Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Initial Program Approval:
CLEAR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CREDENTIAL PROGRAM

Institution	Ventura Unified School District
Submission Link	
Date of Review	April 2026
Dates of Subsequent Reviews	June 2026, <Insert Review Month/Year>

Reviewer Instructions:

- You will be providing feedback for each program standard.
- Please reference the program standards handbook linked on the Program Standards webpage as you review.
- If the standard **is fully addressed**, please write "No additional information needed" in the respective *Reviewers' (First, etc.) Review* row.
- If the standard **is not fully addressed**, please provide specific feedback, and identify the part(s) of the standard not addressed.

Institution Instructions:

- Amend the original submission in an easily identifiable manner either **bold**, highlighting and/or different colored text. Also, identify the response to feedback (i.e., "Response to First Review," "Response to Second Review, etc.").
- Provide the **direct link** to the updated submission in the *Link(s) to Institution's Response* row for each standard that the reviewers identified as needing more information. The link must take the reviewers to the **exact location** of the amended evidence on the IPA proposal website. For example, if the response to feedback was updated in Element 1.2, then provide a link to Element 1.2 in the *Link(s) to Institution's Response* row.
- Once you have responded to the feedback, *please email this form back to the IIA Team as an attached word document.*
- If a standard is aligned, no additional information or link is necessary.

General Comments

There are several documents that indicate or require a mid-year CPSEL Self-assessment. Reviewers believe some of these may refer to the IIP focus elements only, but it is unclear if these instead refer to the benchmark CPSEL self-assessment completed mid-program. It would be helpful for reviewers to better understand the two self-assessments and when each is done by the candidates so we can determine alignment to the appropriate standards. Clarification on when a CPSEL self-assessment is an IIP focus element self-assessment or the full element self-assessment would also be helpful.

Clear Administrative Services Credential Program Standards

PS 1: Program Design and Rationale

Reviewers' Feedback & Institution's Response
Reviewers' First Review: The program handbook includes program standard 1 language "enrollment in a program expected upon placement in an administrative position, but no later than one year from activation of the preliminary credential". Reviewers request clarification on when candidates have access to the handbook, how the program is designed to ensure internal partners and prospective candidates receive eligibility information, and what processes are in place to ensure the timeline outlined in this standard is met?
Link(s) to Institution's Response to First Review:
Reviewers' Second Review: No additional information needed at this time.
Link(s) to Institution's Response to Second Review:

PS 2: Program Collaboration, Communication, and Coordination

Reviewers' Feedback & Institution's Response
Reviewers' First Review: Evidence of meetings with a regional IHE group twice per year was reviewed. Without an agenda, purpose of meeting notes it is unclear if these meetings would be evidence of "the induction program formally collaborates with education organizations through partnership agreements to establish a professional education community structure that facilitates and supports induction activities." In what ways is the program communicating on a regular basis with partners to support individualized candidate learning? Provide evidence of: • The induction program **individualizes professional learning** opportunities for each candidate and includes program, employer, partner and high-quality professional learning approved by the provider, in support of Standard 5 outcomes • The program regularly assesses the quality of their professional learning offerings using criteria that includes…direct observation of offerings. • The program leaders provide formative feedback to professional learning providers on their work.
Link(s) to Institution's Response to First Review:
Reviewers' Second Review: No additional information needed at this time.
Link(s) to Institution's Response to Second Review:

PS 3: Selection and Training of Coaches

Reviewers' Feedback & Institution's Response

Reviewers' First Review:
• Provide evidence of "The induction program ...supervises coaches, using well-defined criteria."
• "Coaches receive initial training prior to being assigned to a candidate". Narrative indicates initial training occurs prior to candidate assignments, however the evidence linked contradicts this. Coach and Candidate Support and Activities Timeline indicates Coaching begins in August, and new Coach Initial training occurs in Sept - Oct 11. How will the program provide initial training to coaches prior to being assigned a candidate?
• Provide a sample of how the program will track, monitor and/or document "the program identifies and assigns one of its coaches to each candidate within the first 30 days of days of the candidate's admission to the program"?
• Evidence was provided of the mentor/coach feedback conversation guide and agendas of coach training with activities for coaches to practice and receive feedback on coaching skills. It is unclear if formative feedback is coming from program leaders to coaches and when participant feedback is shared.
  ○ How will "The program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by coaches to candidates, using criteria including… direct observation of coaching, growth of candidate on established criteria, and compliance with program requirements"?
  ○ How will "Induction program leaders provide formative feedback to coaches on their work"?

Link(s) to Institution's Response to First Review:
Reviewers' Second Review: No additional information needed at this time.
Link(s) to Institution's Response to Second Review:

PS 4: Professional Learning

Reviewers' Feedback & Institution's Response
Reviewers' First Review: 4a - "IIP considers individual job responsibilities", this is included in directions and Section 1 rubric, reviewers did not find evidence of where candidates provide this information in the IIP. 4b - Reviewers found evidence of the Program Support Plan but it is unclear how 'additional coaching hours' might be incorporated. This is in response to "In order to provide each candidate with the coaching service needed to attain program outcomes, additional coaching hours may be required." 4c • Handbook Road Map List, Professional Learning Log - 20 hours required on IIP each year (check point 4), CPSEL and Admin Session materials provided indicate different seminar lengths (3 hours and 5 hours), reviewers were not able to confirm the program is providing a minimum of 20 hours of PD offerings annually. • Evidence reviewed of professional development offerings provided by the program related to CPSEL Seminars does not include differentiated learning opportunities. This may connect back to the feedback on Program Standard 2. • Reviewers were unable to locate the evidence of CPSEL or PD offerings that include: ○ * reflection on current practice, ○ * direct instruction in research-based best practices, ○ * modeling, ○ * problem-based practice, and ○ * opportunities for planning and adaptation to current leadership responsibilities." ○ Opportunities to "Share best practices" 4d • It is unclear to reviewers if "The initial assessment is informed by multiple measures." • Reviewers did not find evidence of the Benchmark Self-Assessment prompting a "goal or IIP revision, if necessary". • It is unclear in the 1.1 narrative how the VUSD Observable Evidence of Leadership Practice is used. Is it an optional or required tool/activity?

Reviewers' Feedback & Institution's Response
Link(s) to Institution's Response to First Review:
Reviewers' Second Review: No additional information needed at this time.
Link(s) to Institution's Response to Second Review:

PS 5: California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs)

Reviewers' Feedback & Institution's Response
Reviewers' First Review: **No additional information needed at this time.**
Link(s) to Institution's Response to First Review:
Reviewers' Second Review:
Link(s) to Institution's Response to Second Review: