

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

## Santa Clara County Office of Education

Professional Services Division

March 2024

### Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Santa Clara County Office of Education**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

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

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

### Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	9	0	0
Clear Administrative Services	4	4	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs Extensive Support Needs	6	1	5	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education	6	2	4	0
Teacher Induction	6	4	0	2

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:** Santa Clara County Office of Education

**Dates of Visit:** February 4-7, 2024

**Accreditation Team Recommendation:** Accreditation with Stipulations

**Previous History of Accreditation Status**

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
Date: May 1-4, 2016 <a href="#">Santa Clara County Office of Education Report</a>	<a href="#">Accreditation</a>

**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

All preconditions have been determined to be **aligned**.

Program Standards

For the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and Clear Administrative Service Credential, all program standards are **met**.

For the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs Intern pathway and Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs Intern pathway programs, one program standard is **met**, and five program standards are **met with concerns**.

For the Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Intern pathway program, two program standards are **met** and four program standards are **met with concerns**.

For the Teacher Induction program, four program standards are **met** and two program standards are **not met**.

Common Standards

For the Common Standards, three standards are **met**, and two standards are **met with concerns**.

#### Overall Recommendation

Based on the following findings the team recommends **Accreditation with Stipulations**. The team found that three Common Standards are met, two are met with concerns; for the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services Credential programs all standards are met; for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs Intern programs each has one met four met with concerns; and the Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Intern program has two met and four met with concerns. Finally, the Teacher Induction program has four standards met and two not met. Despite the number of standards less than fully met, the team determined that a higher level of stipulations is not recommended due to the specific nature of the findings, the number of programs offered, and the quality of those programs.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

- 1) That the institution provide quarterly reports and host a seventh year focused revisit.

For the Common standards:

- 2) Provide evidence that 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. (Common Standard 3c)
- 3) Provide evidence that site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. (Common Standard 3g)
- 4) Provide evidence 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 based on findings. (Common Standard 4a)
- 5) Provide evidence that 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. (Common Standard 4c)

For the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Extensive Support Needs, and Early Childhood Special Education programs:

- 6) Provide evidence that the program's organizational structure supports a logical and integrated progression for candidates including preparing candidates in case management practices (IEP preparation). (Program Standard 1)
- 7) Provide evidence that the minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance is 5 hours per week. (Program Standard 3)
- 8) Provide evidence that appropriate information is accessible to guide candidates' meeting all program requirements. (Program Standard 4)

- 9) Provide evidence that before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, district-employed supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan (IDP) consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear credential program. (Program Standard 6)

For the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs programs:

- 10) Provide evidence that each candidate receives clear and accurate information about the nature of the pedagogical tasks within the Commission-approved teaching performance assessment model selected by the program. The program provides multiple formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the TPA tasks/activities. (Program Standard 5)

For the Teacher Induction program:

- 11) Provide evidence that prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear Credential, the induction program sponsor verifies that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements, and that the program has documented the basis on which the recommendation for the clear credential is made. The program sponsor's verification must be based on a review of observed and documented evidence, collaboratively assembled by the candidate, the mentor and/or other colleagues, according to the program's design. The Induction program's recommendation verification process must include a defensible process of reviewing documentation. (Program Standard 5)
- 12) Provide evidence that induction program leaders provide formative feedback to mentors on their work. (Program Standard 6)

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:

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Intern Pathway  
Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, Intern Pathway  
Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, Intern Pathway  
Preliminary Multiple Subject, Intern Pathway (approved January 25, 2024, not included in site visit review)  
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential  
Clear Administrative Services Credential  
Teacher Induction

In addition, staff recommends that:

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

- Santa Clara 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:**

Aleeta Powers  
Los Angeles Unified School District

#### **Common Standards:**

Kelly Daly  
Sonoma County Office of Education  
  
Joe Frescatore  
San Diego County Office of Education

#### **Programs Reviewers:**

Jenny Chiappe  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Elizabeth Jara  
San Joaquin County Office of Education

Rachel Pittman  
Riverside County Office of Education

Raina Arellano  
Ventura County Office of Education

#### **Staff to the Visit:**

Miranda Gutierrez  
Rosemary Wrenn  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

#### **Documents Reviewed**

Common Standards Submission  
Program Review Submission  
Common Standards Addendum  
Program Review Addendum  
Course Syllabi and Course of Study  
Candidate Advisement Materials  
Accreditation Website  
Faculty Vitae  
Candidate Files

Assessment Materials  
Candidate Handbooks  
Survey Results  
Performance Expectation Materials  
Precondition Responses  
Performance Assessment Results and Analysis  
Accreditation Data Dashboard

### Interviews Conducted

Constituencies	TOTAL
Candidates	141
Completers	46
Employers	10
Institutional Administration	10
Program Coordinators	2
Faculty	43
TPA/APA Coordinator	2
Mentors/Coaches	51
Field Supervisors – Program	12
Field Supervisors – District	1
Credential Analysts and Staff	3
Advisory Board Members	14
Program Staff	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>344</b>

*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

Working collaboratively with school and community partners, the Santa Clara County Office of Education (SCCOE) is a regional service agency that provides instructional, business, and technology services to the 31 school districts of Santa Clara County. The County Office of Education directly serves students through special education programs, alternative schools, Head Start and State Preschool programs, migrant education, and Opportunity Youth Academy. The SCCOE also provides academic and fiscal oversight and monitoring to districts in addition to the 21 Santa Clara County Board of Education authorized charter schools.

## Education Unit

The vision of the Santa Clara County Office of Education Educator Preparation Programs is to build courageous teachers and leaders who utilize effective educational practices. These practices are founded on the research-based California Standards for the Teaching Profession (2009) (CSTPs/teachers) and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2014) (CPSELs/administrators) and will facilitate the development of life-long learners who will possess 21st-century learning skills. The Educator Preparation Programs endeavor to develop equity-based educators (Schmeichel, 2011; Valenzuela, 2017) and administrators who are competent, innovative, and who will have the skills and desire to provide inclusive and equitable educational opportunities for the students of California.

The SCCOE's Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) is led by the executive director and includes seven educator preparation programs, both intern and clear induction programs. In 2022, EPP introduced the Educator Workforce Pathways (EWP). Although not a credentialing program, EWP is integrated into EPP efforts as an initiative to recruit individuals into the educational field. EWP supports educator candidates in identifying and securing grants and funding sources, irrespective of their current education level, to eliminate or reduce tuition costs toward earning Pupil Personnel Services and teaching credentials in high-demand areas.

**Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Number of Program Completers (2022-23)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Enrolled (2023-24)</b>
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Intern Pathway	30	91
Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, Intern Pathway	6	36
Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, Intern Pathway	7	18
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential	90	165
Clear Administrative Services Credential	59	130
Teacher Induction	17	46



## **The Visit**

This site visit was conducted virtually. Institutional and program constituencies were interviewed via technology.

## **PRECONDITION FINDINGS**

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

## **PROGRAM REPORTS**

The EPP department, led by an executive director (unit leadership) who oversees all educator preparation programs, serves as the credentialing body for the Santa Clara County Office of Education. Within the organizational structure of the SCCOE, the EPP resides within the Professional Learning and Support Division (PLSD) under the associate superintendent. The director of programs oversees the day-to-day operations of credential programs. EPP staff are committed to providing a high-quality educational experience that builds technical skills and emphasizes the relational skills necessary to make a positive impact for all candidates and the students they serve.

In summer of 2023, the EPP department underwent substantial expansion. The EPP department includes the Educator Preparation Programs and Educator Workforce Pathways, each led by a director who reports to the executive director. Within the EPP department, Education Preparation for Inclusive Classrooms (EPIC) includes the education specialist programs: mild to moderate support needs (MMSN), extensive support needs (ESN), and early childhood special education (ECSE). Also, within the EPP Department is The Leaders in Education Administration Program (LEAP) which includes the administrative services programs, preliminary and clear. The director of programs oversees the EPIC programs, LEAP programs, and teacher induction program. In addition to leading programs, the director of programs provides oversight for the CalTPA (California Teaching Performance Assessment) and the CalAPA (California Administrator Performance Assessment).

### **Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Intern Pathway Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, Intern Pathway**

#### Program Design

The Santa Clara County Office of Education offers preliminary education specialist credentials through their Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) department: Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN). The program includes a two-year intern program for new credential holders and an accelerated pathway for those who already have a Clear credential in another area. The focus of the EPP is around equity and inclusion. Courses are offered online, and candidates complete their observations via GoReact (an interactive cloud-based platform feedback, grading, and video assignments).

The vision of the program is to build courageous teachers to utilize effective educational practices and develop equity-based educators to provide inclusive and equitable educational

opportunities for students. One advisor supports program candidates through office hours, general advice, and steps to credential completion.

Documentation shows communication structures allow the credential program and institution to regularly interact with Professional Learning and Support Division (PLSD), credential services, employing agencies, faculty, and program coaches (program supervisors). The executive director of EPP shares program information such as enrollment, completers, district partners, and budget information with the assistant superintendent of the PLSD. Program updates are shared annually with PLSD. Branch newsletters are shared weekly. Communication with coaches begins with orientation on the program along with ongoing assistance. Coaches receive 12 professional development sessions throughout the year and monthly coaching advisory meetings. Faculty meet to collaborate on courses and provide feedback via survey. Staff also meet with SCCOE Human Resources district directors and Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) multiple times a year to gather information and receive feedback. Coaches have described how helpful the trainings are and highlighted the support they receive from the coaching consultant.

The program obtains constituent inputs through various methods. The program has an advisory board which has direct contact with program leadership and meetings. Faculty, coaches, and district support providers (district-employed supervisor) have meetings, surveys, and one-on-one meetings with leadership. Input is also received from candidates through orientations, surveys, advisory meetings, and class sessions. Completers also provide input via survey and email. Candidates, instructors, and local administrators reported that candidates complete end of course surveys and data are used for reflection and focus to update and improve the program. Feedback and collaboration is ongoing across the faculty.

Over the last two years, the organization structure of the program changed. The MMSN and ESN program includes general education observations, tracking of multiple grade span experiences and a TPA training and tracking system. In addition, each course has developed focused outcomes on equity.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The coursework and fieldwork for the intern and accelerated pathway in the MMSN and ESN programs follows a developmental sequence before candidates begin their intern practicum. The intern program is two years, and the accelerated pathway (AP) is one year. Candidates receive foundational knowledge prior to entering the classroom and their knowledge is deepened throughout their internship around evidence-based and high leverage practices for inclusive classrooms. Candidates in both credential programs complete foundational courses together. In the intern program, the courses that differ are the Advanced Curriculum and Instruction courses for MMSN and ESN and literacy for MMSN and ESN. In the AP pathway, the ESN courses include literacy -ESN and Advanced Curriculum and Instruction ESN while the MMSN program has an advanced instruction course focused on Universal Design for Learning -, high-leverage practices, and evidence-based interventions. Faculty described the work they did to collaborate across courses to embed equity and ensure a developmental sequence. In

interviews, candidates praised the instructors of their courses and their coaches in the program for the knowledge shared and the support given.

The MMSN and ESN programs have specific literacy courses to prepare candidates to teach literacy to English Language Learners. District supervisors have also indicated that candidates are prepared to teach content in their classroom. Candidates state they feel prepared to teach content areas from their coursework. The program offers an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) symposium and embedded IEP content in courses. However, candidates and completers emphasized the need for additional preparation on how to write IEPs.

Courses include assignments which require that candidates' early fieldwork is coordinated with general education experiences during their first year. For their final field placements, candidates either come with an offer of employment or are connected with districts who are hired by the director/advisor. Field placements mainly include Resource Specialist Program and Special Day Class placements. Faculty and candidates reported that the courses make connections to clinical practice.

For field experiences, candidates receive direct support from their coaches. The coaches are available for individual meetings as well as group meetings. Coaches have individualized their support for candidates and that is reflected in candidates' discussion about the support provided by their coaches. Candidates struggling with coursework and/or clinical practice will seek their instructor, coach, advisor, or director for support. Candidates reported that the program is responsive in communication. The director and advisor also indicated that when candidates are struggling, the first point of contact is from the instructor and/or coach. Depending on the situation, the director and/or advisor will also provide support. District support is also available at the interns' school site, but interviews revealed that candidates were not consistently getting the minimum hours of weekly support. In addition, interviews revealed that district support providers did not consistently participate in collaboration on the development of the Individual Development Plan (IDP).

Data on coursework and clinical practice experiences are collected at the end of each course. The instructors and director review the data. At the beginning of each semester, the faculty also review the data to inform how to make changes in their coursework for continuous improvement. However, some faculty reported that they do not receive course feedback from the program on a regular basis and are thus unable to use data for continuous improvement. Interviews indicated that program staff look at the patterns in the CalTPA data to inform coaches on how to better support candidates.

### Assessment of Candidates

For both the intern program and the accelerated pathway, candidates complete formative and summative assessments in their courses. All candidates complete a disposition survey and reflection at the beginning and end of their internship to measure professional attitudes, values, and beliefs. Lastly, candidates complete the Education Specialist CalTPA. The stated

expectation is that all candidates complete a portfolio and an Individual Development Plan (IDP) with their coach, district support provider, and candidate supervisor.

For candidates who are struggling with assessments, the leadership team reported that typically candidates contact the instructor for support. The instructor or coach will support the candidate and depending on the situation, they will be referred to the leadership team for support. If candidates are not meeting standards for the courses, they may be placed on academic probation. Candidates who are struggling may also develop an Academic Success Action Plan (ASAP) with advisor and/or program leadership to meet the required competencies.

Candidates are informed about the required assessments at the beginning of their program. Candidates shared that they receive prompt answers when they reach out to those in their program regarding questions. With regards to advising, candidates had varying experiences with the advisement and assistance efforts. Interviewees indicated that while handbooks were provided, the CalTPA and some other program requirements were not clear at the beginning of their program. In addition, interviewees shared that there is not enough support in taking and passing the CalTPA. While sometimes mentioned during class, coursework did not include an organized, systemic, intentional approach to preparing candidates for success on the RICA or other required exams/assessments. In 2021-22, 100% of candidates passed the RICA: Written.

The SCCOE program uses the CalTPA model and the CalTPA coordinator is responsible for the oversight and coordination of the performance assessment. The CalTPA coordinator trains the coaches to support candidates on the CalTPA. Preparation for CalTPA is threaded throughout coursework and fieldwork. Candidates complete Cycle 1 in their first semester of their internship and Cycle 2 in the second semester of their internship.

Documents and interviews with program leadership indicate that candidates are made aware of the performance assessment requirement during intern orientation. Candidates receive materials through their learning platform, Canvas. Leadership shared that each candidate has a checklist and a student portal that includes information on the requirements at each stage of the credential program. The program is designed for coaches to provide support to the CalTPA for their candidates. The CalTPA coordinator will analyze the data to determine what codes and why candidates are not passing certain cycles to better support the candidates. Candidates who need additional support on the CalTPA will be provided support from the coach and a course to support the passage of the performance assessment.

Interviews revealed candidates did not consistently receive timely feedback on formative assessments and experiences preparatory to the TPA. Course alignments for the TPA for both the MMSN and ESN programs were provided. Interviewees reported a lack of communication and connection of the TPA requirement and integration into coursework to receive feedback to prepare for the TPA.

### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined Program Standard 2: Preparing Candidates to Master the Teaching Performance Expectations is met for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Intern Pathway program and the Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, Intern Pathway program. The team determined the following for the remaining standards:

#### **Standard 1: Program Design and Curriculum – Met with Concerns**

The MMSN and ESN intern and AP program offer an IEP symposium prior to their intern year and Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) case management in their courses. However, interviews revealed candidates and completers did not feel they were adequately prepared on how to write IEPs.

#### **Standard 3: Clinical Practice – Met with Concerns**

While district support is available to interns at their school sites, interviews revealed that candidates were not consistently getting the minimum hours of weekly support.

#### **Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress toward Meeting the Education Specialist Credential Requirements – Met with Concerns**

Candidates and completers indicated that while handbooks were provided, the CalTPA and some other program requirements were not clear at the beginning of their program. In addition, interviewees shared that there is not enough support in taking and passing the CalTPA. While sometimes mentioned during class, coursework did not include an organized, systemic, intentional approach to preparing candidates for success on the RICA or other required exams/assessments.

#### **Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment – Met with Concerns**

There are inconsistencies on Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment for evidence of providing candidates with timely feedback on formative assessments and experiences preparatory to the TPA. Course alignments for the TPA for both the MMSN and ESN programs were provided. Interviews with candidates revealed a lack of communication and connection of the TPA requirement and integration into coursework to receive feedback to prepare for the TPA.

#### **Standard 6: Induction Individual Development Plan – Met with Concerns**

The stated expectation is that all candidates complete a portfolio and an IDP with their coach, district support provider, and candidate supervisor. However, interviews revealed that district support providers did not consistently participate in collaboration on the development of the IDP.

## **Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, Intern Pathway**

### Program Design

The Preliminary Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Intern program offers two pathways for candidates. The first pathway is a two-year intern program. In year one, candidates take a developmentally appropriate sequence of courses providing them the foundation to build their instructional practices as they prepare for their teaching assignments. In year two, candidates obtain an intern teaching assignment where they are the teacher of record/case manager. Candidates enroll in coursework during year two that continues to extend their knowledge, skills, abilities, and instructional practices to support their teaching practices as an intern.

The accelerated pathway (AP) is available for candidates who already hold a clear education specialist credential allowing them to earn an ECSE authorization in an accelerated one-year program. Candidates with a preliminary credential and two years of verified teaching experience are also eligible to earn the ECSE authorization.

All education specialist programs, ECSE, MMSN, and ESN include a number of common courses and requirements. Many interviews included constituents from all three programs. Reviewers collaborated through interviews and evidence review during the visit.

The director of programs regularly interfaces with the Professional Learning and Support Division, credential services, employing agencies' Human Resources (HR), faculty, and coaches. The ECSE program leadership includes the director of programs, consulting director of Educator Workforce Pathways, consulting intern coach, and program advisor. The executive director also communicates with faculty and coaches as needed as indicated in interviews. Program description and interviews with leadership indicate ongoing departmental communication through scheduled meetings, email, virtual sessions, phone calls, in-the-moment, and in-person meetings.

The credential services department within SCCOE HR department is an integral part of the credentialing process. This department provides support for determining intern or preliminary credential eligibility and supports candidates in submitting required documents and providing clarity for credentialing questions and concerns.

Program leadership stated they attend and present necessary information and updates to SCCOE HR district directors and Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) meetings. These meetings give leadership the opportunity to answer questions, identify and address district needs, and solicit and receive feedback. Leadership also indicated that end of the year surveys are sent to HR directors and district administrators for needs assessment and feedback. If needed, communication also occurs via email, Zoom, phone calls, and in-person meetings. The EPP advisor also provides bi-monthly information meetings via Zoom and will conduct information meetings by appointment as requested.

Leadership reported that the program regularly communicates with constituents. They receive input from constituents via surveys and direct communication as needed. The program has an advisory board with whom they meet regularly to report on the program and receive input. Candidates, the program director of programs, and program advisor communicate via three mandatory orientation and advisement meetings over the course of two years. Candidates stated the need for clear communication regarding RICA requirements. Twice weekly, the program advisor offers drop-in office hours for candidates either in person or via Zoom.

Candidate interviews confirmed that ECSE program leadership are “very responsive” in their communication and most often answer calls and emails “within minutes”, generally within 24 hours. Interviews further indicated ongoing communication may extend to faculty, coaches, and candidates specifically in terms of orientation, advisement, and training. Input from faculty, coaches, candidates, and completers is solicited through the end of the course and yearly surveys for program improvement.

Coaches provide comprehensive support to ECSE interns in many aspects of their program and internship. The coaches and interns meet a minimum of one time weekly. Interviewees shared that communication between candidates and coaches is ongoing, through weekly meetings, phone calls, texts, and annotations in GoReact video observations. Orientation and training are provided to coaches to provide an overview of procedures, coaching techniques, role, expectations, Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs), GoReact, and program updates. Coaches stated that the training and ongoing support they receive from leadership and the coaching consultant supports them in successfully supporting their candidates. Coaches and candidates are usually matched within 30 days of the candidate internship. Often coaches are matched sooner and attend orientation with the candidates to support candidates in meeting the requirements of their internship and preliminary credential. Coaches matched with ECSE candidates have credentials and expertise in ECSE.

As confirmed in interviews, ECSE coaches also serve as faculty and consultants to provide candidates knowledge and experience in collaboratively working with children birth-age three, colleagues, families, and in settings to gain a better understanding of family perspectives and needs and to meet the TPEs. Leadership and coaches confirmed that coaches receive 12 professional development sessions throughout the coaching year. Further, coaches are able to meet with leadership as needed to support them in working with candidates. Coaches communicate with site administrators and mentors a minimum of once yearly to set and reflect upon goals to support the candidates in their teaching practices.

Faculty participate in online training four times yearly. Overall program information and changes are shared with faculty by program leadership at the beginning of each training. Faculty then work in teams to discuss curriculum scope and sequence, needed changes to syllabi in terms of relevant assignments, evidence-based practices, signature assignments, etc. are completed during the team meetings. Faculty continue to collaborate after the team meetings as needed. Faculty expressed leadership was responsive in their communication with any needed questions, concerns, or needed support. It was further reported that collaborative

faculty teams ensure consistency and that all candidates receive a similar experience in obtaining the knowledge, skills, and abilities to best serve ECSE students. Yearly surveys are sent to faculty to solicit anonymous program feedback. Faculty have regularly scheduled office hours for candidates to provide support on assignments. Frequent and sequential feedback is given to candidates on assignments. ECSE faculty ensure that candidates have the opportunity to solicit help on assignments as well as the opportunity to “fix” them as needed to learn and grow in their practice. Candidates reported that the ECSE faculty were flexible and understood that family or other emergencies may interfere with coursework and worked with candidates when such emergencies occurred. The candidates also discussed the consistent support they received from faculty and that some of the ECSE professors will “be friends forever” and told the candidates “even after the class or when we graduated that if we had any questions or needed help to reach out to them.”

In addition to the professional development sessions throughout the year, coaches attend semi-monthly themed coaches’ advisory meetings. During regularly scheduled coaches’ meetings, they receive information, and have their questions answered, concerning coaching, documents their participating teachers need to fill out and any technical issues they may have.

To assure alignment with Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards, program leadership initially review all ECSE credential program syllabi and approve any revisions to syllabi or texts. In addition, faculty collaborate in course-alike groups to assure consistency across course sections. For these reasons, teacher candidates all receive a similar experience. During regularly scheduled faculty meetings, instructors meet in course and topic area groups to discuss the texts, updates in the field, curriculum, assignments, and other agenda items. Faculty can provide program feedback via an anonymous survey as well. As needed, one-to-one communication happens casually or by arrangement through email, virtual sessions, in-person meetings, and phone calls.

Following the program review in the fall of 2022, the program has undergone significant transformations. In Fall 2022, the program consisted of five staff members; presently, it has expanded to include 15 members, and this growth is ongoing. Responding to feedback from the program review, the ECSE program restructured its approach to handbooks, ensuring that each program has a comprehensive handbook shared with candidates and district partners. This restructuring involved aligning every standard directly with evidence, as detailed in the comprehensive evidence shared with the site visit team.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

In year one, candidates take a developmentally appropriate sequence of courses prior to the internship experience. This structure provides the foundation for the intern to build their instructional practices to prepare them for their teaching assignments. In year two, these candidates obtain an intern teaching assignment where they are the teacher of record/case manager. Year two and AP candidates continue to be enrolled in year two coursework that extends their knowledge, skills, abilities, and instructional practices to support their teaching practices as an intern.



The program developed an Equity Matrix to outline Equity Focused Outcomes and current research articles for each course as well as embedded equity into assignments and/or activities. Course-alike faculty groups collectively agreed upon the final assignment or activity. The Equity Focused Outcomes, research articles, activities and assignments are included in all syllabi.

The ECSE credential program provides a developmentally appropriate sequence of courses prior to the internship experience. This structure provides the foundation for the intern to build their instructional practices once they are the teacher of record. Candidates receive foundational knowledge prior to entering the classroom in their first year of the program based upon research, evidence-based, and high leverage inclusive practices. This knowledge and practices are deepened throughout their internship. Candidates described they feel prepared to teach in the content areas from their coursework and expertise of their professors and coaches, “I don’t worry, and feel confident to do the job” Further, completers indicated that, “this program was amazing!”, if you want to earn a credential go to SCCOE!”

Faculty described the work they did to collaborate across classes to embed equity and ensure classes have a developmental sequence. The program offers IEP symposiums and embedded IEP content in courses. However, candidates and completers described the need for additional preparation on how to explicitly write Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) as they did not feel adequately prepared for their job in this area.

District support providers reported candidates seemed to be prepared to teach content in their classroom. Although district support is available to interns at their school sites, interviews revealed that candidates were not consistently getting the minimum hours of weekly support.

Courses are generally eight weeks in length and include developmentally appropriate practices to support ECSE TPEs. Assignments, field experiences, and opportunities to observe and/or participate in multiple grade bands, general education, special education, and inclusive settings are embedded throughout the coursework.

To begin an internship, candidates must first submit proof of qualified employment. Qualified employment must meet fieldwork requirements. For interns this means ensuring placement in a public school in a diverse setting with regards to race, ethnicity, languages spoken, the inclusion of students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), and diversity of social-economic status. School sites must also have a qualified school administrator. School sites may be either public or independent schools that the California Department of Education (CDE) has approved for placement of public-school students who need support services. Sites should demonstrate placement of students with disabilities in the LRE, provide support for dual language learners with disabilities, and offer the opportunity for candidates to observe and interact with different populations of student groups in both general, special education, and inclusive settings reflecting the continuum of placement options. The program changed the amount of clinical observations of interns to 12 times over the course of the year through

GoReact to ensure that course content pertaining to the TPEs is being applied within the intern's teaching clinical practice.

To ensure that ECSE candidates receive experience with a variety of ages, they are required to complete assignments, fieldwork and clinical practice in co-planning or co-teaching for different aged students outside of their current classroom/caseload. In their infant and toddler field work course, ECSE candidates receive experiences in 0-3, Kindergarten and preschool. In their internship, candidates are also given five release days to observe and gain experience in a range of settings, different age groups, grade levels, and with students with a range of disabilities.

The program collects survey data on coursework and clinical practice experiences at the end of each course. The instructors and director are expected to review the data to inform continuous program and course improvement. During interviews, however, some faculty reported that course feedback is not consistently shared with them, leaving them unaware of necessary improvements.

#### Assessment of Candidates

Candidates in both the regular intern program and the accelerated pathway participate in formative and summative assessments in their courses. All candidates complete a portfolio and an Individual Development Plan (IDP) with their program coach. According to documents provided, the IDP should be completed with the candidate, the coach, and district support provider. However, interviews with candidates revealed that collaboration on the development of the IDP with the candidate, coach, and district support provider is inconsistent. All candidates also complete a disposition survey and reflection at the beginning and end of their internship to measure professional attitudes, values, and beliefs. ECSE candidates are also required to complete the RICA for the new ECSE credential, however, interviews indicated that conflicting information is provided by leadership, making assessment requirements for the ECSE credential unclear.

According to the leadership team, candidates who are struggling with course assessments typically contact the instructor for support. The instructor or coach will support the candidate and depending on the situation, they will be referred to the leadership team for support. If candidates are not meeting standards in courses, they may be placed on academic probation. Candidates who are struggling may also develop an Academic Success Action Plan (ASAP) with their advisor and/or program leadership to meet the required competencies.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined Program Standard 2: Preparing Candidates to Master the Teaching Performance Expectations and Program Standard 5: Assessment of Candidate Competency are met for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education Intern program. The team determined the following for the remaining standards:

### **Standard 1: Program Design and Curriculum – Met with Concerns**

The ECSE program offers an IEP symposium prior to their intern year and Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) case management in their courses. However, interviews revealed candidates and completers did not feel they were adequately prepared on how to write IEPs as a part of their internship.

### **Standard 3: Clinical Practice – Met with Concerns**

While district support is available to interns at their school sites, interviews revealed that candidates were not consistently getting the minimum hours of weekly support.

### **Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress toward Meeting the Education Specialist Credential Requirements – Met with Concerns**

Candidates and completers indicated that while handbooks were provided, some program requirements were not clear at the beginning of their program. While sometimes mentioned during class, coursework did not include an organized, systemic, intentional approach to preparing candidates for success on the RICA.

### **Standard 6: Induction Individual Development Plan – Met with Concerns**

The stated expectation is that all candidates complete a portfolio and an IDP with their coach, district support provider, and candidate supervisor. However, interviews revealed that district support providers did not consistently participate in collaboration on the development of the IDP.

## **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential**

### **Program Design**

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program is part of the EPP department and, like all other programs, is led by the executive director. Internal communication between the leadership team and the program involves a range of structured interactions. These include quarterly leadership team and division meetings; bi-monthly Executive Leadership meetings; bi-weekly department meetings; bi-monthly one-on-one supervisory meetings, focusing on individual staff goals; faculty meetings that take place three times per year; annual course-specific faculty meetings; semi-annual EPP Advisory Board convening; and the EWP Consortium meeting three times a year. Communication also occurs often through unstructured interactions (i.e. emails, phone calls, impromptu meetings, etc.) between and among fieldwork supervisors (CalAPA supporters), coaches, faculty, coordinators, directors, and the executive director. Open, responsive, and positive communication between program leadership and staff was confirmed in interviews. The EPP department communicates internally its yearly goals and objectives to the assistant superintendent of instruction who presents the information to Cabinet, and the county superintendent.

The PASC program fosters external communication with constituents through a snapshot of program offerings posted on the program website, alumni portals, and on social media. Ongoing communication with external partners, school districts, and institutions of higher

education (IHEs) occurs informally as well and is primarily facilitated by existing professional and personal relationships that program staff have with local institutions, and professional organizations. The program provides opportunities for candidate feedback on their experience taking courses through end-of-course surveys, and this data is discussed by faculty for validation of program practices and continuous improvement. Faculty collaborate on curriculum modifications needed due to changes in educational trends and policy. During interviews a strong sense of collegiality between faculty members was evident. Faculty shared their appreciation for “thought partnership” when they collaborate, even in light of the “creative tensions” between the veteran and newly hired faculty. One faculty member noted the LEAP faculty strive to “develop scholar practitioners whose decisions are based on theory”.

Over the last two years, there have not been any significant program modifications. However, there have been changes to leadership and candidate growth of the PASC Program.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The 11-month accelerated online program consists of six required courses and fieldwork through required CalAPA assignments. The courses cover a broad range of topics aligned to the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs). Candidates may enter the program either in the fall or spring with courses offered online. The program is designed flexibly so that candidates can select which cohort they are assigned to based on the days of the week they can commit to attending courses. Each cohort follows the same course sequence and allows enrollment from candidates across the state of California. Candidates are assigned their fieldwork supervisor based on their cohort selection. Candidates are able to switch cohorts but remain assigned to their fieldwork supervisor unless they request otherwise. Candidates meet with their fieldwork supervisor as a cohort, in small groups, and one-on-one meetings to receive CalAPA support.

During interviews candidates expressed that small group discussion and collaboration in courses among peers in the program broadened their perspectives on topics discussed in courses. Further, faculty create many opportunities for reflection with one candidate sharing “I am getting access to understanding other ways of being an administrator which I have never really thought about”. However, some candidates and completers who are in county office or district office roles felt the instructional materials and content of courses could be made more applicable to them. Faculty plan for guest speakers to share their experiences in the field and candidates have expressed this has greatly enriched their experience in the program.

The lead fieldwork supervisor is responsible for the oversight and coordination of the CalAPA and fieldwork supervisor assignments. The lead monitors candidate progress toward CalAPA submission. Fieldwork supervisors have expressed great appreciation they have received from the lead regarding timeliness of feedback and supports to keep candidates on track for a successful submission. Over the last year, LEAP faculty have restructured portions of course curriculum and assignments to better align with cycles of the CalAPA; particularly by integrating assignments in the end of program courses that align to Cycle 3 of the CalAPA. As evidenced by interviews, the program philosophy has been that the CalAPA submissions are managed by

fieldwork supervisors whereas course assignments are assessed for proficiency by faculty. At the discretion of faculty members, Cycle 1 and 2 CalAPA support is offered as part of coursework.

During interviews, candidates and completers shared that LEAP faculty and fieldwork supervisors were incredibly accommodating of late submissions and making up courses on alternate days. During interviews candidates shared that “reaching out to professors is so easy” and that fieldwork supervisors “help so much.” Informal support for coursework and fieldwork is provided to candidates from staff on an ongoing basis. Formally, candidates may receive support by submitting an appeals document found on the program website. Candidates who need extensive support to pass the CalAPA after attempting to do so are placed in the Completer Course which is designed to adjust to the specific needs of each candidate based on the performance assessment, and their particular area of concern. A fieldwork supervisor facilitates the Completer Course and meets with candidates individually to address their specific program needs.

The program collects data from candidates at the end of each course, and LEAP faculty use the survey results to make modifications to courses after engaging in discussion with their faculty colleagues. Fieldwork supervisors communicate with the lead fieldwork supervisor, and any feedback for program improvements is then communicated to the director.

#### Assessment of Candidates

In both coursework and fieldwork, candidates are assessed for competence in the California Administrative Program Standards (CAPS) and the California Administrative Performance Expectations (CAPEs). In each of the six courses, candidates must complete three to four assignments - one of which is a signature assignment - that indicate competence in the standards. These assignments are graded by the course instructor, and candidates must pass each course with at least a B grade or repeat the course the following year for a passing grade. Courses utilize holistic rubrics to determine an evaluative score on course assessments. Candidates participate in the CalAPA for the program’s fieldwork component. A passing score on the CalAPA is required for a Certificate of Eligibility recommendation.

Candidates are introduced to program assessments during their initial program orientation. Candidates learn about CalAPA submission criteria and how to receive assistance with completing the program after a cohort meeting with their assigned fieldwork supervisor. Course assessment details are provided on course syllabi shared by LEAP faculty and housed on Canvas. Documented evidence and interviews showed that LEAP faculty were available to support candidates on course assessments, and candidates felt well supported in asking for assistance if needed.

The program provides candidates multiple opportunities to show evidence of standards mastery, and these opportunities include engaging in course assessments and reflections and completing the CalAPA. Candidates shared during interviews that there wasn’t “a specific mold” the faculty members fit in. They also shared that the breadth of faculty administrative

experience and depth of their knowledge as practitioners further enriched and shaped their experience in the program.

Candidates meet with field supervisors twice a month as a group, and occasionally one-on-one to discuss CalAPA submission timelines and for candidates to receive support on this mandated assessment prior to submission. Candidates and completers shared during interviews that both faculty and field supervisors vary in their ability to organize course content and/or CalAPA resources within the Canvas platform, with some information being presented “like opening an unorganized drive” with inaccurate labeling and dates. Candidates shared that they appreciated their fieldwork supervisors and felt that clarity on the Canvas platform would help them better understand what is required of them. Candidates also expressed during interviews occasionally “disjointed” and disorganized scheduling of meetings with their fieldwork supervisors. Although there was an expressed need for more platform organization, candidates and completers spoke very highly of both LEAP faculty and fieldwork supervisor support, and care for their wellbeing and success in the program.

Reviewers found program standard eight to be met however during interviews, staff across the program shared a lack of understanding regarding how the CalAPA is graded and perceived “subjectivity of scores” has created conflict among candidates, fieldwork supervisors, and faculty resulting in a “major” concern among all regarding how candidates can best be successful on this mandated assessment. Candidates expressed during interviews their lack of understanding regarding how CalAPA submissions are graded.

The data dashboard shows that candidates are successful in passing the CalAPA (94% in 2022-23) although documented evidence and interviews indicated that candidates are inconsistently supported on the CalAPA in their courses, and that faculty rarely collaborate with fieldwork supervisors on curriculum development and alignment. Candidates who were supported with the CalAPA in their courses shared during interviews that they felt better prepared to complete the CalAPA and appreciated the opportunity to experience coursework that also aligned with CalAPA submission requirements. Faculty shared during interviews that there has been a recent and intentional effort to better align the CalAPA to program coursework.

#### 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, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program.

### **Clear Administrative Services Credential**

#### Program Design

The Leaders in Education Administration Program (LEAP) Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC) is an individualized, job-embedded, two-year program that new administrators start within one year of starting in an initial administrative position. The CASC

program is built and customized to each candidate's work needs and responsibilities. Candidates examine data to reflect and determine the next steps in their progress as an essential process with their team which includes the coach and the candidate's supervisor. The process includes reflecting and focusing on best practices.

The CASC program has recently experienced leadership changes. The lead coach stepped away from the position and it was filled by an employee who left the organization in less than a year. The previous lead coach returned to bring stability to the program until a permanent coordinator position can be filled. The role of the lead coach is to communicate effectively and directly with the coaches for coach training, planning networking sessions and professional development seminars, and supporting candidates with their Individualized Leadership Plan (ILP). The lead coach communicates to EPP leadership and the institution regarding candidate progress and program completion.

A major component of the design of the LEAP CASC program is the relationship between the candidate and their coach. Coaches communicate with their assigned candidate formally and informally on an ongoing basis for just-in-time support, and for coaching once every two weeks for a total of 40 hours per year. Coaching sessions are focused on both the candidate's growth in their ILP goals and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (CPSELs). Coaches build a foundation of trust with candidates in order to inform and guide them in developing and meeting their professional growth goals in leadership competencies. Coaches spend time discussing with candidates how they will be assessed and evaluated in relation to program competencies, and guide candidates through a cyclic process (i.e. plan, act, evaluate, and reflect) for each growth goal.

CASC coaches are veteran and retired education administrators who, as one coach commented in interviews, are "a high level group": an understatement of the combined wealth of leadership experience and administrator development skills of this coaching team. Coaches continue engaging in improving their skills noting that "coaching is a continuing growth process: the more you do it, the better you get." Coaches have participated in extensive training in cognitive coaching and independently seek out professional learning in current educational trends, the latest research, and changes to policy. During interviews, the coaches expressed a deep appreciation for the expertise and leadership of the lead coach. This group collaborates on recruiting more "outstanding people" in the county who are ready to retire and want to use their skills to cultivate future leaders. Coaches regularly seek input directly from their assigned candidates regarding their effectiveness in providing support, and the lead coach provides candidates the opportunity to provide feedback regarding seminar and networking topics.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates are matched to coaches by the lead coach who considers the background of the coach and role of the candidate prior to determining a pairing. Interviews showed that candidates overwhelmingly appreciated their coaches with one candidate stating, "I absolutely adore my coach." When paired, candidates develop goals on their work context and feedback from coaches. All six CPSELs are addressed in the program with the first three goals being

aligned to the first three standards, and the second year's goals being aligned to standards four through six. Coaches help tailor standards to county office work, and other roles not in K-12 schools, and candidates are required to obtain a signature from their supervisor approving the goals. The coach acts as a guide in helping candidates interpret the language of the CSPELs, and provides an ongoing formative evaluation, tracking progress through coaching sessions, candidate self-evaluations, and the use of a holistic, four-point rating scale.

In addition to coaching to obtain standards proficiency, candidates participate in four seminars and five networking meetings each year. Seminars start with a guest speaker that addresses one of the challenges a new administrator faces. The candidates take a survey to provide input on the selection of the seminar topics, and these individualized sessions offer specific tools that candidates can implement to improve their practice. The seminars are followed by a debriefing meeting led by a coach with specific guiding discussion questions. The networking meetings are facilitated by small groups of candidates who are asked to identify a concern they are struggling with and discuss with the group solutions. Networking sessions offer administrators a chance to connect with other administrators in job-alike groups and provide a platform for exchanging ideas, resources, and opportunities for growth.

Candidates are provided the opportunity to provide feedback to program leadership through a survey at the end of each program year. Further, each candidate completes a reflection on their experiences in attending the program as one of their projects. Coaches meet with the lead coach who provides ample opportunity for informal feedback. Additionally, coaches are asked to take a survey to indicate the efficacy of the support they receive from the program as well as offer suggestions for improvement. During interviews, employers expressed a strong desire to co-create goals with the candidate and coach for the opportunity to better connect with candidate learning.

#### Assessment of Candidates

All candidates are monitored and supported in their performance by their coaches to ensure they are progressing toward meeting program requirements. Candidates must maintain an online portfolio of their work as candidates including their work context, up to date ILP, evidence of practice, assessment of proficiencies, and reflections based on the CPSEL. Candidate performance and portfolios are evaluated by coaches. Coaches are readily available to support candidates and have an excellent track record with rare cases of candidates not completing the program. Upon program completion, the lead coach utilized the candidate's portfolio to provide final verification of a candidate's ability to demonstrate the administrative and operational knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to effectively lead, manage, and improve educational organizations.

#### 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, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Clear Administrative Services Credential Program.



## Teacher Induction

### Program Design

The EPP's Teacher Induction program leadership consists of a director who is also responsible for all other preliminary and clear programs, a coaching consultant who provides training for the coaches (mentors) who provide support for all candidates, and one advisor who supports candidates with credentialing.

The program leadership, program director, coach consultant, and coaches communicate and coordinate within their program directly as needed. The coach consultant and induction coaches can connect with the program director at any time, and all expressed that the program director is responsive and supportive. There are opportunities for regular communication among candidates, coaches and the program throughout the year. Interviews with candidates and completers revealed program requirements and expectations were clear from orientation and from the ongoing support of their coach.

Candidates meet twice a year during "Network Meetings" in which they receive logistical program information, professional learning and the opportunity to connect with their job-like peers. This is evident in documentation and confirmed via interviews. Completers spoke to the value of meeting in job alike teams where they shared similar experiences, challenges, goals and steps in the inquiry cycle.

Documents revealed and interviews confirmed that the coaches are the primary support and guide for candidates. When candidates are unclear about anything related to the program, they contact their coach who will either respond or connect with the program director. Interviews with candidates and coaches confirmed that coaches and candidates have a strong reciprocal relationship. Candidates expressed their appreciation for their coach's mindset and practice in genuinely supporting the teacher with their needs and goals in an authentic manner. Some completers felt their coaches were "very supportive" and they "never felt alone." Some candidates expressed that their coaches are "great listeners," they feel "safe to make mistakes," and the "emphasis is on relationships."

The induction program mentoring design is based on adult learning theory, social justice, equity, and coaching practices rooted in Cognitive Coaching and Learning Focused Relationships. All coaches are initially provided with program information, coaching skills and resources during a beginning of the year orientation.

According to documentation and the interview with the program director, new coaches attend six coaches forums (trainings) and returning coaches attend two trainings, though there were inconsistencies noted in coaches' actual experiences. Interviews with the coaching consultant and coaches confirmed that all coaches attend an orientation, but new coaches attended only four additional sessions equaling five for the year and returning coaches attend one additional session equaling two for the year.

Interviews with coaches indicated that they have access to professional development both on specific coaching skills and on self-selected topics. Coaches reported feeling supported in their professional learning and when seeking insight on questions and/or concerns with their candidates. Candidates and coaches stated that they have flexibility in how they connect either meeting weekly or every other week for longer periods of time. Coaches are not at the same school site or district, so they connect via a combination of in person, Zoom, phone, or email.

There is strong evidence from program documents and interviews that coaches collaborate with their candidate to develop their ILP to address the connection with their pre-service work, teaching context, administrator input, and self-assessment. Candidates and coaches conveyed appreciation for a program design that allows flexibility in how they demonstrate progress in their reflection on the ILP. For example, the program provides a pacing guide with suggested windows in which candidates may complete their inquiry cycles and ILPs connected to CSTPs throughout their two-year induction experience. Pacing is monitored both by the candidate and coach using a checklist. Candidates shared during interviews that they appreciated the suggested pacing provided by the program, timeline reminders from their coaches, and the flexibility to customize pacing of completing ILPs and inquiry cycles along with CSTP standard selection based on their need. Because both the coach and candidate have this flexibility candidates and coaches felt the goal development, feedback from the coaches on a candidate's demonstration of CSTPs via a recorded lesson, and their one-to-one conversations with each other were relevant to the teacher's current need and practice. Candidates felt time invested in writing reflections, submitting videos and assignments, was impactful and relevant to their current need.

The program has had staff augmentations and changes since Fall of 2022. Equity has been threaded throughout all programs as outlined in the Equity Matrix and demonstrated through a recent book study done with coaches on *Coaching for Equity*. Interviews with coaches confirmed that equity is evident and incorporated into their practice as coaches. One coach shared, "You know when programs say they do equity, they (EPP) really do."

Based on feedback about the observation process, the program adapted to allow observations to take place either in person or GoReact.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Coaches are matched with candidates based on their credential type as verified in their application. When there is not an exact credential match a "peer coach" who offers content/credential specific support is provided in addition to the primary coach. The program monitors the credential match among candidates and coaches through a teachers/coaches spreadsheet. Interviews with candidates and completers revealed there were some education specialist candidates matched with a coach with a general education credential.

The candidate develops their professional growth goals on their ILP based on their context analysis, induction transition plan, and triad meeting with their site administrator along with the support of their coach. Goals are established in the fall and candidates collect evidence of

progress toward the goal through the end of fall. In the spring candidates discuss the mid-year goals with their coach.

Coaches provide candidates with feedback about progress toward their selected goals a minimum of three times throughout the year as it relates to their three cycles of inquiry. Candidates are required to be observed in relation to their three cycles of inquiry. These formal observations are often recorded lessons that candidates upload to GoReact, a tool embedded within Canvas. Based on interviews with candidates and coaches, coaches consistently and regularly provide feedback to candidates about their progress toward meeting their self-selected goals.

The program relies on the coaches to monitor and evaluate a candidate's completion of program requirements using the induction candidate evaluation checklist at the end of each year. The checklist has a signature verification space for the coach and candidate. In interviews, the program director and coaches conveyed they reach out to the program director if they have a concern with a candidate's progress.

At the end of a teacher's first year, the coach may review the program requirements with the candidate to ensure they are on track to meet requirements within the two-year program. If a coach observes that a candidate may need additional support, they reach out to the program director.

At the end of a candidate's two-year program, a coach other than the one assigned to the candidate reviews and evaluates their final portfolio.

Candidates are provided opportunities for professional learning and support opportunities twice a year, through two networking sessions as indicated on the program pacing document. Attendance at the networking sessions was verified by the program director, candidates, and completers. In interviews, completers expressed the value they found in networking with colleagues in the job-alike settings.

Coaches and candidates confirmed in interviews that they were asked to complete an end of year survey, however it is unclear how many actually complete it or how the program uses the data collected. Outside of the end of year survey, it appears there is no institutionalized process for collecting input from coaches and candidates on a regular basis about their experience or the program. The team was unable to identify clear evidence of how the program seeks feedback from employers about the effectiveness of the program.

### Assessment of Candidates

The program relies on the coaches to monitor and evaluate a candidate's completion of meeting program requirements using the induction candidate evaluation checklist at the end of each year. There does not appear to be a system in which EPP program staff or leaders monitor a candidate's progress throughout the year or review the induction candidate evaluation checklist outside of the coach's analysis.

The program relies on the coach to monitor and inform the program of candidates who are not making progress. If a coach has a concern about a candidate's progress, they contact the program director to share their concerns. At this point the candidate will remain in the program and the program director will outline specific targeted goals which will be monitored by their coach.

From interviews with the program director and candidates, candidates are informed about how they will be assessed and evaluated in relation to program competencies during orientation. However, during interviews with candidates and completers, there were gaps among the group to the degree in which candidates felt they were clearly informed about this process.

Outside of the end of year survey, it is unclear how the program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates. There is no evidence of how the induction program leaders provide formative feedback to coaches on their work.

Based on documentation and interviews with the program director, candidates, and coaches, there is strong evidence of a system of support through collaboration, communication and coordination between candidates and coaches. The program uses MOUs and triad meetings as a way of providing a coherent overall system of support.

The program relies on the coaches to document candidate progress of their learning and professional growth goals on the ILP by reviewing and providing feedback to their candidate. The program has a set pacing guide for both the candidate and coach in which the three inquiry cycles need to be completed and reviewed, but it is up to the coach to ensure that the ILP is completed and reviewed at these recommended pacing windows.

Based on documents and interviews, coaches are responsible for verifying candidates have satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements throughout the two-year program. The program sponsor's process for verifying evidence of a candidate's growth and progress relies on reviewing a completed induction candidate evaluation checklist signed by both the candidate and coach. The team was unable to find a documented verification process that includes a defensible process of reviewing documentation prior to the Induction program's recommendation. The team did not find convincing evidence that the program sponsor reviews the induction candidate evaluation checklist provided by the coach and the work underlying the completed checklist.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews candidates, completers, coaches, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Teacher Induction Program except for the following:

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

Although there is a process for the coach to verify that the candidate has completed all requirements, there is no convincing evidence that prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear credential, the induction program sponsor verifies that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements.

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

The team was unable to find evidence that coaches are receiving formative feedback on their work or that the program is regularly assessing the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates.

**INSTITUTION SUMMARY**

The EPP department serves as the credentialing body for the SCCOE. Within the organizational structure of the SCCOE, the EPP resides within the PLSD. SCCOE serves as the Local Education Agency (LEA) for six commission-approved professional preparation programs: Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Intern; Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs, Intern; Preliminary Education Specialist: Early Childhood Special Education, Intern; Preliminary Administrative Services Credential; Clear Administrative Services Credential; Teacher Induction; and are newly approved to offer the Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential, Intern program (approved January 25, 2024).

EPP department staff are committed to providing a high-quality educational experience that not only builds technical skills, but also emphasizes the relational skills and consistent equity practices necessary to make a positive impact for all candidates and the students they serve. The superintendent of SCCOE shared, “We intentionally and strategically thread equity and inclusion through all of our programs, it is embedded through everything we do ...we need to have (these practices) everywhere all of the candidates are.” Interviews with each constituent group strongly supported this as a core tenet of all programs. The Equity Matrix was frequently cited as exemplifying their coordinated efforts.

The EPP has recently undergone substantial expansion. The institution has added staff and reorganized to meet the needs of the growing programs. Additionally, EPP has made program documents and contacts for each program available online. As they face the need to rebuild clear communication pathways the program director has been acknowledged as an essential key in the process, with every group interviewed citing her accessibility as well as her willingness and ability to assist. District partners noted their appreciation for the number of teachers and administrators the program contributes to fill positions to serve the needs of their students, as well as taking their needs into account when developing new programs.

Key to all of the programs is the support integrated throughout each program. All staff interviewed shared their passion for being there for the candidates they work with and to prepare them comprehensively for what is ahead of them.

## COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
a. Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<b><i>No response needed</i></b>
b. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>
c. The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	<b>Consistently</b>
d. 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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
e. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>
f. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>
g. Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	<b>Consistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
h. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>
i. The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

### **Finding on Common Standard 1: Met**

#### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

The SCCOE EPP department supports teachers and administrators in their programs, providing a research-based vision of teaching and learning, with an emphasis on equity. Feedback is sought through surveys and meetings. The advisory board, which includes representation across constituent groups, consists of members with extensive experience and relationships with the broader educational community. Some faculty and instructional personnel also collaborate with colleagues outside of SCCOE, however, there is inconsistency across groups. The institution provides the unit with the authority, support, and resources for the operation of all educator preparation programs through dedicated base revenue supplemented by grants. Recently, funding was allocated to increase the number of staff to alleviate the current workload. Hiring and retention of faculty, coaches, staff, and candidates who represent and support diversity and excellence is cited as a high priority. Interviews highlighted the dedication of SCCOE, including their Educator Workforce Pathways team, to recruiting in diverse arenas, accessing grants and donations to support recruiting for multiple aspects of diversity, removing barriers to their entry into and completion of educational pathways. They also aid in retention, including assignment of coaches to help navigate unfamiliar systems.

Surveys from the accreditation data dashboard indicate that demographic data is shifting to become more diverse. For example, 47% of those enrolled identified as non-white in 15-16, increasing to 62.6% in 21-22. Faculty diversity has also increased with those identifying as Black or African American increasing from 0% in 17-18 to 29% in 23-24. The effectiveness of the SCCOE EPP in hiring qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development and

provide coaching was apparent. SCCOE demonstrated a credential recommendation process which assesses completion of program and state requirements, however, there were some inconsistencies in having a defensible process that includes program sponsor validation of evidence prior to recommendation for the credential.

<b>Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
a. Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
b. The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	<b>Consistently</b>
c. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>
d. Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
e. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>

### **Finding on Common Standard 2: Met**

#### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

The SCCOE has a comprehensive system of recruitment and support across its credential programs. Application and enrollment information is clear to potential candidates through the SCCOE website, flyers, conference attendance, and twice-monthly information sessions. As evidenced by interviews, the program advisor meets with potential candidates to determine the course of study that best meets their educational goals.

The SCCOE engages in a robust recruitment effort to diversify the educational pool in California, including a large social media presence and extensive grant opportunities intended to attract candidates who might not otherwise be able to afford the costs associated with earning a teaching credential. In an interview with the EWP team, it was shared that some of the grants include a stipend for living expenses to ease the burden of maintaining full-time employment while completing coursework. The team also shared that certain scholarships are advertised to



school districts in lower socioeconomic areas to attract individuals from the community to enter the field of education for a combined total of “65% of the classified grant awardees [being] Hispanic/Latinx.”

In interviews across programs, candidates expressed favorable relationships with faculty, coaches, mentors, or fieldwork supervisors. “My fieldwork supervisor was flexible, available, and one I could always go to for support” exemplifies a pattern of comments from across the interviews. Candidates shared that information about their progress was clear to them and they understood their next steps in order to progress in the program. Coaches shared they are available to candidates “wherever and whenever they need us for support.” Some examples they shared about their support to candidates includes “office hours, weekly sessions to support candidates with the CalAPA, individually and collectively, timely feedback on rubrics to help guide student success. We’re available by email, text, or call for any need candidates have.”

While evidence was found across all programs that appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements, interviews revealed a lack of communication and understanding of roles exists among some of the school site supervisors.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
a. 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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
b. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>
c. 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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
d. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
e. Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	<b>Consistently</b>
f. The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	<b>Consistently</b>
g. Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
h. All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	<b>Consistently</b>
i. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>

### **Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns**

#### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

Programs across SCCOE provided evidence of a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills relevant to their credential area. The 2022-23 California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Completer Surveys for the Education Specialist, Preliminary Administrative Services, and Clear Administrative Services programs asked whether field-based experiences enabled participants to apply what they learned in their coursework. In the Education Specialist program, 95% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed, slightly above the statewide average of 91%. However, for the Preliminary Administrative Credential program, only 53% agreed, which is significantly lower than the 86% statewide agreement. The Clear Administrative Services program's effectiveness in preparing educational leaders was rated at 86%, below the statewide average of 94%. Additionally, interviews with various constituents confirmed that SCCOE's educator preparation programs are well-structured, offering both coursework and field experiences to foster professional growth. Despite the Preliminary Administrative Credential program's lower ratings, feedback from both completers and candidates highlighted the supportive role of coaches. One candidate noted that their coach provided "great advice and a good ear."

Review of documents and interviews conducted with program coordinators, district employed supervisors (district support providers), and SCCOE field supervisors (coaches) confirmed all programs have processes in place for ensuring district employed supervisors are certified and experienced in their relevant credential area. However, interviews with district support

providers indicated they are trained in their supervisory role, but not evaluated by the program. In addition, interviews with constituents indicated that there was little collaboration or communication with the program regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites. The consensus in the interview was that the collaboration involved the program providing candidates for employment.

Documentation and interviews confirm that the programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to experience issues of diversity that affect school climate. A clear example of this is the work they have done with equity in their programs.

Candidates in the intern, induction, and administrative programs receive support from their coaches. The courses that the interns are taking are tied into their work in the classroom. Through multiple interviews it is confirmed that they put into practice what they are learning in their classes. Constituent groups confirmed that surveys are used for evaluation, however the data was not available to the reviewers due to technical issues with the platform.

#### **Rationale for the Finding**

Constituent interviews related to the Education Specialist Programs revealed lack of collaboration and understanding of roles and expectations among district support providers, district level administrators, and human resource directors. In addition, all district support providers indicated that they were unaware of program requirements, and the evaluation component of the program. During interviews, coaches for the CASC program indicated that there is no formalized training.

<b>Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
a. 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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
b. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>
c. 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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
d. 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.	<b>Inconsistently</b>

## **Finding on Common Standard 4: Met with Concerns**

### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

Based on review of documents and interviews, it is clear that the SCCOE has developed surveys for the effectiveness of their programs. However, it was not evident that survey data was shared across programs, nor was it used to inform a comprehensive continuous improvement process or used to identify unit effectiveness or make appropriate modifications based on that data. There was no evidence that assessment data is consistently analyzed to help make program improvement decisions. Interviews did confirm that the program responds immediately to candidate and constituent concerns when they are raised and that individual program assessment activities are more likely to grow organically out of each programs' concerns. Interviews across multiple constituent groups emphasized how change was primarily driven by those concerns and perceptions. For example, when surveyed, Education Preparation Inclusive Classrooms (EPIC) interns indicated an online teaching and learning platform was preferred, EPIC moved to a complete online program. Program leadership indicates that they review, analyze, and evaluate trends and patterns to determine modifications needed at the unit level, but there was no specific evidence of this occurring.

Completer data was available both through the program and the Commission data dashboard, but it was unclear how the program used this data in their continuous improvement process and specifically within each program. Although feedback is given to coaches at the end of the program, there is no evidence of the understanding or the use of that feedback to inform continuous improvement. Interviews within certain programs indicated that there is no formalized process to give feedback to the program, specifically from employers, district support providers, and community partners. One area that was identified as needing more systemic, unit-level assessment was effectiveness of fieldwork and clinical practice.

### **Rationale for the Finding**

The education unit has not yet developed a comprehensive unit wide process at both the unit level and within each program that identifies unit effectiveness. Furthermore, inconsistent evidence was found that indicated the assessment of the impact of decisions, and analysis over time of program data and unit decisions.

<b>Common Standard 5: Program Impact</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
a. 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.	<b>Consistently</b>

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
b. The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	Consistently

### **Finding on Common Standard 5: Met**

#### **Summary of information applicable to the standard.**

The SCCOE 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.

Comprehensive assessments include formative and summative measures across all SCCOE programs to ensure candidate competency. Candidates and completers across programs shared about the applicability of the course content to their work, and about the willingness of program faculty and leadership to provide individualized support whenever sought. A quote by one candidate exemplified patterns across other candidates’ comments regarding program support, “I would show evidence aligned to each CPSEL goal through artifacts. My coach and I would review the evidence aligned to each CPSEL and we would talk through its alignment to the specific standard and my current scope of work. I used my ILP to complete a self-evaluation at the district level which was very helpful in my growth as a professional educator.”

The SCCOE is having a positive impact on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students through the programs it provides to educators around Santa Clara County, and beyond, by providing highly qualified individuals to respond to the rigors or working in PK-12 education. SCCOE’S grant awards make a significant impact on the county’s schools and districts, including the Classified School Employee Grant, Early Childhood Teacher Development Grant, School Based Mental Health Grant, and the Teacher Residency Grant. Through these grant opportunities, educators are able to earn credentials to serve in some of the highest needs schools and positions in Santa Clara County and around the state.

Additionally, districts and schools around the county benefit from relevant and timely support. “Providing principal professional learning around the new TK/ECE requirements positioned our principals to support the teaching and learning of our youngest learners.”