State of Washington Professional Educator Standards Board

27 Month Program Review
ESD-U

Education Service District 112

Summer 2019

Preface

27-Month Evaluation Requirement

The Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) ensures that the state's educator preparation programs prepare diverse and learner-ready educators for Washington's schools. Toward this end, the PESB oversees preparation program approval and ongoing program review. PESB approves programs that demonstrate potential to uphold all preparation program standards and requirements, serve local and state educator workforce shortages, and offer needed access to candidates. Such programs are initially approved in specific locations for an initial approval period of 27 months following the beginning of instruction. Prior to the expiration of initial approval staff of the board conduct site visits to determine if the program is in full compliance and performance aligned with state approval requirements. This includes a full review of all applicable key performance indicators and program standards. The review is a dimensional evaluation in which the quality and value of the program is determined by looking at its performance on multiple dimensions of merit, including design fidelity, standards alignment, key performance indicators, and the ability to demonstrate continuous improvement.

Outcomes of the 27-Month Review

The review will produce information for program improvement and accountability. The review will provide:

- Better understanding of program design, implementation, and outcomes
- Opportunities for strategic input into preparation programs
- An approval decision by the Professional Educator Standards Board

Key Audiences

The Professional Educator Standards Board

The primary audience of the 27-month review report is the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board whose members will use the report to make an approval decision. Based on the content of the review report and the recommendations of the review team, PESB members will determine whether the program will be approved to transition from limited approval to full approval, remain on limited approval, or have approval rescinded. Members of the PESB will also use 27-month program review reports to gather information about the overall health of the educator preparation system in the state and to make ongoing decisions related to preparation program standards, approval, and review.

The Preparation Program Being Reviewed

The 27-month review will provide valuable insights to the preparation program being reviewed by focusing on critical areas of practice, highlighting promising practices, and by providing commendations and recommendations. The review will address all areas of educator preparation program practice, but will focus on areas of practice identified through analysis of key performance indicators, program leaders' goals, and evidence provided by the program of meeting each of the Board's [program standards](#). Each review will seek to information about innovative and effective practices for the purpose of

examining and sharing these practices. And, each review will provide both commendations and recommendations for program improvement.

The Wider Field of Educator Preparation

Another key audience for the 27-month review is the wider field of educator preparation. Findings, commendations, and recommendations of the review team will serve to inform the wider field of educator preparation and prompt further discussion and dissemination of promising practices.

Program Review Team

Program review teams including individuals familiar with the program and expert in the areas of practice identified for focused review. Review teams, in general, consist of 5, 6, or 7 individuals, dependent on the programs' focus and the expertise of the review team. One PESB staff member served as chair on the review team during the review process but will not serve in an evaluative role. Additional members of the review team shall include one member of the programs' professional educator advisory board (PEAB), one P-12 practitioner with expertise related to the program scheduled for review, and two representatives of peer programs. Any two of these review team members, or two additional members, must be identified individuals with expertise related to the domains of practice and standard components identified as focal areas.

Executive Summary

Background and Context of ESD-U

This report details the findings of the 27-Month Program Review for the ESD-U educator preparation program. Like all new educator preparation programs, ESD-U is currently approved on limited approval. From this review and report, the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) will consider and vote to grant full approval, retain the program on limited approval, or rescind program approval.

The Educational Services District (ESD) 112 formed ESD-U as an educator preparation program designed to prepare and support new teachers, and currently endorsed teachers looking to add endorsements, through coursework and fieldwork leading to certification, but not an academic degree. The program was developed to serve districts by supporting degree-holding candidates to become certified in high-need endorsement areas in hard-to-staff districts within ESD 112. ESD-U is currently approved to offer endorsements for reading, ELL, special education, and elementary education. Pending continued approval, the ESD-U program leaders intend to add endorsement offerings as needs are discovered among the districts they serve. The program has been designed to emphasize the pedagogy of "learning to teach while teaching" through a service model that primarily focuses efforts on addressing districts' needs for teachers.

ESD-U was designed to be unique in its organizational structure. ESD-U was designed to provide instructional and supervisory support from contracted instructors, district administrators, and mentor teachers in a residency-based model, which relies extensively on support from local districts.
- Prior to the start of the school year, ESD-U teacher candidates receive practical, pedagogical coursework in a three week summer institute.
- Saturday seminars continue throughout the year once or twice a month.

- ESD 112 and partner districts are engaged to prepare and supervise field experiences of locally embedded candidates within the districts in the service region.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION					
Organization type	Educational Service District				
Degree	No degree, certification only				
Certificate offered	Residency teacher certificate				
Alternative Routes	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**None**
		X	X	X	
1Endorsements	**Approved to offer**	**Date approved**	**Currently offering**		
	Reading	At initial approval, 7.18.2017	Reading		
	Special education*	At initial approval, 7.18.2017	Special Education		
	English Language Learner (ELL)	At initial approval, 7.18.2017	English Language Learner		
	Elementary Ed.*	1.10.2019	Elementary Ed.		

*Note. Areas of shortage defined in PESB shortage report and / or indicated by local district shortages.

Personnel			
Role title:	**Description:**	**% FTE**	**Name:** *If transition in role has taken place, include both names with dates of employment (mm/yy-mm/yy)*
Director of Educator Effectiveness & Early Career Development	Program Director Data Administrator Field Coordinator Instructor	.40	Mike Esping
Program Specialist for Educator Effectiveness & Early Career Development	Certification Officer Data Coordinator Candidate Support	.90	Alissa Jolly
Program Secretary II for Educator Effectiveness & Early Career Development	Instructor Support Mentor Support	.50	Karen Solberg

Program Secretary I for Educator Effectiveness & Early Career Development	General Program Support	.50	Open Position

In order to determine how, in what ways, and to what degree newly approved preparation programs are performing, the 27-month program review focuses on the following key evaluation questions:

1. Design Fidelity. How is the program being implemented relative to the design under which it was initially approved?

2. Standards Alignment. To what degree does the programs processes and outcomes align with PESB educator preparation program standards?

3. How is the program demonstrating outputs, processes, and outcomes via annual indicators?

4. How is the program assessing performance to design, develop, and implement improvement initiatives?

Findings
Below, findings of the review team are summarized. More detailed descriptions are included in subsequent sections.

Design Fidelity.
The review team found that the preparation program was offered in close alignment with program providers' original intent as represented in approval documentation. Key facets of the program design include a strong emphasis on serving districts needs for educator shortage and programming serving the needs of alternative route candidates and those currently working in schools. The evidence provided by ESD-U leaders was thoroughly reviewed by the review team and demonstrated multiple and ongoing efforts to ensure that the program serves the certification needs of school districts in the service region. The program also delivers a competency-based framework of instruction designed to accommodate the schedules of working educators with programming tightly aligned with InTASC standards and the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) Instructional frameworks.

Standards Alignment.
The review team found that ESD-U met or exceeded most standards. . As prescribed by the board, the focal unit of analysis was the domain component area, ex. 1A, 1B, 1C, etc. Out of 24 component areas, the review team found 18 component areas met and 6 component areas unmet. Out of the 24 component areas, the review team found 2 areas in which the program was exceeding the board's approved standards. A standard area checklist is included as Appendix A

Indicator Analysis.
The review team and the preparation program provider were unable to use annual performance indicator data because on the accelerated schedule requested by the program and approved by the board. However, the ESD-U program did submit accurate and complete data submissions for the 2018-19 reporting year after the review date, but prior to the 10/31/19 deadline. Colleagues at the Education Research and Data Center accelerated their work to provide information to produce the ESD-U Initial Outcomes Analysis included as Appendix B, also included as Item C in this tab's Materials.

Name	Role in Review	Contact
Nicholas Gillon	PESB Staff Chair	Nicholas.gillon@k12.wa.us
Sara Kaviani	P-12 Practitioner familiar with program	kaviani.sara@battlegroundps.org
Matt Hoffman	PEAB representative	matthew.hoffman@esd112.org
Tara Haskins	Peer program representative	thaskins@ewu.edu
Krissy Kim	Peer program representative	KMKim@pierce.ctc.edu
Krissy Kim	Specified area of practice - recruitment	thaskins@ewu.edu
Tara Haskins	Specified area of practice - district partnership	KMKim@pierce.ctc.edu

Evaluation Criteria

Program Standards and Requirements

The primary evaluation criteria are the PESB program standards and the degree to which the program upholds each. In order to evaluate the degree to which ESD-U upholds PESB program standards and requirements the authors of this report reviewed data submitted by ESD-U personnel; conducted a day-long, structured focus group; collected additional evidence as requested.

Prior to the program review, PESB staff provided a list of guiding questions and possible data sources for each of the 7 Domain Standards (PESB Standards, Evidence, and Guiding Questions). ESD-U personnel provided evidence of upholding each domain standard and component area. Review team members then examined the guiding questions and data sources, discussed them, and develop a list of (ESD-U Standards and Follow-up Questions). PESB staff provided these follow up questions to ESD-U personnel in advance, then asked program personnel to respond during the site visit. The review team them shared additional questions and requests for data and conducted limited follow-up interviews.

This section is organized around three essential functions of newly approved preparation programs and includes the review team's assessment regarding how each standard was met, unmet, or being exceeded. Each of these essential functions transcends a particular domain standard. However, each domain standard can be best characterized under one of these essential functions. These three essential functions served as organizing structure for the site and this section of the report (ESD-U 27 Month Review Overview and Agenda):

1. Developing and improving sustainable programming (Domains 7 & 5)
2. Serving communities with educator preparation programming and leaner-ready teachers (Domains 1, 3 & 4)
3. Preparing culturally responsive, skilled, and knowledgeable educators (Domains 2 & 6)

Developing and Improving Effective and Sustainable Programing

Effective and sustainable programming is the foundation of preparing educators for Washington State districts and schools. This essential function involves administrative, governance, resources, and data infrastructure and encompasses standards 7 and 5.

Domain 7: Program Resources and Governance

7A. Administrative Unit | Providers ensure that programs utilize a separate administrative unit responsible for the composition and organization of the preparation program.

Review Team Findings: *Met*

A distinct administrative unit is responsible for the ESD-U educator preparation program. Decisions regarding the structure and implementation of ESD-U are made through collaboration among the Director of Educator Effectiveness and Early Career Development, the Professional Educator Advisory Board (PEAB), and the administrators of ESD 112. The program director, with input from instructional and administrative staff, leads the program approach, content, format, allocations. The PEAB is informed and consulted at multiple points in the process of program development to offer input and guidance. Administrator at ESD 112 approve or modify decisions regarding program revision after input from PEAB members and the program director (ESD 112 Organizational Chart; Logic Model for ESD-U). ESD 112 staff and personnel from schools and districts are central to the ESD-U organizational model (Staffing Narrative Describing Organizational Chart).

ESD 112 and local district services, personnel, facilities, and resources provide a great deal of support for operation of the ESD-U program. Support from ESD 112 takes the form of conference center space, office space, technology support, custodial services, communications, legal, accounting and other services (Staffing Narrative Describing Program Organizational Chart). ESD 112 also serves a financial support role; in the case of program budget shortfall, unallocated reserves are available from ESD 112. Program content and sequence is intertwined with inservice teacher training offerings, BEST mentor supports, and Teachers and Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) evaluation support (Educator Effectiveness and early Career Development). The ESD-U program, Early Career Development BEST Training, and Educator Effectiveness work are all supervised by the Director of Educator Effectiveness and Early Career Development, who works within the teaching and learning department of ESD 112. Within the ESD-U program unit, three part-time personnel administer the program; another part-time administrative assistant position is vacant. The combined full time equivalency of these four positions is 2.35 (Budget for 2019-20). Program personnel operate the ESD-U in cooperation with 20 contractors, three field supervisors and 17 instructors (Program Organizational Chart). Implementing the ESD-U program also relies on direct assistance from district human resources professionals, school building administrators, and classroom teachers (Roles and Responsibilities), all of whom take active roles in operating the preparation program. These district and school-based individuals perform program-critical functions such as candidate recruitment, admissions interviewing, candidate field placement and the assignment of mentors (Roles and Responsibilities; Budget for 2019-20). Partnering districts are compensated at a rate of $1000 per year, per candidate for supporting initial licensure candidate. District services are modeled after a standard held by ESD-U and, to a degree districts offerings differ, creating some diversity in candidates experiences. The closeness of the interaction between ESD-U and the districts prompted discussion among the review team members as to whether and to what degree districts operate as program partners, or co-providers.

7B. Personnel | *Providers ensure the program has adequate personnel to promote teaching and learning.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U content is taught by 17 instructors ([Instructor Vitas 2018-19](), [2019-20]()). All instructors work in a part-time contractor capacity; 16 also work full time for a local district or for ESD 112. Instructors have a range of backgrounds and a range of involvement across 36 distinct courses and are paid in alignment with OSPI rate. The program director recognized that the rate is below some competitive market rate estimates , however, "Many instructors could get paid more but they want to be part of this program and grow their own educators".

ESD-U instructors offer 18 clock-hour courses during intensives and weekly Saturday seminars, in addition to their work in districts or at ESD-U. In the 2018-19 cohort there were 48 candidates and 14 instructors; during 2019-20, 49 candidates were served by 19 instructors ([Instructor to Student Ratios]()). ESD-U field supervisors conduct at least three formal observations during hours when candidates are directly instructing students. Additional formal observations can be requested and scheduled by either the candidate or the field supervisor. Field supervisors also conduct a minimum of three informal observations "which may occur during hours of case management, directly instructing students and or leading adults" ([Field Supervisor's Visitation Schedule]()). For retooling candidates, ESD-U field supervisors are required to schedule a single formal observation with each candidate.

The Director of Educator Effectiveness and Early Career Development is responsible for hiring instructors and field supervisors. Instructors applied for open calls, were interviewed, observed, and then matched with standards-aligned course outlines for which they were most qualified. Instructors then co-develop coursework, which is subsequently reviewed and approved by the Director of Educator Effectiveness and Early Career Development and the PEAB. Instructors are evaluated through observational assessments by the program director and their teaching with candidates, candidates' course evaluations ([Program Evaluation 18-19_Canvas]()). Any aggregate evaluation rating below 3.5 out of 4 prompts action from program leaders. In terms of personnel, this has meant coaching conversations with instructors and improvement planning. Instructors also self reflect on the data and suggest improvements for themselves and engage in coaching conversations with the program director. Candidate evaluations were part of decision-making that resulted in two instructors not returning for the 2019-20 cohort.

7C. Facilities | *Providers ensure the program has adequate facilities and resources to promote teaching and learning.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U leverages facilities and resources provided by ESD 112, which supports effective administration ([ESD 112 Conference Center Guidelines]()). ESD-U uses classroom, conference, and web technology within the ESD 112 Conference Center building in Vancouver, Washington ([ESD 112 Conference Center Map]()). Cost allocations and budget decisions are subject to proposal and approval processes that are similar to program revision decisions; however, expenditure amounts proposed by ESD-U are developed for specific alignment with common allocation models. For example, instructor pay and indirect cost rates follow standard rates adopted by ESD 112, which follow rates offered by the the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction(OSPI). The relationship between the program and ESD 112 eases maintenance, overhead, and administrative burdens on the ESD-U program itself. The ESD 112 Conference Center does not provide some resources typical of educator preparation programs - library, student advising, curriculum collection, etc. Mentors and instructors have a role to advise candidates in a way different from typical educator preparation programs. Instructors and candidates have access to an academic research database to access recent, relevant research and resources, although candidates do

not have specific learning requirements related to the use of these tools, or are using these tools a formal part of instructor training.

Although the setting does not offer traditional classrooms, facilities provide necessary elements for teaching and learning. Face to face workshops and training sessions are accessible remotely and the program uses common learning management and communications software. Candidates primarily access course materials from the Canvas learning management system. Candidates evaluated the Canvas learning management system in the 2018-19 annual program evaluation survey (Program Evaluation 18-19_Canvas). The program involves individuals from across the ESD 112 organization in addition to its four core personnel. Course instructors and mentors develop courses from their own preparation, professional expertise, and resource network. Funding reserves are set aside to rehire quickly as needed, cover for low enrollment, or address acute program needs. Some candidates are paid for the hours they serve in student teaching experiences, some are not. This depends on the school, district, and candidate involved.

Domain 5: Data and Assessment Systems
Educator preparation providers maintain data and systems that are sufficient to evaluate program performance, direct program decision-making, and fulfill reporting requirements of the professional educator standards board.

5A. Effective Data Systems |Providers develop and maintain effective data systems that are sufficient for program growth, evaluation, and mandated reporting.
Review Team Findings: *Unmet*

ESD-U program relies on ESD 112 data and technology infrastructures. Program data are housed in integrated spreadsheets within a Microsoft Office 365 environment. During the processes of outreach, admissions, coursework, fieldwork, and assessment; program personnel generate various types of candidate data, which are imputed into individual forms or spreadsheets that are then combined (Data Administration Staffing Breakdown). Data from these spreadsheets are used to compile and submit annual required program data to PESB (PESB Preparation Programs' - Annual Reporting), although these processes have yet to be tested for candidate-unit data submission to the Education Research and Data Center (ERDC). Data in the combined spreadsheets are also accessed and used to share information and make curriculum, staffing, and other program decisions. Currently, these data do not directly feed into required reporting templates, but program leaders would like to develop this capacity. Program leaders note that data systems and capacities "Is not finished work". At this time the program has not decided to invest in a complex data management system because they have found their systems adequate. Pending expansive program growth, program leaders have begun planning to consider developing completely integrated student data system that would better link with partner districts, regional learning management systems, and additional data networks serving ESD 112 (Data Governance, Storage & Access Processes & Policies). Program leaders find their data systems adequate.

Data systems and practices are used in connection with coursework, field work, PEAB meetings, and in considerations of program changes. ESD 112, through ESD-U, offers professional learning opportunities for certificated educators through the web-based PDEnroller system. Data generated through this system are also imputed into ESD-U data spreadsheets for ESD-U candidates. Course assessment data are entered into spreadsheets, along with other program data such as formal candidate evaluations. During fieldwork, site supervisors conduct observational assessment using the TPEP framework and InTASC competency standards. InTASC competency standards also serve as a framework for organizing and evaluating coursework. Program leaders and instructors assess coursework and propose changes based on student assessment and evaluation results. A component of this standard

includes notions of reducing bias in assessment, the TPEP model, which guides includes training on reducing bias in assessments. Program leaders have not noted variations in assessment results based on race, ethnicity, or gender, but have not specifically analyzed data or assessment practices to search for and address potential bias. The program leaders take steps to prevent candidates from being evaluated for the program by the same individuals who evaluate their job performance, such as principals. Program personnel report that PEAB members have informally discussed bias in PEAB ; though it is not noted among agenda items (ESD-U Assembled PEAB Agendas).

5B. Secure Data Practices | *Providers utilize secure data practices for storing, monitoring, reporting, and using data for program improvement.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U has detailed its data system processes (Data Governance, Storage & Access Processes & Policies). Data are stewarded by ESD 112 Information Technology Director and data security staff in a manner aligned with Washington State OCIO and FERPA data security and storage requirements. The systems use internet content filtering compliant with the Children's Internet Protection Act, and password protected access control lists. Data are housed in a Microsoft Office 365 structure secured with passwords and access control list. IT Director and staff have encryption capabilities, virus protection, and conduct backup recovery exercises. Current data practices are secure; program leaders are interested in developing a more comprehensive Student Infrastructure Framework (SIF) compliant database in the future to securely link data from the ESD-U program across varied data sets used in local districts.

5C. Program Reporting | *Providers produce and utilize data reports in accordance with data manual and reporting guidance published by the board.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U has developed a process of annual data collection and submission based on PESB data manual and reporting guidance (Annual Data Collection based on PESB Manual & Guidance). ESD-U program leaders submitted all data required for annual submissions on time, prior to the 10/31/19 deadline. ESD-U PEAB meetings have involved data regarding district needs assessments, cohort demographics, and candidates' evaluations of the program (PEAB Annual Data Collections; ESD-U Assembled PEAB Agendas). Specifically, the PEAB used data in the form of vitas and draft course syllabi to hire instructors. The PEAB assessed candidate data to develop course equivalencies.

As well, the PEAB supported program decision-making to adjust the program to two major policy changes, in the year preceding the review - the dual endorsement requirement and change to basic skills testing policy. Though more policy circumstances than data use, the PEAB discussed the new requirement for educators holding only either ELL or SPED endorsements to hold an additional content endorsements. This stood to impact candidates and would alter the approach of the program. "That was a big pushback day, from the PEAB, when they saw what was required. *How will we expect them to work a job and do this dual endorsement*? The PEAB recommended developing additional support for candidates. Program leaders responded by giving candidates more support, yet it was not clear to review team members what these supports were. The PEAB also discussed how changes in basic skills assessment requirements would be addressed in program policy. Surveys of candidates, human resources professionals in districts, candidates' mentor teachers, and instructors survey are currently informal. Internal data from these surveys are incomplete but were said to have shed some light on

program processes and outcomes, yet these surveys are largely informal and unrefined as systematic data collection tools.

Serving Communities with Educator Preparation and Learner-Ready Novice Educators

The second essential function of newly approved preparation programs is *serving communities with educator preparation programming and learner-ready teachers.* This critical function of all preparation programs is encompasses program domain standards 1, 3, and 4.

Domain 1: Candidates and Cohorts

Educator preparation programs recruit, select, support, and prepare diverse cohorts of candidates with potential to be outstanding educators.

***1A. Strategic and Ongoing Outreach** | Providers conduct strategic and ongoing outreach to identify, recruit, admit, support, and transition promising educator candidates.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U uses multiple outreach strategies and methods; primarily, outreach for the program is done through partnerships with school districts in ESD 112 ([Comprehensive Outreach and Recruitment Strategy](); [Outreach Efforts Table]()). ESD-U has guided its efforts by aligning offerings with state and district educator workforce needs according PESB's analyses and their own regular and formal district needs assessments ([PESB Shortage Report](); [Needs Assessment Summary 18-19](); [Needs Assessment Summary 19-20](); [Partnership_Shortage Area Table]()). A district human resources professional interviewed for this report characterized these efforts, "ESD-U is service model, it's just naturally set up that way to provide for shortages and areas of need".

District human resources personnel and principals play a direct role in ongoing outreach, specifically identifying hard to fill openings as early as possible, determining capacity for full release mentors, screening, interviewing, and recommending candidates to the program ([Roles and Responsibilities](); [Candidate Interview Questions]()). Building leaders also play formal roles in the outreach process; they identify current internal staff (paras, volunteers, etc.) who may be good candidates, communicate with human resources to recruit and interview candidates and align them with potential mentors, and commit to substitute release 2 days per month. Schools and districts commit to support the candidates. Although there is no commitment to hire program completers as teachers, the program prepares a pool of candidates prepared to be hired by the districts' schools. Districts receive $1000 from ESD-U per candidate to support their preparation. Recruitment practices also involve partnerships with ESD 112 staff who support district personnel in the service area. By informing these ESD 112 staff who support individuals in schools, many school and district based personnel are informed about the program and pass that information on to potential candidates and mentors ([ESD 112 Newsroom Articles](); [Available Cross-ESD 112 Supports]()).

ESD-U also employs more traditional means of outreach via newspaper notices, social media, and flyers recruiting individuals to find out more through an information session ([Quick Facts Flier](); [Retooling Flier](); [Got Funding Flier](); [District Leader Flier](); [ESD 112 Facebook Posts](); [ESD 112 Twitter Posts]()). ESD-U holds district and candidate information sessions for individuals interested in finding trained teachers for districts and schools or those seeking educator credentials, which orient them to the program's offerings ([Informational Session Handout Packet](); [Information Session Presentation]()). These information sessions also include remote access options for those who cannot be present in person.

***1B. Recruiting and Supporting Underrepresented Groups of Candidates** |Providers of educator preparation programs use strategies to recruit, admit, and prepare a greater number of candidates from underrepresented groups including, but not limited to, candidates of color in an effort to prepare an educator workforce that mirrors the characteristics of the student population in Washington state public schools*

Review Team Findings: *Unmet*

Currently outreach and support systems and practices in place were not developed with the specific goal of being highly accessible and responsive to local communities of color. ESD-U leaders do acknowledge conducting specific outreach and recruitment strategies focused on candidates of color is a challenge for the program, and across ESD 112 school districts. Primary means of outreach include informing districts and serving the candidates districts identify. Program leaders assured review team members that districts do employ multiple strategies that do engage local communities of color, including nomination and induction support, however there is not a clear and consistent means to ensure that these practices are standard across districts. This is a stated goal of the preparation program leaders.

Program leaders have collected and analyzed candidate demographic data and compared that to the ESD 112 student population (approximately 105,000 students) and the new educator workforce statistics published by the PESB (2015-16) ([Local Demographics Table](); [Candidate Demographic Data Summary]()). The collected data shows ESD-U candidates for 2018-19 were 84% white, less diverse than the 2015-16 new educator workforce (75% white), and less diverse than the ESD 112 student population (64% white). Demographics of the 2018-19 cohort and alternative route scholarship recipients was more diverse than the first cohort. Program leaders describe their focus as helping to develop educators who represent "life diversity" and strive for "local cultural competence". ESD-U program leaders embrace the challenge of recruiting more diverse candidates to their program and are engaged in efforts to do so.

As one strategy to potentially recruit and retain underrepresented candidates, ESD-U emphasizes recruiting paraeducators to earn teaching credentials, noting that the paraeducators better represent the students in the districts and schools they serve. Building principals in several schools regularly make direct referrals of paraeducators, other school staff members, and community members. ESD 112 also participates in Recruiting Washington Teachers, which promotes outreach to highly diverse highschools and middle schoolers to encourage them to consider careers in education.

WIth these efforts in mind, the review team was looking to see that ESD-U program leaders continue to focus on this area by ensuring that district partners, who do a great deal of outreach and recruitment on behalf of the program, are in fact each participating in coordinated efforts to diversify the educator workforce.

***1C. Admission Standards** | Providers set, publish, and uphold program admission standards to ensure that all educator candidates and cohorts are academically capable and technically prepared to succeed in educator preparation programs.*

Review Team Findings: *Met*

The Candidate Handbook lists program prerequisites and completion requirements for entry into its various endorsement pathways ([Steps for Candidates Diagram](); [Candidate Handbook]()). Candidates evaluated the admissions process; approximately one third did not find anything challenging about the admission process or standards. Primary requirements in the process included having a Bachelor's degree or higher from a regionally accredited institution, meeting good moral character guidelines and

passing basic skills and endorsement tests (depending on endorsement pathway) ([Informational Session Handout Packet](#); [Information Session Presentation](#); [WEST_NES Information Resources](#)).

When evaluating the admission process, candidates did note that basic skills testing was the most significant challenge ([Program Evaluation 18-19 Admission Process](#)). Candidates described testing as, "Pretty challenging", "Hard and stressful to prepare for", and "Extremely difficult". Particular candidates commented that "Study material did not help as much as [one] thought it would" and that "The material provided both by ESD-U and online wasn't sufficient" to pass endorsement assessments.

Regarding basic skills testing, program leaders intend to change the program requirement regarding basic skills testing to match the language approved by new legislation enabling preparation programs to use basic skills assessments formatively, without a firm cut score. Program leaders also plan to develop a systematic response to persons not meeting proficiency as measured through basic skills assessments.

Domain 3: Novice Practitioners
Educator preparation programs prepare candidates who are role ready.

3A. Role Readiness| Providers prepare candidates who are ready to engage effectively in their role and context upon completion of educator preparation programs.
Review Team Findings: *Met*

The large majority of ESD-U candidates currently work in schools throughout the ESD 112 service region. The 2018-19 program evaluation included items to determine completers' perceptions of their preparation across several categories ([Program Evaluation 18-19 Looking Ahead](#)). The evaluation was on a 4 point scale. The following categories received scores below 3.5: I feel prepared leading instruction in my endorsement area, SPED (3.44); I feel prepared to be an effective case manager, ELL and SPED (ELL, 3.33 and SPED, 3.48); What I learned in the ESD-U program is relevant to the responsibilities I experienced on the job during my residency , SPED (3.48). The following categories received scores above 3.5 for both ELL and SPED candidates: I feel prepared to direct, supervise and collaborate with paraeducators (ELL and SPED, 3.52); The program prepared me to be a life-long learner (ELL, 3.57 and SPED, 3.67); I anticipate what I learned in the ESD-U program will be relevant to the responsibilities I will experience on the job in the future (ELL, 3.71 and SPED, 3.57).

Candidates on conditional certificates already teaching in classrooms, are evaluated as teachers by district observers, mentors, and field supervisors. Other candidates not on conditional certificates also receive feedback from mentors and field supervisors with TPEP language and aligned to InTASC competency standards. These TPEP based evaluations and follow up conversations support candidates' learning during the program in the context of the work setting and familiarize candidates with TPEP language. These also provide multiple opportunities from multiple individuals to provide extra support in flagged areas of need. Candidate's mentors are required to be BEST trained, however, the extent and type training varies across districts. BEST professional learning opportunities are available through ESD 112 ([BEST PD Offerings](#); [Systems of Induction & Recent Graduate Supports](#)). Mentors receive release days to support the program.

Another strategy ESD-U uses to prepare their candidates to be role ready is the use of Saturday seminars. These seminars cover topics relevant to beginning educators with time alloted to the edTPA. Examples of other topics include: Workshop to prepare for first day/first week of instruction; Advanced behavior management; Lesson planning; Motivation and management ([Seminar Schedule](#)).

***3B. Reflective Practice** | Providers prepare candidates to develop reflective, collaborative, and professional growth-centered practices through regular evaluation of the effects of their practice through feedback and reflection.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U coordinates layered support from district, building, and program mentors. Curricula and methods emphasize practice-based learning and the program has developed systems of support for ongoing professional learning ([Systems of Induction & Recent Graduate Supports](#)). ESD-U is able to understand their district community, and is responsive to the individual ways each district operates. ESD-U program leaders analyzed candidates' practice PGPs and developed professional learning sessions based on the results. These sessions are free to candidates for two years following program completion ([Explanation re: Analysis of Candidates Practice PGPs](#)). Ongoing professional growth is embedded in courses throughout the experience.

***3C. Working with Paraeducators** | Providers prepare candidates for their role in directing, supervising, and evaluating paraeducators.*
Review Team Findings: *Unmet*

ESD-U emphasizes paraeducators in outreach and recruitment. The PEAB also added a theme throughout all courses called 'leading adults', which is emphasized throughout coursework and field work ([Coursework & Fieldwork Aligned with Goal to Support Educators' Work with Paraeducators](#)). The Saturday Seminar series, involved a session on Supervision and Collaborative Communication, which included some content on leading paraeducators ([Seminar Schedule](#); [Supervision and Collaborative Communication](#)). Additionally, there is a BEST program session focused on expectations of paras and teachers. The review team was looking to see a greater depth of program content focused on directing and supporting paraeducators in classrooms. Program personnel have additional information available related to this standard upon request including the integration of the TPEP frameworks and the InTASC competencies. Survey results indicated the 2018-19 program evaluation also include an item in which candidates describe their perceptions of readiness to lead paraeducators. ESD-U program leaders continue to add courses and program offerings and will include this area in upcoming additions.

***3D. Educator Evaluation** |Providers require candidates to demonstrate knowledge of teacher evaluation research and Washington's evaluation requirements.*
Review Team Findings: *Exceeded*

Curricula, field work, and mentorship were designed to be aligned with TPEP and PGP requirements ([Alignment Among Coursework, Field Work, TPEP, and PGP](#); [Crosswalk of TPEP to ELL Course Competencies](#); [Crosswalk of TPEP to SPED Course Competencies](#)). Every public school building in ESD 112 has a TPEP teacher leader, who has specific training in TPEP. This TPEP teacher leader is able to mentor candidates. Across districts, candidates receive support specific to the building and district where their field experiences take place. All candidates in the ESD-U program receive either a formal TPEP evaluation if they are serving as teachers of record. Candidates not serving as teachers of record do not receive formal TPEP evaluation per se, but do receive approximations of the TPEP evaluations that are very tightly aligned to formal requirements. Based on this extensive practice of TPEP support, review team members viewed ESD-U programming as exceeding the board's standard.

Domain 4: State and Local Workforce Needs
Educator preparation programs contribute positively to state and local educator workforce needs.

***4A. Partnerships to Address Workforce Needs** | Providers partner with local schools, districts, and communities to assess and respond to educator workforce, student learning, and educator professional learning needs.*
Review Team Findings: *Exceeding*

ESD-U builds partnerships with districts to support a "grow-your-own" model of addressing local workforce needs. Review team members interviewed several human resources personnel in ESD 112 districts who shared that ESD-U's approach to preparing candidates focused on certifying teachers who addressed the district's most pressing needs, avoiding the challenge of convincing certified teachers to move to their areas, "It has been challenging to fin the caliber of candidates that we would like to have. ESD-U has been an opportunity to hire individuals who have natural skills and who live here. We work with ESD U to have high caliber teachers."

The nature of the programs' partnerships with districts is that of a service organization. The program providers develop their offerings and recruit candidates who are already identified, and in some cases vetted by districts according to the districts' needs for teachers. This approach reorients roles among candidates, districts, and the program. A human resources professional interviewed for this report explained, "Who is the customer? In a lot of programs its the student [candidate]. What do they need? In our case, with a shortage area we [the districts] are now the customer. Here is somebody we are interested in getting through to certification; we are going to invest in a person."

Workforce demands are partially determined through district human resources offices participating in the program's annual educator needs assessment. This assessment is submitted to ESD-U and analyzed by PEAB members, ESD 112 content experts, and key district staff (Process of Developing & Using Partnerships Strategically to Address Workforce Needs, Summary of Needs Assessment for 19-20 Cohort, Partnership Shortage Area Table). In particular, ESD-U has supported SPED teacher recruitment for a small, rural district by encouraging "paraeducators and individuals who work in these communities to go into the program and become a teacher. We have been much more successful growing our own that we have been recruiting from other parts of the state."

Districts additionally support candidate residencies; although there is no district commitment to hire them when they complete the program. As part of that residency support, candidates with relevant uncertificated experience receive new teacher orientations from the district to help transition from uncertificated to certificated staff. Mentors are Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST) trained and receive additional training on program and role standards in June, August, and October. BEST training is provided by the district.

ESD-U's partnerships are heavily, but not exclusively, focused on relationships with their partner districts. ESD-U program leaders have also built collaborative relationships that serve key program functions with the Washington School for the blind; independent schools in the area looking to support their teachers; the Clackamas, Oregon ESD; and well as the Cowlitz Tribe. Efforts in building these partnerships have resulted in recent, relevant, accurate information that has been consistently and systematically used to increase participation and success of the program on behalf of candidates and districts.

***4B. Data to Address Workforce Needs** | Providers use preparation program and workforce data in cooperation with professional educator advisory boards to assess and respond to local and state workforce needs.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U focuses recruitment and enrollment on hard-to-fill positions and retooling situations in which someone is teaching out of endorsement, but is willing and able to learn on the job. This can be helpful particularly in small districts in which needs are known and promising substitutes can be encouraged to apply. As mentioned in the previous component area, district human resources offices conduct a needs assessment, which is submitted to ESD-U and analyzed by PEAB members, ESD 112 content experts, and key district staff ([Process of Developing & Using Partnerships Strategically to Address Workforce Needs](), [Summary of Needs Assessment for 19-20 Cohort](), [Partnership Shortage Area Table]()). A clear line of inquiry and action can be seen in successive PEAB agendas in which members considered the results of the first needs assessment to develop the second needs assessment, then analyzed its results to offer new programming to meet those needs.

***4C. Endorsements in Shortage Areas** | Providers of teacher educator preparation programs prepare and recommend increasing numbers of candidates in endorsement and areas identified by the board as workforce priorities.*
Review Team Findings: *Exceeding*

Program offerings and changes demonstrate a high-degree of responsiveness to partners' identified needs ([Partnership & Shortage Area Table]()). The program was developed in response to specific and current workforce needs. The design philosophy of the program could be very loosely summarized as 'if it's needed, we will offer programming; if it isn't, we won't.' ESD-U administers an annual needs assessment with a variety of partners to identify exactly how many educators, and in what shortage areas, district personnel anticipate needs. Needs assessments surveys are distributed to human resource personnel, Teaching and Learning leaders, SPED directors, and superintendents ([Needs Assessment Summary 18-19](); [Needs Assessment Summary 19-20](); [Partnership Shortage Area Table](). Program personnel, PEAB members, ESD 112 content specialists, district representatives, and other partners then develop curricular and practical approaches to meet those needs through the program ([Developing and Using Partnerships to Address Workforce Needs]()). This hyper focus on the needs of local districts does not, to review team members, narrow the possibilities for candidates, but rather ensures that candidates emerge with skills and credentials needed most. The small size of the program team and the fact that the program is not run through an institution of higher education serve to support success in this standard. With a small program team, changes can be considered and adopted more quickly. Also, without the need to have curricula approved through departments, colleges, and accreditation commissions enables program changes to happen more quickly with less vetting of curriculum and content. Areas related to this standard in which review team members advise caution relate to precisely the same dynamics. With fewer individuals reviewing and approving changes, there is increased responsibility on those who do.

Preparing Culturally Responsive, Skilled, and Knowledgeable Educators

The third essential function of newly approved preparation programs serving to organize this section was *preparing culturally responsive, skilled, and knowledgeable educators.* This critical function of all preparation programs is addressed in standards 2 and 6.

Domain 2: Candidates' Knowledge, Skills and Cultural Responsiveness

Educator preparation program providers prepare candidates who demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and cultural responsiveness required for the particular certificate and areas of endorsement, which reflect the state's approved standards.

2A. Methods of Instruction | Providers demonstrate effective, culturally responsive pedagogy using multiple instructional methods, formats, and assessments.
Review Team Findings: *Unmet. Additional evidence was reviewed. See Appendix C*

Program leaders and PEAB members selected instructors and assigned them to courses based on their areas of practical expertise (ESD-U Assembled PEAB Agendas). ESD-U instructors were observed in their practice, interviewed, and hired from interested applicants working for ESD 112 or a partnering district (Instructor Vitas 2018-19, 2019-20).

Instructors were trained in a workshop setting prior to program launch. Content of the training included leading adult learners, use of the program's learning management system, and use webcasting software for remote candidate participation (Leading Adult Learners Training Agenda; Technology Training Agenda). Beyond initial training, ESD-U offers instructors opportunities for ongoing learning including content on adult learning theory and application, mentor training, and performance review (Progression of Learning Support for Instructor, Faculty, Mentor & Field Supervisor). To support their role in mentoring, instructors also have access to the Mentor Academy and BEST Roundtables (Mentor Academy 101 Agenda; Mentor Academy Descriptions; BEST Mentor Roundtables). Instructors are evaluated annually by the program director, who observers instructors and conducts 1:1 follow up coaching as needed. Instructors are also evaluated by candidates through course evaluations and program evaluations. Instructors and candidates have access to Proquest research database to access recent, relevant course research resources. Candidates do not have specific course requirements to learn to use these database tools and the use of Proquest is not included in the technology training for instructors.

ESD-U Instructors' roles are described in the Instructor Handbook and Resources, and can be described in two categories:

1. ESD-U instructors' responsibilities include areas involved in most educator preparation programs such as:
    a. Works with the teacher candidate and the field supervisor to plan a tentative schedule for accomplishing the teacher candidate's goal.
    b. Bring concerns to the teacher candidate and field supervisor in a timely manner.
    c. Sign teacher candidate's Field Experience Log at the end of the apprenticeship experience.
2. And, ESD-U instructors' responsibilities include areas not included in many educator preparation programs.
    a. Orients the teacher candidate to the school community.
    b. Sharing district specific school policies and procedures.
    c. Assist the teacher candidate in scheduling and planning lessons that support the classroom curriculum.

d. Provide constructive feedback to teacher candidate regarding classroom performance and student interaction, typically course instructors do not see their students in classrooms, rather this is often done by field supervisors.
e. Serve as the teacher candidate's mentor.
f. Support the candidate in the completion of edTPA requirements. Adhere to the mentor agreement matching candidate's pathway.

Program leaders emphasize the assets-focused lens to curriculum and instruction emphasized in the expectations of all instructors, yet the review team was looking for more explicit focus in curricula. The review team recognized that almost all components of this standard area were clearly in place, such as 2.A.ii - creating opportunities for instructors' professional learning, 2.A.iii - collaborative content development and improvement, and 2.A.iv systematically and comprehensively evaluating instructors' effectiveness. It was also clear, to an extent, that the course content reflected a variety of instructional strategies, pedagogies, and assessments; however, it was not clear to review team members that culturally responsive teaching and learning practices were an explicit focus of the instructor handbook, instructor training, instructor professional development, or all courses. Members of the review team found this problematic because they believed it critical that instructors were precisely and intentionally modeling culturally responsive pedagogies in multiple ways so that candidates are not only learning about how to engage these practices through coursework, but also have had the opportunity to reflect on their experiences watching instructors regularly modeling these practices. To be met, members of the review team were looking for evidence that instructors were held accountable, and provided support to enable, a deliberate, explicit, and focused practice of modeling culturally responsive pedagogies across the program content.

2B. Subject Matter Knowledge | *Providers ensure that completers demonstrate the necessary subject matter knowledge for success as educators in schools.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found this standard met and raised considerations regarding the length of the program in total and approach to including the Since Time Immemorial curriculum. ESD-U candidates attend courses during summer institutes, and three or four Saturdays per month, depending on which endorsement(s) the candidate pursues (Course Descriptions_Competencies). Elementary education candidates participate in a second summer institute the following summer. Each endorsement program is comprised of a series of 3-day workshops and day-long Saturday intensives. Each course is measured in clock hours. Courses of study leading to dual endorsements add up to 408 clock hours (equivalent to roughly 40 quarter credits) and programs to add endorsements to existing certifications add up to 170 clock hours (equivalent to roughly 17 quarter credits).

Courses and fieldwork ensure that competencies are demonstrated by each candidate. Course descriptions include dates and details about which competencies are "addressed" and which are "assessed" Course Descriptions_Competencies. These competencies fully address the InTASC role standards through coursework connected with fieldwork. Course assignments vary across courses and were co-developed between instructors and program leaders. Assignments and courses are graded on a pass / fail basis. Rubrics notate candidates' performance as "below standard", "approaching standard", "at standard", and "exceeding standard". Candidates may resubmit assignments until they earn a grade of "at standard" (Course Syllabi - ELL; Course Syllabi - SPED).

Key performance assessments have been developed for each course to support candidates' learning and instructors' assessment of endorsement competencies (Key Course Assessments and / or Performance Tasks; Key Course Assignments List). Candidates' are assessed on endorsement standards in

coursework and are evaluated on InTASC teacher knowledge and skills standards and the Danielson Framework rubrics (Field Experience Handbook & Resources p. 9; Program Course Crosswalk with Endorsement Competencies; Crosswalk of TPEP to ELL Course Competencies; Crosswalk of TPEP to SPED Course Competencies). This tight alignment among coursework, fieldwork, and TPEP frameworks were commended by the review team thorough and highly supportive of novice educators.

Candidates were exposed to the Since Time Immemorial curriculum through a powerpoint resource provided by OSPI during a required seminar (Since Time Immemorial Presentation). The program does not include a one quarter or semester course in either Washington state history and government, or Pacific Northwest history and government in the curriculum of all teacher preparation programs(WAC 181-78A300(3); Course Descriptions & Competencies). Program leaders are interested in cooperating with system partners and colleagues to address this requirement more deeply in the coming cohort.

2C. Pedagogic Skill | *Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and skill relative to the national professional standards adopted by the board for the role for which candidates are being prepared.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

The review team found ESD-U meeting this standard through its process of candidate matching and tight alignment among coursework, fieldwork, and competency standards. Candidates are matched with a mentor in cooperation between district personnel and program personnel (Candidate Handbook pp. 16-17; Steps for Candidates Diagram). Candidates for initial certification receive at least three, and up to nine formal evaluations between December and May by ESD-U field supervisors. Candidates for retooling endorsements are scheduled for one formal evaluation during the course of the program. Candidates evaluate both coursework and fieldwork through structured surveys that are required for program completion (Program Evaluation 18-19 _ Field Supervision Process; Program Evaluation 18-19 _Courses). Pedagogic skills are assessed on endorsement standards and the Danielson Framework rubrics (Field Experience Handbook & Resources p. 9; Program Course Crosswalk with Endorsement Competencies; Crosswalk of TPEP to ELL Course Competencies; Crosswalk of TPEP to SPED Course Competencies).

2D. Cultural Responsiveness | *Providers ensure that candidates are well prepared to exhibit the knowledge and skills of culturally responsive educators.*
Review Team Findings: *Unmet. Additional evidence was reviewed. See Appendix C*

After reviewing the evidence provided and notes from interviews with instructors and program leaders, the members of the review team did not see this standard as met for all candidates in the program. The teaching and learning cycle embedded throughout the program emphasizes assets-focused approach to supporting candidates, which is associated with culturally responsive pedagogy, review team members were looking to see more explicit focus in all coursework and more concentrated focus in specific coursework emphasizing and providing instruction and guided practice in culturally responsive pedagogy. PEAB uses culturally responsive lens Multiple aspects of culturally responsive practice are emphasized in ELL endorsement coursework including the complexity of cultural identity in relation to learning and schooling (ELL 105); exploration of culturally responsive practices (ELL 202); culturally responsive assessment strategies (ELL 404); culture and equity (ELL 606); and the use of culturally and linguistically appropriate materials for English learners (ELL 808). Culturally responsive practice is also incorporated in SPED endorsement coursework, to a lesser degree, including featured resources (SPED 101); creating learning experiences for P-12 students (SPED 105-110); assessing assessment instruments

for cultural and linguistic biases (SPED 404). Fewer examples of a focus on culturally responsive practice were found in elementary education and reading endorsement courses. Candidates involved in elementary education and / or reading endorsements would therefore have less focused support and instruction on principles and practices of culturally responsive education. Because it is possible for candidates to engage the program and not engage either the SPED or ELL endorsements, review team members were looking to see more explicit focus on culturally responsive practices consistently across all endorsement offerings.

Domain 6: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Educator preparation providers offer field-based learning experiences and formalized clinical practice experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed for their role.

***6A. Field Placement Partnerships** | Providers establish and maintain field placement practices, relationships, and agreements with all school districts in which candidates are placed for field experiences leading to certification or endorsement per WAC **181-78A-125** and **181-78A-300**.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U's clinical practice is tailored to the candidate's route. The route often corresponds with the amount of experience candidates have when they enter the program. In particular, ESD-U PEAB members recommended Route 3 candidates would need extra support (Candidate Handbook; Field Experience Overview for Candidates; PEAB Meeting Agenda & Handouts 2018.10.26). The following is a break down of the number of required clinical practice hours by route type:
- Route 2: 540 hours of clinical practice
- Route 3: 600 hours of clinical practice, with a minimum of 150 continuous hours.
- Route 4: 1000 hours of clinical practice

Clinical practice for all candidates focuses on student instruction, pedagogy, and case management. Candidates record their hours in a field experience log. Candidates begin in small groups and by the end of the clinical practice must record a minimum of 4 weeks as teacher of record. Additionally, there is not a standardized number of IEPs candidates pursuing the special education endorsement must complete. Review members were not provided with candidates' clinical practice logs and their content.

Candidates are described as receiving a "mosaic of support" during their field experiences. Support comes from administrators, the field supervisor, and mentor (Field Experience Handbook & Resources; Program Evaluation 18-19_Field Supervision Process) The following steps are described in the handbook:
- Field supervisors facilitate and structure the multiple supports for the candidates. The supervisor is selected by ESD-U with support from the district.
  - Candidates were asked to evaluate their experiences with their field supervisor. Survey responses varied. Generally qualitative responses described their field supervision process (specifically the field supervisor) as either a positive and important support, or there was confusion around who even served as the field supervisor and described a lack of contact.
- Mentors provide ongoing feedback and support for candidates throughout their experience. The mentor is selected by the district with support from ESD-U. Mentors have three opportunities to engage with training: a mandatory Mentor Academy 101; Mentor Roundtables; and Mentor 201.

- Administrators coordinate building level orientations for candidates, as well as completes formal observations, 90-day review, and other evaluations.

6B. Integrating Coursework and Field Work | *Providers ensure that candidates integrate knowledge and skills developed through field and industry experiences with the content of programs' course work.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

ESD-U supports districts in recruitment and placement of candidates for field experiences. This looks different depending on the candidate's route or if they are a retooling candidate (Placement Systems & Protocols for Candidates). Route 2, Route 4, and retooling candidates submit a letter of support from their school district detailing a commitment for placement as a part of their ESD-U application. Districts identify enrollment priority. Route 3 candidates apply to ESD-U and are admitted conditionally until residency placement. Route 3 candidates are introduced by ESD-U to district partners for potential placement.

Course descriptions are focused on concrete skill sets associated with teaching and learning in classrooms and school buildings (Course Descriptions & Competencies). Introductory coursework, ELL 101 and SPED 101, have assignments which are applicable to and sometimes implemented during field experiences (Course Syllabus ELL 101; Course Syllabus SPED 101). For example:
- SPED 101: candidates use the lesson plan template also used during field experiences to write directed lessons plans.
- ELL 101: candidates create a student learning profile of one of their students touching upon "general information about the student, special considerations, strengths, challenges, academic goals, transition goals, schedule, supports, strategies, data collection, and any additional notes."
- Find more examples in the syllabi linked above.

Course assignments are graded with a "Pass" or "No Pass." Instructor-created rubrics define competency at the following levels "Below Standard", "Approaching Standard", "At Standard", and "Exceeding Standard" (ELL Assignment Rubric).

6C. Testing Requirements | *Providers offer field experiences and related assessment requirements in accordance with WAC 181-78A-300 and the board approved candidate assessment requirements.*
Review Team Findings: *Met*

In 2018-19, candidates could access edTPA support from four venues: required coursework, optional seminars, mentoring support, optional instructional coaching supports, and field supervision. 86% of the candidates passed the edTPA (edTPA Practices; Student Assessments Data). For the 2019-20 year, certain edTPA support venues moved from optional to required. edTPA support now includes: required use of ESD-U Teaching and Learning Cycle in courses; required use of ESD-U edTPA lesson planning template and reflection templates; required edTPA monthly seminars, and required access to ESD-U Instructional Coach to support on track completion and submission (edTPA Practices; ESD-U Field Experience Handbook & Resources). As expressed in the handbook, "Candidates must attempt the edTPA during the winter quarter (mid-year review). Candidates will be able to retake the edTPA during the spring quarter if needed." (Candidate handbook). The edTPA or performance assessment does not appear in the Field Experience Guidelines in Candidate & Mentor Handbook.

6D. Diversity in Field Experiences | *Providers ensure that candidates participate in field experiences in school settings with students and teachers who differ from themselves in race, ethnicity, home language, socio-economic status or local population density.*
Review Team Findings: *Unmet*

ESD-U program personnel cooperate with district human resources professionals and building leaders to identify and recruit potential candidates and their mentors ([Roles and Responsibilities](#)). In most cases, mentors are assigned prior to beginning the program. Primary considerations during field placement are the needs of the district and building, not candidates' experiences participating in field experiences in school settings with students populations with backgrounds dissimilar to their own ([WAC 181-78A-236(4)(a)](#)).

Although courses and assignments address culturally responsive practice, field experiences do not regularly offer candidates opportunities to reflect upon interactions diverse populations and communities in order to integrate professional growth in cultural responsiveness as a habit of practice ([WAC 181-78A-236(4)(b)](#)). The district-as-customer model prevents the program for serving candidates with field experiences that conflict with district or building needs. Additional information is available from the program upon request. This challenge is not unique to ESD-U but is the case for any program in which a candidate is working on a conditional certificate or is otherwise embedded in a full time school-based position.

Process Evaluation

Program Design and Delivery

Key features of the ESD-U program's design and delivery process are unique and illustrative of how the program works. The programs' service oriented approach, competency-based instruction and fieldwork and instruction, as well as its outreach efforts to districts stand out. These key features distinguish the program in ways that indicate progressive approach aimed to target known needs. These key features also raised several considerations among review team members.

ESD-U reframes the relationships between program, candidates, and districts. ESD-U is operated by an educational service district, whose mission is to serve the needs of local school districts. This program is another way the ESD is carrying out is traditional mission. Program design, allocation, and operation all reflect this service oriented model, which casts local school districts as the primary client of the program, rather than each candidate. District support in program critical-functions such as candidate recruitment, admissions processes, placement interviewing, candidate field placement, and the assignment of mentors place district interests and efforts at the center of the model. Two considerations arose 1) with district leaders positioned as clients and relied upon to support recruitment of candidates, in what ways might district personnel be unintentionally positioned as potential-candidate advisors? Members of the review team wondered how consistent these services were among districts and how informed these individuals might be as to the breadth of program possibilities available in Washington. And 2) whether and to what degree could the ESD-U administrative unit, i.e. program team, be challenged to meet standards in areas of practice influenced by district action and decision-making. For example, Standard 6D related to diverse field experiences, if districts have a great deal of influence on this aspect of practice

in ways that do not readily enable the program to meet the standard, how should program leaders respond?

ESD-U was designed as a competency-based induction model for school staff and community members. In this model, district leaders identify educator workforce needs, nominate potential educators, and support matching the candidate with a classroom and a mentor. Preparation coursework takes the form of daylong workshops supported by classroom observation and BEST mentoring. If converted to quarter credits, the total amount of coursework equates to roughly 2-3 full-time quarters in a traditional preparation program system. The amount of coursework is relatively low compared to most educator preparation programs at the Masters, Bachelors, or Associates degree level (for early childhood educators). These considerations would apply to any alternative route program, or non-traditional model in which candidates have fewer standardized seat hours. Candidates enter ESD-U with a bachelor's degree or residency certificate already. And, as a competency-based program, coursework and field work are tightly aligned with appropriate endorsement standards, the TPEP frameworks, and candidates have multiple and repeated opportunities to demonstrate their competency through their day-to-day teaching work. However, the shorter, practiced-based program does not include coursework comprising most educator preparation programs in subject areas like, history of education, child development, psychology of learning, and educational research. The review team considered how this program differs from inservice training and whether having fewer foundations in education courses, typical in educator preparation programs, might somehow disadvantage its candidates unintentionally, and in ways that candidates may not even know about.

The processes of outreach, enrollment, coursework, fieldwork, and assessment reflect centering of local district as co-providers of professional learning for practicing educators seeking initial or expanded credentials. With the districts at the center of the model, the program relies on their support to operate. This creates remarkable efficiencies and allows the program operate with a very lean program staff and group of contractors. ESD-U offers standards-aligned coursework and field experience evaluations with district supports added on as available. Each candidate is supported by the program meet all competency requirements through ESD-U programming, and each district adds on to those offerings, but in different ways and to different degrees. This variable district support contributes to variability candidate experiences based on how district resources or how district-based program collaborators perform their roles. This observation led the review team to consider, whether and in what ways variability in candidates' experience based on what districts add on, may challenge efforts to understand the experience of every candidate, whether it may be at all problematic in ways that are unforeseen. However, program leaders emphasize that this program was designed to serve all local districts, particularly those with access to few resources. Leaders note that as an ESD their role is to support equity for candidates and schools by creating more equity in opportunity for schools and districts by using a shared resource model to offer additional resources to those with fewer resources.

Innovations in Design or Approach

Leveraging resources. The ESD-U educator preparation program was designed, developed, and implemented with a small program administrative team with a wide, supportive, and coordinated team of dedicated individuals positioned around the service area, within school buildings, who are deeply invested in the field. ESD-Us model allow has attracted instructors with a great deal of experience in the practices they teach. District personnel seeking teachers are finding an extremely valuable resources that meets their needs. By providing instructors an opportunity to give back to the field by training future

teachers and creating a framework of support for district personnel, the ESD-U program has invited and organized the help and cooperation of those it serves. EDU-U's practices of engaging the district communities it serves as a means to leverage the resources it has allows the program to keep costs low for candidates and provide a rich value to districts. The review team commended these efforts and encourages other programs to consider what can be learned from this model.

District outreach. ESD-U program leaders' message is clear, compelling, and consistent. The program exists to serve districts in the area who are seeking to build the most qualified and capable candidates possible, especially in geographic and subject areas that are hardest to staff. Place-bound candidates, those seeking additional training to improve their current work, and district staff members looking for their next career steps are finding a place at ESD-U in which to advance their careers and support their communities. ESD-U in a short time has identified the needs in the community and built tailored course and field work to serve those needs. Simple tools and processes such as community needs assessments and on-demand district orientations facilitate this process. However, the tools and processes are undergirded by the commitment to serve these districts needs, the willingness to be in full partnership with districts, as well as strong and ongoing communications between the program sponsor (ESD-112), candidates, instructors and the programs PEAB. The review team appreciated this approach and recognized that many programs, especially those in which were district partnerships are few or constrained, have a lot to learn from this model.

Recruit current P-12 practitioners to teach. A common refrain among teacher educators across the state is candidates' interest in practical knowledge to help them succeed in the classroom. The coursework, fieldwork, mentorship model, and practicing instructor-coach corps has helped the program ensure that candidates knowledge, skills, and practice are tightly aligned with InTASC standards and the TPEP framework. These aligned learning experiences are supported by instructor-coaches guiding field supervision. Because these individuals are deeply engaged in their own practices, within the districts candidates aim to teach, they have a remarkable ability to contextualize candidates experiences as they build the skills and competencies of high-quality educators. The review team acknowledged the clear value in practice-focused instructors and the merging of the instruction and site supervision to build strong, well supported, clinical practices for candidates. And, the review team commended the program in its clear, focused, and ongoing alignment of district needs, program offerings, and competency-based educator preparation.

Reporting and Follow-Up

Reporting process and outcomes

Following the review, the review team has provided this report identifying any areas of practice in which program performance is out of alignment with standards and requirements. The review team has also reported key areas of discussion and provided commendation on three specific program practices. During the presentation of this report to the Professional Educator Standards Board, members will have the opportunity to ask questions of the review and the program team before making a decision about whether and how to act related to the programs ongoing approval.

Presentation to the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board

This report was presented to the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board during the course of its regular meeting on November 14, 2019.

Program Providers Response

Providers of the program reviewed may submit a response to the review to report within three weeks following receipt of the report. Program leaders received findings of the report on November 1st, 2019 and report full text November 8th and may reply by November 29nd, 2019.

The Review Team found ESD-U meeting 18 of 24 Standard Areas. From these 18 met Standard Areas, ESD-U was found exceeding 3 of the Standards.

Domain 1 – Candidates and Cohorts | Educator preparation programs recruit, select, support, and prepare diverse cohorts of candidates with potential to be outstanding educators.	Met	Unmet	Exceeding
(A) Providers conduct strategic and ongoing outreach to identify, recruit, admit, support, and transition educator candidates.	X		
(B) Providers of educator preparation programs use strategies to recruit, admit, and prepare a greater number of candidates from underrepresented groups including, but not limited to, candidates of color in effort to prepare an educator workforce that mirrors the characteristics of the student population in Washington State public schools.		X	
(C) Providers set, publish and uphold program admission standards to ensure that all educator candidates and cohorts are academically capable and technically prepared to succeed in educator preparation programs.	X		
Domain 2 – Candidates' Knowledge, Skill, and Cultural Responsiveness Educator preparation program providers prepare candidates who demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and cultural responsiveness required for the particular certificate and areas of endorsement, which reflect the state's approval standards.	Met	Unmet	Exceeding
(A) Providers demonstrate effective, culturally responsive pedagogy using multiple instructional methods, formats, and assessments.		X	
(B) Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate the necessary subject matter knowledge for success as educators in schools.	X		
(C) Providers set, publish and uphold program admission standards to ensure that all educator candidates and cohorts are academically capable and technically prepared to succeed in educator preparation programs.	X		
(D) Providers ensure that candidates are well prepared to exhibit the knowledge and skills culturally responsive educators.		X	
Domain 3 Novice Practitioners | Educator preparation programs prepare candidates who are role ready.	Met	Unmet	Exceeding
(A) Providers prepare candidates to engage in their role and context upon completion of preparation programs.	X		
(B) Prepare candidates to develop reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practices through regularly evaluating the effects of their practice through feedback and reflection.	X		
(C) Prepare candidates for their role in directing, supervising, and collaborating with paraeducators.		X	
(D) Providers require candidates to demonstrate knowledge of teacher evaluation research and evaluation requirements.			X

Domain 4 – State and Local Workforce Needs | Providers contribute to state and local educator workforce needs.			
	Met	Unmet	Exceeding
(A) Providers partner with local schools, districts, and communities to assess and respond to educator workforce, student learning, and educators' professional learning needs.			X
(B) Prepare candidates to develop reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practices through regularly evaluating the effects of their practice through feedback and reflection.	X		
(C) Providers use preparation program and workforce data in cooperation with professional educator advisory boards to assess and respond to local and state workforce needs.			X

Domain 5 – Data and Assessment Systems | Educator preparation providers maintain data and systems that are sufficient to evaluate program performance, direct program decision-making, and fulfill reporting requirements of the professional educator standards board.			
	Met	Unmet	Exceeding
(A) Providers develop and maintain effective data systems that are sufficient for program growth, evaluation, and mandated reporting.		X	
(B) Providers utilize secure data practices for storing, monitoring, reporting, and using data for program improvement.	X		
(C) Programs produce and utilize data reports in accordance with data and reporting guidance published by the professional educator standards board.	X		

Domain 6 - Field Experiences and Clinical Practice | Educator preparation providers offer field-based learning experiences and formalized clinical practice experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed for their role.			
	Met	Unmet	Exceeding
(A) Providers establish and maintain field placement practices, relationships, and agreements with all school districts in which candidates are placed for field experiences leading to certification or endorsement per WAC 181-78A-125 and WAC 181-78A-300.	X		
(B) Providers ensure that candidates integrate knowledge and skills developed through field and industry experiences with the content of programs' coursework.	X		
(C) Providers offer field experiences and related testing requirements in accordance with 181-78A-300 and board approved candidate assessment requirements.	X		
(D) Providers ensure that candidates participate in field experiences in school settings with students and teachers who differ from themselves in race, ethnicity, home language, socio-economic status, or local population density.		X	

Domain 7 Program Resources and Governance| Providers ensure that programs have adequate resources, facilities, and governance structures to enable effective administration and fiscal sustainability.			
	Met	Unmet	Exceeding
(A) Providers ensure that programs utilize a separate administrative unit responsible for the composition and organization of the preparation program.	X		
(B) Providers ensure that programs have adequate personnel to promote teaching and learning.	X		
(C) Providers ensure that programs have adequate facilities and resources to promote teaching and learning.	X		

Appendix B: Initial Outcomes Analysis for ESD-U Based on 2018-19 Program Data

How many potential candidates have applied to the program?

YEAR	APPLICANTS
2018-19	49
2019-20	42
Total	91

How many of applicants were admitted as program candidates?

- All applicants were admitted.

How many candidates are currently in the program total, and disaggregated by SPED, ELL, READ, ELEM endorsements?

Currently Enrolled:

YEAR	SPED	ELL	Reading	Elementary	*Totals*
2018-19	4	2			*6*
2019-20	29	5	1	7	*42*
Totals	*33*	*7*	*1*	*7*	*48*

* Reading and Elementary endorsements are new program offerings, unavailable in 2018-19.

***Excluded is one student enrolled from 2018-19 pursuing a SPED endorsement who is on LOA.*

How many candidates are currently in the program, disaggregated by race / ethnicity and gender?

Race Category	2018-19		2019-20		*Totals*
	M	F	M	F	
African American			1		*1*
Alaska Native					
American Indian				1	*1*
Asian					
Hispanic	1		1	2	*4*
Naïve Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1				*1*
Pacific Islander					
White		2	9	23	*34*
Multi-Racial					
Unknown		1		3	*4*
Totals	*2*	*3*	*11*	*29*	*45*

* 2018-19: Add one student with unknown race and gender

**2019-10: Add Two white students with unknown gender

How many candidates are currently in the program?

YEAR	SPED	ELL	Reading	Elementary	*Totals*
2018-19	23	19			*42*
2019-20					
Totals	*23*	*19*			*42*

How many candidates are currently in the program, disaggregated by race / ethnicity and gender?

Race Category	2018-19		2019-20		Totals
	M	F	M	F	
African American					
Alaska Native					
American Indian					
Asian		1			1
Hispanic		1			1
Naïve Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					
Pacific Islander					
White	5	33			38
Multi-Racial					
Unknown		2			2
Totals	5	37			42

How have completers scored on endorsement and pedagogies assessments?

Assessment	2018-19			
	Takers	Passers	Avg. Score	Std. Dev
West-E				
ELL	19	19	273.21	8.35
SPED	22	22	260	16.41
NES				
SPED	1	1	228	--
edTPA				
English as an Add-on	1	1	3.56	
SPED				
Score 1	16	16	3	.52
2	16	16	3.25	.45
3	16	16	3.13	.62
4	16	16	3.06	.44
5	16	16	3.06	.44
6	16	16	3.06	.25
7	16	16	3.38	.62
8	16	16	3.13	.50
9	16	16	3.06	.25
10	16	16	2.75	.45
11	16	16	2.88	.50
12	16	16	3.56	.51
13	16	16	3.00	0
14	16	16	3.19	.40
15	16	16	2.81	.40
16	16	16	2.88	.34
17	16	16	2.75	.45
18	16	16	2.75	.77

Appendix C includes additional information about two program standards which all review team members found initially unmet upon initial review of evidence provided and discussions with the program team. The two standards in questions are 2A - Providers demonstrate effective, culturally responsive pedagogy using multiple instructional methods, formats, and assessments; and 2D - Providers ensure that candidates are well prepared to exhibit the knowledge and skills of culturally responsive educators. After careful review of the evidence originally provided and provided as a program team response, the members of the review team agreed that the additional evidence did support program leaders' perspectives that the program meets these standards. However, on final analysis the program team reached a split decision on these two standards. It will be up to Board members to ask questions during the board presentation or request additional information in order to make the final determination.

2A. Methods of Instruction | Providers demonstrate effective, culturally responsive pedagogy using multiple instructional methods, formats, and assessments.
Review Team Findings: *Undecided. Additional evidence was reviewed. Review team reached split decision*

In response to the review team's initial finding that this standard was unmet, program leaders provided additional clarification and evidence, and are willing to provide further evidence upon request. The clarification and evidence emphasized the programs' assets-focused lens to curriculum and instruction, and in the expectations and evaluation of all instructors. The program team also provided additional evidence about the core knowledge, skills, and dispositions at the center of the preparation program include "knowledge of community and culture", "skills in effective communication", and multiple dispositions of ESD-U candidates, including "cultural competency" and "self awareness (All Classes Evidence of 2A & 2D). Program leaders also emphasized that the 2018-19 program evaluation included the following item related to standard 2A, "The instructor modeled effective, culturally responsive pedagogy (i.e. used multiple instructional methods)". Results from this survey showed that for candidates in ELL and SPED endorsement courses 101, 202, 303, 404, 606, 707, and 808 the average rating for this item across ELL and SPED courses was 3.48 on a 4 point scale. Seven additional courses have finished, these reflections are available upon request. The PEAB at ESD-U considers this rating appropriate and demonstrates that the standard was met. Such responses were not available for ELEM and READING coursework because those courses are new offerings, and candidates have not yet evaluated them. The program team also gathered additional evidence on this item by asking instructors to describe "How did you [/ will you] do the following as an instructor for ELEM ED and READING candidates". Instructors responded with activities and lesson materials for ELEM 01, ELEM 202, ELEM 303, ELEM 404, ELEM 405 (Elementary Education Courses - Cultural Responsiveness) and for RDG 101, RDG 105/110, RDG 202, RDG 303, RDG 404, RDG 707 (Reading Courses - Cultural Responsiveness).

The review team members examined the additional evidence and reached a split decision. All review team members saw the evidence and better understood how the program was working to integrate cultural competence expectations for instructors. Half of the review team was compelled to change their position after seeing the additional evidence, and half of the review team members were not compelled to change their position. Those who changed their minds, and saw the standard as met, determined that instructors' descriptions of the practice they are, or will be, engaging in their coursework, coupled with the learning objectives in the new/proposed coursework, as sufficient to determine that the program provider "demonstrates effective, culturally responsive pedagogy using multiple instructional methods, formats, and assessments." Review team members that did not change

their position raised two primary issues. First, Reading and Elementary Education endorsement coursework is part of the program and is subject to their complete review. Without information about how candidates have found the courses, review team members had not seen results from all courses, only those submitted for 2018-19. Second, information from instructors about what they have done and / or will do in the course, coupled with objectives listed in the syllabi, was evidence that the instructors use culturally responsive methods, though some review team members were looking for more robust evidence of these practices. All the review team members were deliberate and thorough in this consideration and submit their mixed perspectives to the board for deliberation.

2D. Cultural Responsiveness | *Providers ensure that candidates are well prepared to exhibit the knowledge and skills of culturally responsive educators.*
Review Team Findings: *Undecided. Additional evidence was reviewed. Review team reached split decision.*

In response to the review team's initial finding that this standard was unmet, program leaders provided additional clarification and evidence, and are willing to provide further evidence upon request. A primary concern of the review team initially was that some students in the program may not receive courses that emphasize culturally responsive practice. Program leaders clarified that this was not the case. Rather, the new endorsements have not been offered and therefore were not part of the original collection of evidence. Program team members further clarified that no candidate could choose coursework options that did not involve these topics; all candidates are exposed to these topics regardless of the courses they take or endorsement options they choose. The clarification and evidence were additional syllabi for Reading and Elementary Education coursework, to the degree that they are complete and ready to present when the endorsement launches. Syllabi provided by the program team and examined by the review team showed that reading 101 course includes "culture and oral language development and reading acquisition for various stages of development" Reading 202 includes a learning objective related to how to create a "culture of learning [in which the educator knows] …"how to assess current knowledge, design engaging lessons, and continually assess and differentiate to maximize learning". Reading 707 emphasizes "lesson planning for inclusion and differentiation". These courses also includes the assets-focused instruction cycle listed above. Elementary education courses also include aspects of culturally responsive education. ELEM ED 101 includes the teaching and learning cycle and an emphasis on "issues of equity and access". Candidates in this course are assessed on their ability to "Understand how environment and community factors: cultural backgrounds, ethnicity, language development SES, values about education , gender , and disabilities influence the learning of students", and "understand the needs of high poverty and at risk children and adolescents. This course also includes a reading list organized by headings such as "multi-culture articles", "poverty articles", and "classroom strategies for special needs students". In ELEM ED 202, candidates "...will also understand how a child's learning is influenced by family, home, and community factors including SES, family value of education, cultural background, ethnicity, gender, language development, and exceptional abilities. The competency scoring rubric for this course details several additional aspects of the skills needed by culturally responsive practitioners. ELEM ED 404 includes a learning objective that candidates use their learning to "support their understanding that learners of diverse backgrounds and apply it to the teaching and learning cycle" and in ELEM ED 405 candidates "learn how to establish equitable learning environments that are accessible while maintaining high expectations for all students". These course offerings are still in development, yet program leaders confident that up to the present stage of development, the courses and the program is meeting expectations of standards 2A and 2D.

The review team members examined the additional evidence and reached a split decision. All review team members saw the evidence and better understood how each course was developed with learning objectives that emphasized culturally responsive practices. Half of the review team was compelled to change their position after seeing the additional evidence, and half of the review team members were not compelled to change their position. Those who changed their minds, and saw the standard as met, determined that assessing the program up to its current point of delivery revealed the learning objectives were sufficient to consider that "Providers ensure that candidates are well prepared to exhibit the knowledge and skills of culturally responsive educators." Review team members that did not change their position believed additional work in this area was needed to reach the conclusion that the standard was met.

After careful review of the evidence originally provided and provided as a program team response, the members of the review team reached a split decision on these two standards. It will be up to Board members to ask questions during the board presentation or request additional information in order to make the final determination.