



27 Month Program Review 1-Year Follow Up Report ESD-U

Education Service District 112

Fall 2020

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will be approved to transition from limited approval to full approval, remain on limited approval, or have approval rescinded.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 provides insights to the preparation program being reviewed by focusing on critical areas of educator preparation, highlighting promising practices, and by providing commendations and recommendations. The review addresses 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 and the Board's Standards. Each review seeks information about innovative and effective practices for the purpose of examining and sharing these practices. And, each review provides 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.

Follow-up Reporting

Following a 27-month review, the members of the PESB make an approval decision regarding the program under review. Members of the Board may rescind program approval, grant the program full approval, extend the period of limited approval pending a follow-up report. In the instances that the members of the board request a follow-up report at a later date, usually, but not necessarily in 1-year's time, staff of the board work with the program leaders to develop a follow-up report. The follow-up report is authored by staff of the board, based on the initial recommendations of the review team, and with cooperation from the program team. The 27-month review 1-year follow-up report provides information about how program leaders responded to any program standard areas that were unmet or undecided in the initial 27-month review report. Based on this follow-up report, Board members will have the opportunity to make another approval decision regarding the program. Members may rescind approval from the program, grant the program full approval, or extend the period of limited approval for a specified duration of time, or pending particular program change.

ESD-U 1-Year Follow Up Report

Program Standards and Requirements Unmet During 2019 Review

ESD-U is a certification only Alternative Routes and residency teacher preparation program offered by Educational Service District (ESD) 112. ESD 112 is currently approved to offer endorsements for reading, ELL, special education, and elementary education.

Description of the review team's 2019 findings on each standard area that was unmet are provided below. Following the excerpt from the review report are the program team's response and a brief synthesis by PESB staff.

Unmet Standards During 2019 27-Month Review	
1B	<i>Recruiting and Supporting Underrepresented Groups of Candidates</i>
3C	<i>Providers prepare candidates for their role in directing, supervising, and evaluating paraeducators.</i>
5A	<i>Providers develop and maintain effective data systems that are sufficient for program growth, evaluation, and mandated reporting.</i>
6D	<i>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.</i>

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’s November 2019 Findings: Unmet

At the time of the 2019 review, 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 acknowledged conducting specific outreach and recruitment strategies focused on candidates of color was a challenge for the program, and across ESD 112 school districts. Primary means of outreach included informing districts and serving the candidates districts identify. Program leaders assured review team members that districts employed multiple strategies that do engage local communities of color, including nomination and induction support, however there was not a clear and consistent means to ensure that these practices were standard across districts, although this was a goal of program leaders.

Program leaders had 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 emphasized recruiting paraeducators to earn teaching credentials, noting that the paraeducators better represented the students in the districts and schools they serve. Building principals in several schools

regularly made 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 2019 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.

Program Team's September 2020 response to Domain 1B:

In response to the 27-month review report, program leaders engaged several areas of change.

ESD-U established - and continues to facilitate - a regional [Diversification of Workforce Group](#). This group includes candidates of color from the ESD-U program, staff from Clark College (a local partner), district leaders and ESD 112 Equity Committee representatives. This work has been highlighted in all informational sessions with both candidates and districts.

The [ESD-U District Needs Assessment](#) was enhanced and now includes questions specific to the efforts on the diversification of the workforce. Districts are asked to include their workforce development plan and the steps that they are taking to recruit a diverse workforce. ESD-U will utilize that feedback to leverage or strengthen support for candidates. Additionally, the program now asks the district to list the partnerships they engage in to help diversify the educator workforce partnerships. The goal of collecting this information is to better support districts' efforts to diversify the workforce and evaluate and address any gaps in approach, service area, or support.

The [ESD-U Candidate Interest Survey](#) has been updated to include questions to determine interested candidates who have not yet been awarded their bachelor's degree, as well as expanded demographic questions including preferred or primary language, gender and ethnicity group. Candidates who indicated that they had not yet attained their bachelor's degree are asked follow up questions to include information about resources for helping them identify a pathway towards attaining their degree.

PESB Staff Distillation of Domain 1B:

The 27-month review team highlighted a need to more specifically ensure that outreach efforts were targeted and supportive of local communities of color. Since a large part of the outreach efforts were taking place in districts, they argued, ESD-U needed to have a greater role in establishing the priority of diversifying the educator workforce and understanding the ways in which this was, or was not, happening in the districts. The program team addressed these concerns by creating a diversification of the workforce group to address these issues in an ongoing and systematic way, improving the annual needs assessment by asking district leaders to list their current efforts to diversify their workforce, and amended the candidate interest survey to include demographic components associated with diversifying the workforce. No areas of the 2019 27-month review report involving standard 1B were left unaddressed.

3C. Working with Paraeducators | Providers prepare candidates for their role in directing, supervising, and evaluating paraeducators.

Review Team's November 2019 Findings: Unmet

At the time of review, ESD-U emphasized connecting with paraeducators in outreach and recruitment. This population was in fact of the key groups the program intended to attract. In early consideration of the curriculum, the PEAB voted to add 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 was a BEST program session focused on expectations of paras and teachers. At the time of the review, review team members reviewed the curriculum, observing both the embedded elements by review syllabi and focused elements by review the seminar content. The review team members were looking to see a greater depth of program content focused on directing and supporting paraeducators in classrooms. ESD-U program leaders planned to continue to add courses and program offerings and will include this area in upcoming additions.

Program Team's September 2020 response to Domain 3C:

Program leaders have worked to embed more focused content in each course and added an additional seminar. The ESD-U program leaders work to intentionally support role transition from paraprofessional to teacher through explicit teaching centered on leading adults. Candidates moving from paraprofessional to teachers will need support with knowledge, skills and dispositions in leading adults. To support this transition, all ESD-U instructors revised their [syllabi and coursework](#) to include the specific strategies they will use for candidates to demonstrate that ability to lead adults. Additionally, ESD-U provided a seminar for candidates on '[Supervision and Collaborative Communication](#)' designed to support the candidates with tools to work through conflict, supervision and collaboration strategies with paraeducators and how to use student-led IEPs to enhance the collaboration of the team.

PESB Staff Distillation of Domain 3C:

At the time of the review, review team members were looking to see a greater depth of program content focused on directing and supporting paraeducators in classrooms. In response to the 2019 27-month review report, program leaders revised syllabi and course content. These revisions included specific content in each course regarding leading paraeducators and other colleagues. The content also better supported current paraeducators' transition into being a teacher, a professional change that can be challenging in many ways. Another seminar was also added to provide candidates more access and practice to more strategies and ideas regarding paraeducator support. These changes aligned with all aspects of the 2019 27-month review team's recommendations.

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

Review Team's November 2019 Findings: Unmet

At the time of the review, and currently, the ESD-U program relies on ESD 112 data and technology infrastructures. At the time of the review, program data were housed solely in integrated spreadsheets within a Microsoft Office 365 environment. During the processes of outreach, admissions, coursework, fieldwork, and assessment; program personnel generated 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 were used to compile and submit annual required program data to PESB ([PESB Preparation Programs' - Annual Reporting](#)), although these processes had yet to be tested for candidate-unit data submission to the Education Research and Data Center (ERDC), following the review data were successfully submitted. Program leaders noted at the time that data systems and capacities “Is not finished work”. At the 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 had 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, although review team members were looking to see more specific capabilities in the data system such as reporting functions and integration of data across spreadsheets.

Program Team’s September 2020 response to Domain 5A:

ESD-U is now coordinating with the ESD 112 Student Support and IT staff to design and develop a data infrastructure that will enable storage, tracking and reporting needed to meet the annual data submission requirements. This data storage system is currently in Skyward and will be transferred to the Qmlativ system in Skyward. Basic features of Qmlativ include SQL database licensing, daily offsite backups, secure cloud hosting and 24x7 infrastructure monitoring and alarming.

Qmlativ’s global search will enable a search of any information in the system. Data such as enrollment numbers will be updated whenever a change is made. Qmlativ also includes a built-in report writer that can be customized to the ESD-U program that will support the gathering of data on recruitment, retention and program offerings. This will also ensure that the system will have the ability to report on candidates, aligned with state and federal requirements, to ensure the fair and unbiased assessment of candidates.

PESB Staff Distillation of Domain 5A:

The 2019 review team found the program unmet in this standard area because the data system program leaders used lacked specific capabilities for tracking, storage, and reporting. Following the review program leaders submitted annual data successfully and are currently coordinating and improving their data system with their ESD partners. The capabilities in the new system address the concerns mentioned by the review team members in 2019.

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’s November 2019 Findings: Unmet

At the time of the review, ESD-U program personnel cooperated with district human resources professionals and building leaders to identify and recruit potential candidates and their mentors ([Roles and Responsibilities](#)). In most cases, mentors were assigned prior to beginning the program. Primary considerations during field placement were 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 did not regularly offer candidates opportunities to reflect upon interactions with diverse populations and communities in order to integrate professional growth in cultural responsiveness as a habit of practice ([WAC 181-78A-236\(4\)\(b\)](#)). Review team members held that the district-as-customer model prevented the program for serving candidates with field experiences that conflict with district or building needs.. This challenge has not been unique to ESD-U but has occurred in programs in which a candidate is working on a conditional certificate or is otherwise embedded in a full time school-based position.

Program Team's September 2020 response to Domain 6D:

ESD-U strives to 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. During their first seminar in September, candidates are asked to complete the [Context for Field Placement Personal Reflection Form](#) to reflect on potential special considerations of students served. Candidates are asked to identify student interests, their assets and the cultures represented. Additionally, they are asked to explore the OSPI report card site to identify the demographic data. As ESD-U is designed as a Grow Your Own program, and most candidates are serving the students in the communities where they live, all efforts are made to ensure that each candidate has the opportunity (potentially with a partner district) to access students who have backgrounds different from their own. The [Context for Field Placement Personal Reflection Form](#) identifies these situations and asks that the candidate work with the program and their district to create a plan to work in a different school community.

The ESD-U program intentionally supports candidates to demonstrate culturally responsive teaching practices through modeling by instructors in course work, learning focused conversations with mentors and field supervisors, and required assignments in class. Through coursework, candidates are provided experiences to enhance knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to culturally competent teaching practices and to include into their lesson plans culturally responsive objectives and how to elicit feedback. These opportunities are found in each of the [course syllabi](#).

PESB Staff Distillation of Domain 6D:

Program leaders addressed the challenges present in meeting this standard by gathering more specific information from candidates, establishing a planning process with partnering districts, and adjusting the course syllabi. These steps allowed for the program leaders to have more information about each candidate's teaching environment and the candidate's own schooling background. With this information, and partnership processes in place, they addressed the core of the review team's concern with this standard area.

Program Standards and Requirements Undecided During 2019 Review

Description of the review team's 2019 findings on each standard area that was undecided are provided below. Following the excerpt from the review report are the program team's response and a brief synthesis by PESB staff.

Unmet Standards During 2019 27-Month Review	
1B	<i>Recruiting and Supporting Underrepresented Groups of Candidates</i>
3C	<i>Providers prepare candidates for their role in directing, supervising, and evaluating paraeducators.</i>

2A. Methods of Instruction | *Providers demonstrate effective, culturally responsive pedagogy using multiple instructional methods, formats, and assessments.*

Review Team's November 2019 Findings: Undecided

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 had access to the Mentor Academy and BEST Roundtables ([Mentor Academy 101 Agenda](#); [Mentor Academy Descriptions](#); [BEST Mentor Roundtables](#)). Instructors were evaluated annually by the program director, who observed instructors and conducted 1:1 follow up coaching as needed. Instructors were also evaluated by candidates through course evaluations and program evaluations. Instructors and candidates had access to Proquest research database to access recent, relevant course research resources. Candidates did 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 were 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 emphasized the assets-focused lens to curriculum and instruction emphasized 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 was 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 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.

In response to the review team's initial finding that this standard was unmet, program leaders provided additional clarification and evidence. 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](#))".

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 submitted their mixed perspectives to the board for deliberation.

Program Team's September 2020 response to Domain 2A:

To ensure that faculty use multiple instructional strategies, pedagogies, and assessments to address students' academic language ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds, ESD-U provided additional training required for all instructors in ['Working with Adult Learners in a School Setting'](#). Training outcomes included how to process and make meaning of content explored (during both synchronous and asynchronous instruction) with instructors having the opportunity to discuss strategies in the text "Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain" by Zaretta Hammond and collaboratively revise their instructional units based on what was learned. Questions instructors were asked to address included the following:

- How clear are the connections to culturally responsive teaching in terms of content? [outcomes, activities, standards]
- Where will culturally responsive teaching practices be modeled for your adult learners?

Instructors in ESD-U are now provided with multiple opportunities to participate in ongoing professional learning to improve their knowledge, skills, and effectiveness in culturally responsive practices. All instructors were provided with the text "Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain" by Zaretta Hammond. Over the course of the year, [they worked within their departments](#) to discuss and identify strategies to be used throughout the courses. Additionally, instructors were provided with the opportunity to participate in the 'Culturally Responsive Teaching Learning Community', which is a course provided by Zaretta Hammond that is designed to help lead people through the study of the text in a way that helps them understand the basics of culturally responsive teaching.

Instructors collaborate within their departments, and Department Leads meet quarterly to collaborate.

Additionally, ESD 112 Content Coordinators and OSPI experts all provide opportunities for additional collaboration across the broader professional community. OSPI training includes such topics as Mentoring Matters and Leading Adult Learners.

The comprehensive and systematic review of the faculties effectiveness occurs in feedback provided through instructor created surveys (formative) and pdEnroller and Program surveys (summative). The data is reviewed by the program's administrative team, shared during instructor meetings, discussed with district partners, and reviewed during PEAB meetings and is used as the basis for course development decisions, as well as the evaluation of instructor effectiveness.

PESB Staff Distillation of Domain 2A:

Following the review, program leaders created additional professional development opportunities for all instructors. These experiences were conducted in common, so that all instructors began working for the first time around similar foundations of understanding and group expectations. These learning

experiences also called on instructors to be more specific in the ways they applied principles of culturally responsive teaching to their adult learners, as well as how they presented how their adult learners could use these ideas with P-12 students. These steps were aligned with recommendations provided by the review team in 2019.

***2D. Cultural Responsiveness** | Providers ensure that candidates are well prepared to exhibit the knowledge and skills of culturally responsive educators.*

Review Team's November 2019 Findings: Undecided

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 emphasized assets-focused approach to supporting candidates, which was associated with culturally responsive pedagogy, although 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. Multiple aspects of culturally responsive practice were 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 was 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.

In response to the review team's initial finding that this standard was unmet, program leaders provided additional clarification and evidence. 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 included the assets-focused instruction cycle listed

above. Elementary education courses also include aspects of culturally responsive education. ELEM ED [101](#) included 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 were 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.

Program Team’s September 2020 response to Domain 2D:

The ESD-U model offers candidates the opportunity to interact with racially diverse colleagues through the cohort model. The program works closely with district partners to ensure that placement(s) for each candidate provides meaningful interactions with P-12 students.

The ESD-U program intentionally supports candidates to demonstrate culturally responsive teaching practices through modeling by instructors in course work, learning focused conversations with mentors and field supervisors, and required assignments in class. Candidates are provided opportunities in class to enhance knowledge, skills and dispositions related to culturally competent teaching practices. Each [course syllabus](#) identifies how the candidates will demonstrate these culturally responsive practices. Examples of these include opportunities for candidates to examine implicit and explicit bias to develop awareness of how bias can directly and negatively impact instruction.

All instructors utilize and model the practices found in the text “Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain” by Zaretta Hammond. [Syllabi for each course](#) indicates that the planned outcomes represent high

expectations and rigor, and reflections provided to candidates include the identification of student assets, to recognize bias, and to reflect on their own cultural lens.

PESB Staff Distillation of Domain 2D:

Program leaders made efforts to embed additional course objectives into each course and focused on professional development for instructors. These steps were in alignment with recommendations made by the review team.