<div align="center">**Initial Program Review**
Initial Program Common Standards</div>

Institution: Modesto City Schools
Link to Submission: https://sites.google.com/monet.k12.ca.us/cascipr/home
Initial Review (month, year): April 2021
Subsequent Reviews (month, year):

Reviewer Instructions:
Use the column labeled *Reviewer Comments* to provide feedback to the institution. Feedback is required if reviewers find that the standard is not aligned. Provide specific feedback and identify the part(s) of the standard that are not aligned. Feedback is not necessary if the standard is aligned. If the standard is aligned, place an X in the column labeled *Aligned* to indicate the standard is aligned.

Institution Instructions:
Use the column labeled *Institution Resubmission Link* to link directly to the institution's response to reviewer feedback. The link must take the reviewer to the exact location on the website where the response can be located. If a standard is aligned, no additional information or link is necessary.

General Comments:
- There are two separate areas where the Common Standards appear to be housed:
  - Common Standards One – Five as listed on the left-hand menu (and are accessible)
  - The Common Standards on the Program Common Standards webpage (not accessible as it requires a Google sign-in).
- Individual Learning Plan (ILP) and Individual Induction Plan (IIP) are used interchangeably throughout the submission.

Initial Program Common Standards

Common Standard	Reviewer Comments	Institution Resubmission Link	Aligned

1. Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	● CS 1, Element 1: o The main document and ancillary documents repeatedly make the claim that the program is research-based, but there is thin documentation and no references provided to indicate this.	School Leadership is second only to teaching Link to CS 1 Element 1 Getting Principal Mentoring Right, Lessons From the Field *Strong Leaders Strong Schools* These articles were used to shape the design of our leadership coaching model. Getting Principal Mentoring Right, Lessons From the Field discuss best practices for job-embedded coaching to support new administrators in growing professionally.	More Information Needed
	o Some of the documents found in the Handbook are confusing and suggest that the proposed program is either a part of or a revised version of an in-house leadership development program for administrators. Reviewers recommend careful review of all documentation so that it is clear just what this clear credential program is and, if related to the other program, how it interfaces. (See "The Leadership Development Curriculum Map" in the Handbook for an example of inconsistency among documents provided to reviewers).	Pages 14-19 of the revised draft handbook	
	o Common Standard 1 Candidate Training Document is misspelled on the Google document.	Candidate Training Document	

	o Clearer explanation of the PD meeting schedule. It is ambiguous what 5 days every other month means.	PD meeting schedule		
	o There is no comprehensive reference list for the books to be used—only titles.	Comprehensive reference list		

1. Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation continued	● CS1, Element 2:
	   o Link to Mentor Feedback is not accessible.
	
	   o More information is needed about the nature of the collaboration meetings with K-12 and IHE. There is a document called Stakeholders and Activities, but it does not explain how IHE are engaged in the development of the program- beyond "collaboration with the design"- or who is committed to supporting moving forward. Also, under the University Partnership row of this chart, an IDP is mentioned as the "bridge between preservice and teacher of record" – IDPs are specific to teacher induction.
	
	● CS1, Element 3:
	   o It is unclear how faculty and instructional personnel are informed of this requirement.
	
	● CS1, Element 4:
	   o The Hanover Report referenced is about teacher preparation, not administrative preparation, and thus does not address this element sufficiently. Also, it is unclear how the evidence provided shows how the district addresses hiring administrators who are from diverse backgrounds. For example, the HR Senior Director Recruitment form mentions recruiting teachers who were nominated to enroll in the Leaders & Learning Academy but more information is needed on how this relates to hiring those that "represent and support diversity" for the proposed program.
		Link to Mentor Feedback
		
		How we sought and received feedback and how we will continue to reflect on practices to strengthen the program
		
		Current and proposed collaboration dates and agendas
		
		In addition to the Hanover study, Modesto City Schools seeks to recruit diverse and talented administrative candidates.
			More Information Needed

| 2. Candidate Recruitment and Support | • CS 2, Element 1:
  o It is unclear how and when the brochure, which was linked as the recruitment material, is made available to prospective candidates.

  o The first page of the brochure states this is a "CTC Approved Program." Please note that the CASC program cannot be advertised as approved by the CTC until MCS receives Initial Program Approval by the COA.

  o The bottom bullet point under "The Experience" column on Page 2 is incomplete.

  o Is Page 3 also part of the brochure?

  o Under "Program Overview" on Page 3, it says the Clear Admin Cred. Program (CACP) through MCS is "in partnership with ACSA." Would you please clarify this for reviewers?

• CS 2, Element 2:
  o In the "Deadlines Timeline" and "Portfolio Review" documents, an Administrator IDP is referenced? | The brochure was updated. This brochure will be distributed to newly hired administrators upon onboarding with the human resources department and again during the New Principals Pipeline meeting.

Information removed on brochure

Information corrected on brochure

Yes, page three will also be distributed to newly hired administrators.

Information was corrected in the brochure

All reference to AIDP has been deleted. We referred to an IDP, as a means to support Administrators in identifying strengths and weaknesses to create their AILP. | More Information Needed |

3. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	● CS 3, Element 1: o Is there a link associated with "focus group questions" which is underlined?	Focus group questions	X
4. Continuous Improvement	● No additional information is required at this time.		X
5. Program Impact	● Clarification is needed regarding the focus groups: When will the focus groups meet? Who collects the data?	The focus groups are a means to gather qualitative data. The Administrative Advisory Team will conduct the interviews and analyze the data.	More Information Needed
	● The Completer/Graduate Survey ("CASC Alumni Survey Teacher Candidates Graduating 2022-2023") is asking candidates to provide feedback on how the "Induction (BTSA) program affected your practice and the types of challenges teachers experience." BTSA is now Induction; also, this survey is not specific to CASC as noted by the excerpt quoted above and the questions in the survey.	Survey has been removed.	
	● Same comment with the Quality of program survey ("Assuring Quality of Program Services: MCS Administrative Induction").	Survey has been updated	
	● The multiple measures provided in response to this element are focused on the administrator's input. Are there other potential data sources MCS could consider in the evaluation and demonstration that this proposed program will have a positive	Common Standard Four Element 1	

	impact, not just on candidate learning and competence, but on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students? Although "informed K-12 data (student achievement data)" is listed as a data source, the connection to the proposed Clear Administrative Services Induction program is unclear.	