changes to a candidate's experience in teacher induction program when the current ILP form that directs the candidate's experience is not designed in a way that the candidate can show progress towards mastery. It is also unclear how it will generate changes in the administrator induction program.

7. **Data to show continuous improvement.**

The data collected via the focus groups and the mid-year survey listed in 6a through c, 8g, 8i, and 9g for the current academic year are the data that was collected and provided as evidence. There is no evidence yet of how the data is being used to implement program improvements. The program has asserted that there was a program improvement process in place at the time of the site visit, but staff has not been provided with any of that data or evidence of program improvements.

8. **Continuity in documents (where descriptions were inconsistently described, ensure there is consistent information).**

No evidence was submitted to show evidence that documents are now consistent. As an example, the contents of the IIPs submitted for the 2023 cohort were inconsistent; Some IIPs did not include the baseline self-assessment data, session reflection, and/or the program checklist. Additionally, the forms the candidates used differ. For example, one IIP asks for "Key Performance Measures directly related to the goal (Name of measurement)," while another form for the same cohort asks for "Key Performance Measures directed related to one CPSEL: Name of Measurement(s) and Focus." Lastly, the candidate checklist template that was shared as evidence in the first quarterly report does not mirror the checklists included in some of the IIPs.

9. **Hyperlinks evidence to the specific standard – materials, agenda, sign-in sheets and feedback all should link directly to the standard it is addressing.**

Hyperlinks to evidence for this report were provided. The hyperlinks to the candidate specific information that included coaching logs, ILP, and IIPs were sufficient. However, the links were to scanned documents that were not in chronological order which required staff to create a tracking system to ensure that each candidate had met with a coach each month during their enrollment in the program. There were some candidates who were missing logs for specific months, so it appears that there is not a tracking system to ensure that the teacher induction candidates and the administrator induction candidates are receiving the required number hours of supports. This is consistent with the findings of the accreditation site visit team.

The COA requested sign-in sheets. However, none have been provided as evidence as of March 15, 2024.

It should be noted that the second quarterly report does not provide an update on the progress that the institution has made on all of the stipulations. The institution prepared their response to the specific list of items requested from the COA at the January 2024 meeting.

Summary

Five months have passed since MCOE's accreditation site visit. Similar patterns are occurring that happened during year 5 of the accreditation cycle. For the very first quarterly report, many templates were shared for the work of mentors, coaches, and candidates. For the second quarterly report, the COA asked for evidence of candidate work and mentor activity. The evidence provided is not aligned to the current standards for the teacher induction program,

nor is the evidence complete. Essentially, there is a disconnect between what the leadership is doing and what needs to be done.

Prior to the site visit, the institution was required to submit preconditions in March of 2022. It took the institution until March of 2023 to meet all of the preconditions. The program review submission for MCOE was received in October of 2022 and the Common Standards submission was received in February of 2023. Extensive feedback was provided to the institution for both of the programs offered. The institution was asked to provide evidence in the addendums prior to the site visit. The evidence was not provided which made for a challenging site visit. Evidence was requested in January 2024 by the COA to be presented at the March COA meeting. Partial evidence has been submitted.

The ILPs for teacher induction candidates are extensive and exhaustive and allow the candidates to self-pace but not self-direct their growth. There is no clear alignment to the CSTP in the process that is instituted through MCOE that shows progress towards mastery. This does not meet the intent of the current Teacher Induction Standards.

Next Steps
The third quarterly report is scheduled to be presented to the COA at its May 2024 meeting.

Staff recommends that the COA require that the institution, at a minimum, include in their next quarterly report evidence of the following:

1. That the ILP form has been further revised to reflect candidates' self-selected area for growth and is now aligned to the CSTP.
2. That the revised templates and forms shared at the January 2024 COA meeting are being implemented.
3. That the program has developed and implemented a system for monitoring and ensuring each CASC candidate receives at least 40 hours of regular and consistent coaching.
4. That the program has developed and implements a system for monitoring to ensure each TIP candidate receives at least one hour weekly of support.
5. That the program has a process for monitoring the IIPs and ILPs to ensure that candidates are engaging in progress towards mastery of the performance expectations. When and how are program liaisons, candidates, and mentors/coaches informed of the changes? Please include supporting documentation (training materials, sign in sheets, and dates of training) for the implementation of the process.
6. That the program show evidence of what processes have changed and have been implemented since the site visit for each program. Also include evidence that the program has communicated these changes to program's constituencies. What types of training and communication has been sent to candidates and mentors/coaches about the new processes?
7. That the program demonstrate what steps it is taking to respond to each stipulation in October 2023 accreditation report.
8. That the continuous improvement process currently being implemented at MCOE, share data that is used and changes that have been implemented as a result of findings. Describe how the data collected is representative of the communities of interest the program serves

(mentors, program advisors, candidates, employers, etc.) and contributes to programmatic improvement (examples of how the data is being used).

The institution's accreditation revisit is scheduled for October 7-9, 2024. Commission staff will continue to work with the Monterey County Office of Education as it makes progress in addressing stipulations in preparation for its revisit.