

Report of Findings
Commission on Teacher Credentialing Feedback
Initial Program Approval

Induction Program Standards

Institution	Newhall School District
Date of initial review	February 2, 2021
Subsequent dates of review	March 25, 2021; May 21, 2021; June 3, 2021,
Date Program Standards Aligned	June 22, 2021

Status	Standard
Preliminarily aligned	<p>1: Program Purpose</p> <p>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The focus of the program seems more overtly tied to the Center for Educational Leadership's 5D Framework and 5D+ Rubric than the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTPs). Yes, there is a crosswalk document indicating areas of common focus, but it appears that the main focus is not on the CSTPs. - While the CSTPs are referenced, the focus is centered on professional development for teachers, and it is unclear as to whether this professional development is voluntary or mandatory. The participant commitment document suggests it is mandatory. Program Standard 1 is focused on program purpose and does not reference professional development at all. The Newhall response speaks of "enhanced professional development" and "differentiated professional learning" and this is presented as key in program purpose.
Preliminarily aligned	<p>2: Components of the Mentoring Design</p> <p>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No area for IDP – what was the candidate working on in pre-service? - 5D Rubric is not mentioned in the ILP as to which element the candidate will be addressing in relation to the CSTPs. - TRIAD document has no mention of the IDP. - Self-assessment document referenced but not attached

Status	Standard
Preliminarily aligned	<p>3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System</p> <p>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The <i>Individualized Learning Plan</i> template does not provide a clear structure to support cycles of inquiry. The response to the standard does not articulate the manner in which cycles of inquiry will be implemented in the program. There is no specific place for the site administrator input. The template allows for a mentor signature but no place for mentor to contribute to the ILP development. - The <i>Triad Professional Goal</i> document does not reference the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. It is consequently impossible to see how this document provides clear guidance for the ILP. - Mid-year reflection offers no opportunity to revise/adjust set goal and begin again - There is no evidence of PD for the ILP goal - Cycle of Inquiry lacks clarity for timeline, number of inquiry steps, opportunities for revision. Edits needed on this document. - The format of the ILP does not facilitate development of a revised ILP goal.(Mid-year reflection is a separate document) - Triad goal setting seems to emphasize administrator-led goal priority as opposed to candidate goal setting emphasis/focus

Status	Standard
Preliminarily Aligned	<p>4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors</p> <p>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</p> <p><i>There has been an attempt to outline ongoing training via the Support Circles for mentors. Topics covered during these circles meets the language of the standard. It is still unclear as to the structure of the Support Circles. Are these Support Circles after school, all day? In which months will they occur? The material projected to be covered in each session would need a number of hours to adequately cover the topics. Some items listed the circle agenda 3 and 4 (eg. Just in Time Support) may need to be addressed earlier. More detail needed to outline the structure of these circles.</i></p> <p><i>The Mentoring Matters training with Cluster 4 – is this a Trainer-of-Trainer model? The Lead Mentor has taken on an increased responsibility role. The Lead Mentor role has not been brought up previously. Who are the Lead Mentors? How are they selected from participating districts?</i></p> <p>Mentor training is inadequate. Only the first two days of New Mentor Training have been provided with topics specified. Critical mentoring skills such as coaching conversations are not referenced at all. Ongoing training is not evidenced. Support circles are referenced but are not presented as structured trainings with precise focus. Additional information is required related to mentor training. Please provide agendas of proposed mentor trainings. The mentor training agendas provided seem overly full. Standard language reads: <i>The program must provide ongoing training and support for mentors that includes, but is not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaching and mentoring • Goal setting • Use of appropriate mentoring instruments • Best practices in adult learning • Support for individual mentoring challenges, reflection on mentoring practice, and opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks • Program processes designed to support candidate growth and effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the required components from the standard language are not referenced in proposed agendas nor in the response to the standard. The standard calls for “ongoing training and support for mentors.” There is no reference to training beyond the initial 3 days of mentor training. - The proposed amount of time dedicated to mentor training does not seem adequate. When are mentors informed about the mission and vision of the Teacher Induction Program? Please demonstrate the manner in which mentors are prepared for their role in supporting the development of the Individualized Learning Plan. - Mentor recruitment flyer does not indicate min. 3 yrs. teaching experience. It is noted in narrative but not in advertisements - 5D rubric training for mentors is 1/2 day. Realistic? - Just-in-time support guidance not evident for mentor training - Define mentor support circle trainings - Define mentor participation in “relevant professional development activities” - The number of proposed meetings with candidates seems excessive. The weekly meeting with the mentor is the norm. What is the purpose of the additional meetings?

Status	Standard
Preliminarily aligned	<p>5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation</p> <p>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</p> <p>It is unclear who uses the rubric to score candidate progress.</p> <p>Induction Support website is referenced regarding tracking mentor/candidate meetings. Evidence still required regarding manner in which candidate progress and evidence of successful completion of all program activities is documented.</p> <p>Please provide evidence regarding the manner in which candidate progress towards mastery of the CSTPs will be tracked. The weekly mentor log does not provide this evidence. How will completion of activities outlined in the ILP be tracked?</p> <p>How are candidates self-assessing using CSTP? Describe or provide tool used. No evidence of CSTP connection in the mid-year/end-of-year reflections.</p>
Preliminarily aligned	<p>6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services</p> <p>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</p> <p>Please describe the role of the steering committee with regard to regularly assessing the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates.</p> <p>The <i>Reassignment of Mentor Procedure</i> states "Upon receipt of a negative Mentor assessment....". This suggests that the mentor must be deemed inadequate by the candidate at the start of the process. The process outlined does not facilitate a simple request for mentor reassignment based on incompatibility, not mentor inadequacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No evidence of surveys for stakeholders mentioned in narrative - No evidence of mentor surveys. - OTHER - some links supplied are not "hot" requiring opening them in a separate tab <p>"Stakeholders" has been interpreted to be just induction candidates and mentors. A broader reach for feedback is optimal.</p>