
3E

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Update on the Work of the Induction Task Group

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides information regarding specific recommendations from the Commission's Induction Task Group that were discussed at the June 2015 Commission meeting. The item also includes a draft report to the Legislature and Legislative Analyst's Office on Induction requirements and streamlining options, as required by the Budget Act of 2015.

Policy Question: Will the proposed changes in induction policy improve California's induction program for new teachers? Are these proposed changes sufficiently flexible to allow appropriate and necessary flexibility in the employment and induction of new teachers?

Recommended Action: That the Commission review and discuss the Task Group's recommendations, provide direction, and authorize transmittal of the Report to the Legislature and LAO by September 1, 2015.

Presenters: Karen Sacramento, Consultant, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

August 2015

Update on the Work of the Induction Task group

Introduction

This agenda item has two parts. Part I follows up on recommendations of the Commission's Induction Task Group regarding ways to strengthen and streamline new teacher induction. An update was provided at the June 2015 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-06/2015-06-5F.pdf>), during which Commissioners requested additional information and rationale for some of the Task Group's recommendations. This item provides further detail on those particular recommendations, and identifies potential next steps for the Commission's consideration. Part II of the agenda item presents a draft report to the Legislature and the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) on induction requirements and streamlining options as required by the Budget Act of 2015.

Background

As part of its comprehensive review of the Accreditation System, the Commission requested that every effort be made to reduce unnecessary emphasis on detailed program inputs and increase focus on program outcomes. One of the six task groups appointed to assist with this systemic review focused on new teacher induction. The group reaffirmed the importance of providing effective induction experiences for teachers, reviewed perceived and reported burdens on school districts and new teachers related to induction, and developed and discussed options that would strengthen and streamline this program. One of their work products provides recommended revisions to the current Induction Preconditions (Appendix A) and Induction Standards (Appendix B). These draft revised standards are currently undergoing field review and will be reviewed and revised as necessary based on Commission direction at this meeting, prior to being presented for adoption at a future Commission meeting.

Part I - Discussion of Specific Recommendations from the Induction Task Group

The Induction Task Group Recommendations address broad areas for reform and are intended to clarify induction responsibilities for school districts and participating teachers. Four of the recommendations about which the Commission had questions are listed below.

1. All General Education Clear Teaching Credential programs should be required to meet the Induction Program Standards.

Task Group Rationale: Most individuals holding a preliminary teaching credential earn the clear teaching credential by completing a Commission-approved Induction program. Currently, if an employer verifies that Induction is not available to the individual, that teacher may enroll in and complete a Clear Credential program sponsored by a college or university. A Clear Credential program is usually only one year in length, course based, and the mentoring is usually not as focused on the new teacher's assignment as the mentoring in an Induction program.

The Induction Task Group considered whether clear credential programs should be held to the same program standards as induction programs. The discussion was informed by current practice and by several research studies indicating that beginning teachers who participated in some kind of induction experience performed better on typical teaching tasks such as keeping students on task, developing workable lesson plans, using effective student questioning practices, adjusting classroom activities to meet students' interests, maintaining a positive classroom atmosphere, and demonstrating successful classroom management¹. Almost all of the studies reviewed also showed that students of beginning teachers who participated in some kind of induction had higher scores, or gains, on academic achievement tests.

The Task Group concluded that there should be equal rigor and access to mentoring in all routes to the clear general education credential. Requiring all routes to meet the revised Induction Program Standards would provide this level of consistency across the routes.

Staff Summary: If the Commission elects to implement this Task Group recommendation then induction participation would be the route to earn a clear teaching credential with all programs (Induction and Clear Credential) governed by the Induction Standards. If the Commission chooses not to implement this recommendation there would be no change to current practice: induction programs and clear credential programs would be two separate routes to earn the clear credential with two separate sets of standards consisting of rigor and experience requirements that would not be equivalent between the two programs for candidates.

2. During Induction, preliminary credential holders must be observed by a mentor and must also observe experienced, effective teachers.

Task Group Rationale: The Task Group unanimously agrees that mentors are the center of the induction experience and that a robust mentoring component must be prescribed in standards and regulation as the foundational basis for moving beginning teachers through the induction process. The Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is created from the reflective conversations between the teacher and the mentor that are based on observation of the new teachers practice by the mentor and observation of experienced and excellent teachers by the new teacher. Based on adult learning theory, through the experience of two way observation, the new teacher is able to see and examine effective practice and then apply this evidence of strong pedagogical skills to their own teaching. The group agreed that observation practices guided by highly qualified mentors supports the focus of the mentor role which should be to meet the candidate's immediate needs as well as to support long-term candidate growth along the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)* continuum through developing the

¹ *What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover?*

TM Smith, RM Ingersoll - American educational research journal, 2004

A decade of policy support for California's new teachers: The beginning teacher support and assessment program.

M Olebe - Teacher Education Quarterly, 2001

The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers a critical review of the research.

RM Ingersoll, M Strong - Review of educational research, 2011

candidates' habits of ongoing reflection on practice. Language to this effect is in draft Program Standards 3 and 4.

Staff Summary: If the Commission elects to support this Task Group recommendation then the implementation would be through the induction program standards when adopted. If the Commission elects not to support this recommendation then it could provide direction to staff around the role of observations in induction and what emphasis, if any, should be placed on new teachers observing experienced teachers in the induction process.

3. Completion of the Induction program should be defined as making demonstrable progress towards mastery of the CSTP.

Task Group Rationale: The Task Group agreed that effective mentoring within an induction program is designed to support each candidate's growth towards mastery of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Observed and documented evidence that a candidate has met the goals of the Individual Learning Plan and completed all program activities and requirements should lead to the recommendation for the clear credential. Language to this effect is in draft Program Standard 5 in Appendix B.

Staff Summary: If the Commission elects to support this Task Group recommendation then implementation would be through the Induction program standards when adopted. If the Commission elects not to support this recommendation then it could provide direction to staff around measures of induction program completion other than making demonstrable progress towards mastery of the CSTP.

4. The individual must be in an assignment authorized by the preliminary credential to be eligible for Induction.

Task Group Rationale: The Task Group believes that quality induction must include an in-depth analysis of teaching practice to support improvement and growth in the CSTP. In the proposed Draft Induction Standards, the structure and supports for that inquiry and analysis are required to be detailed in the Individual Learning Plan. A preliminary credential holder who is not employed in a position requiring the credential is not fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of a teacher and consequently does not have the appropriate context in which to engage in a robust examination of teaching practice. The opportunity for cycles of inquiry, examination of student response to instruction, and adjustments to practice in an authentic setting is not available to credential holders who are not employed as teachers. While other experiences with students in settings such as after school programs have some similarities to employment as a teacher, they are not equivalent in responsibility, scope, duration, or accountability.

If the Commission were to adopt this recommendation, preliminary credential holders who are unable to secure employment that would qualify for induction after completion of their preliminary preparation would have several extensions of time available to them. The extensions are explained in the leaflet on the Commission's website at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/al3.pdf>.

Staff Summary: If the Commission elects to support this Task Group recommendation then employment as a teacher would be a requirement for enrollment in and completion of an induction program. If the Commission elects not to support this recommendation then additional work with the Task Group would need to place to define the appropriate settings and experiences for new teachers to complete induction.

A fifth Task Group recommendation addresses the responsibilities of employers to provide a mentor to new teachers. Staff is still working with stakeholder groups to try to develop language that addresses this topic that will work for new teachers, programs and employers. It is expected that the language would be ready to share at the October 2015 Commission meeting.

Staff Recommendation

That the Commission discuss each of the issues identified in the agenda item and decide which, if any, of the recommendations it supports.

Next Steps

If the Commission determines that it supports some or all of the recommendations or requires further information, and directs staff accordingly, staff will work with the Induction Task Group to develop plans to implement the recommendations the Commission supports and/or provide additional information for the Commission's consideration.

Staff will continue the stakeholder review process for the Induction Preconditions (Appendix A) and the CSTP-based Draft Induction Standards (Appendix B) after making any modifications based on the Commission's discussion at the August 2015 meeting. Following a review of input received, the final draft of the revised standards could be presented for potential adoption at the October 2015 Commission meeting.

Part II: Report to the Legislature and the Legislative Analyst's Office

The Budget Act of 2015 (SB 69, Item 6360-001-0407, Provision 8) , requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to submit by September 1, 2015, a report to the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the budget and policy committees on beginning teacher induction. Specifically, the provisional language reads as follows:

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) shall work with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Board of Education, legislative staff, the Department of Finance, and beginning teacher induction stakeholders that the CTC deems appropriate to evaluate any burdens of the existing induction requirements and identify options for streamlining and reforming beginning teacher induction. The CTC shall submit a report that discusses the identified options, findings, and funding recommendations, including state, local educational agency, and teacher candidate responsibilities, to the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the budget and policy committees of each house of the Legislature, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the Department of Finance by September 1, 2015.

The report is provided in Appendix C of this agenda item.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize transmittal of the Report to the Legislature and the Legislative Analyst's Office in order to meet the reporting requirement in a timely manner.

Appendix A

Draft Revised Preconditions for Induction Programs

Definition of "Preconditions": Preconditions are requirements that must be met in order for an accrediting or licensing agency to consider accrediting a program sponsor or approving its programs or schools.

Draft Preconditions

1. Each Induction Program must be designed as a two-year, individualized, job-embedded system of mentoring, support and professional learning that begins in the teacher's first year of teaching.
2. Each Induction program, in concert with each partner employing agency, must identify and assign a mentor to each participating teacher within the first 30 days of the participant's enrollment in the program, matching the mentor and participating teacher according to grade level and/or subject area, as appropriate to the participant's employment. The participating teacher must receive an average of not less than one hour per week of individualized support/mentoring coordinated and/or provided by the mentor.
3. Individual participant's goals within the Individual Learning Plan must be developed within the first 60 days of enrollment in the program.
4. The Individual Learning Plan must be designed and implemented solely for the professional growth and development of the participant and not for evaluation for employment purposes.
5. An institution sponsoring a teacher induction program must make available and must advise participants of an Early Completion option for "experienced and exceptional" candidates who meet the program's established criteria.

Appendix B

Draft Revised Induction Program Standards

Induction Program Design for Mentoring Clear Teaching Credential Candidates

Standard 1: Program Purpose

Each Induction Program must support candidate development and growth in the profession through designing and implementing a robust mentoring system as described in the following standards that helps each candidate work towards meeting the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*.

Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design

The Induction program's mentoring design must be based on a sound rationale informed by theory and research, and must provide multiple opportunities for candidates to demonstrate growth in the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. The mentoring approach implemented by the program must include the development of an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) for candidates based on needs determined by the teacher, site administrator, and program provider. The ILP must address identified candidate competencies that support the recommendation for the credential. Mentoring support for candidates must include both "just in time" and longer term analysis of teaching practice to help candidates develop enduring professional skills. The program's design features both individually and as a whole must serve to strengthen the candidate's professional practice and contribute to the candidate's future retention in the profession.

Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System

The individualized learning plan (ILP) must address the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* and provide the road map for candidates' induction work during their time in the program along with guidance for the mentor in providing support. The ILP must be collaboratively developed at the beginning of induction by the candidate and the mentor, with input from the employer regarding the candidate's job assignment, and guidance from the program staff. The ILP must include candidate professional growth goals, a description of how the candidate will work to meet those goals, defined and measurable outcomes for the candidate, and planned opportunities to reflect on progress and modify the ILP as needed. The candidate's specific teaching assignment should provide the appropriate context for the development of the overall ILP; however, the candidate and the mentor may add additional goals based on the candidate's professional interests such as, for example, advanced certifications, additional content area literacy, and early childhood education. Within the ILP, professional learning and support opportunities for each candidate must be identified for candidates to practice and refine effective teaching practices for all students through focused cycles of inquiry.

The program must assist the candidate and the mentor with assuring the availability of resources necessary to accomplishing the ILP. The program must ensure dedicated time for regular mentor and candidate interactions, observations of colleagues and peers by the candidate, and other activities contained in the ILP. In addition, the mentoring process must support candidate's consistent practice of reflection on the effectiveness of instruction, analysis of student and other

outcomes data, and the use of these data to further inform the repeated cycle of planning and instruction. Within the ongoing mentoring interactions, the mentor must encourage and assist candidates to connect with and become part of the larger professional learning community within the profession.

Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors

The induction program assigns qualified mentors and provides guidance and clear expectations for the mentoring experience based on the program's design. Qualifications for mentors must include but are not limited to:

- Knowledge of the context and the content area of the candidate's teaching assignment
- Demonstrated commitment to professional learning and collaboration
- Holding a Clear Credential
- Ability, willingness, and flexibility to meet candidate needs for support
- Minimum of three years of effective teaching experience

Guidance and clear expectations for the mentoring experience provided by the program must include but are not limited to:

- Providing "just in time" support for candidates, in accordance with the ILP, along with longer-term guidance to promote enduring professional skills
- Facilitation of candidate growth and development via providing modeling, guided reflection on practice, and feedback on classroom instruction
- Connecting candidates with available resources to support their professional growth and accomplishment of the ILP
- Periodically reviewing the ILP with candidates and making adjustments as needed

The program must provide ongoing training and support for mentors that includes, but is not limited to:

- Coaching and mentoring
- Goal setting
- Use of appropriate mentoring instruments
- Best practices in adult learning
- Support for individual mentoring challenges, reflection on mentoring practice, and opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks.
- Program processes designed to support candidate growth and effectiveness

Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation

The Induction program must assess candidate progress towards mastery of the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* to support the recommendation for the clear credential. The documentation of candidate progress must reflect the learning and professional growth goals indicated within the Individualized Learning Plan and evidence of the candidate's successful completion of the activities outlined in the ILP.

Prior to recommending a candidate for a Clear Credential, the Induction Program sponsor must verify that the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements, and that the program has documented the basis on which the recommendation for the clear credential is made. The program sponsor's verification must be based on a review of observed and documented evidence, collaboratively assembled by the candidate, the mentor and/or other colleagues, according to the program's design. The Induction program's recommendation verification process must include a defensible process of reviewing documentation, a written appeal process for candidates, and a procedure for candidates to repeat portions of the program, as needed.

Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services

The program must regularly assess the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates, using criteria that include candidate feedback, the quality and perceived effectiveness of support provided to candidates in implementing their Individualized Learning Plan, and the opportunity to complete the full range of program requirements. Induction program leaders must provide formative feedback to mentors on their work, including establishment of collaborative relationships. Clear procedures must be in place for the reassignment of mentors, if the pairing of candidate and mentor is not effective.

The program must provide a coherent overall system of support through the collaboration, communication and coordination between candidates, mentors, school and district administrators, and all members of the induction system.

Appendix C Draft Induction Report

Induction Report as required by Provision 8, Item 6360-001-0407
Budget Act of 2015
September 1, 2015

The Budget Act of 2015, (SB 69, Item 6360-001-0407, Provision 8), requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to submit a report on beginning teacher induction to the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the budget and policy committees by September 1, 2015. Specifically, the provisional language reads as follows:

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) shall work with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Board of Education, legislative staff, the Department of Finance, and beginning teacher induction stakeholders that the CTC deems appropriate to evaluate any burdens of the existing induction requirements and identify options for streamlining and reforming beginning teacher induction. The CTC shall submit a report that discusses the identified options, findings, and funding recommendations, including state, local educational agency, and teacher candidate responsibilities, to the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the budget and policy committees of each house of the Legislature, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the Department of Finance by September 1, 2015.

California has led the nation since 1988 when it initiated a pilot effort to identify strategies that would support new teachers as they entered the teaching profession. Over the years, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program has had a demonstrable impact on teacher quality, effectiveness and retention in the profession.² While much of the education landscape has changed in the more than 25 years since new teacher induction came into being, the idea that the state should protect its investment in a high quality teaching force has endured.

This report provides background information detailing the evolution of funding and program requirements for Induction, surfaces challenges facing the program currently, and identifies options for strengthening and streamlining new teacher induction. In developing this report, the Commission consulted with many stakeholder organizations and individuals, heard multiple reports on the strengths and weaknesses of the current program, and participated in a stakeholder meeting hosted by the Executive Director of the State Board of Education where the issue of new teacher induction was discussed. The recommendations provided in this report are in alignment with the recommendations from an Induction Task Group that has been meeting as part of the Commission's

² *What are the effects of induction and mentoring on **beginning teacher** turnover?*

TM Smith, RM Ingersoll - American educational research journal, 2004

*A decade of policy **support** for California's new **teachers**: The **beginning teacher support and assessment** program.*

M Olebe - **Teacher** Education Quarterly, 2001

*The **impact** of induction and mentoring programs for **beginning teachers** a critical review of the research.*

RM Ingersoll, M Strong - Review of educational research, 2011

larger effort to strengthen and streamline preparation standards, assessments and accreditation practices.

Background

The California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA) was established in 1992 by the Legislature and the Governor following the success of the California New Teacher Project, a pilot study authorized by the Legislature (Chap.1355, Stats. 1988) and jointly conducted by the Commission and the California Department of Education (CDE) that focused on increasing retention rates of beginning teachers. The findings from the California New Teacher Project indicated that new teachers who participated in an induction experience that included intensive mentoring, support, and assistance were not only more successful in their first two years of teaching, they were also less likely to leave the profession within the first five years of teaching.³ Findings from the study also suggested that beginning teacher success, effectiveness, and retention could be improved by thinking of teacher preparation and induction as a “learning to teach” system. This system begins with teacher recruitment, continues with initial teacher preparation, and moves into supporting new teachers in the beginning years of professional service in the classroom. In 2008, the Commission collected retention information from Induction programs that showed over [87% of new teachers who participated in BTSA Induction](#) were still in the teaching profession after five years. National studies confirm what we have learned in California, that overall, between 30 and 50 percent of teachers leave teaching within the first five years, but that teachers who receive multiple forms of support tend to stay in the profession.⁴

The Marion Bergeson Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Act (Chap. 1245, Stats. 1992) was enacted to provide an effective transition into the teaching career for first and second year teachers through intensive professional development and assessment. The BTSA program was established as a state-funded grant program to support beginning teachers in their first two years of teaching. The program was funded through Prop 98 and administered jointly by the CDE and the Commission. In 1998, the Budget Act provided \$66.0 million, which funded over 12,000 beginning teachers. The state funding allocation was set each year in the annual budget act and it only funded new teachers participating in a BTSA program sponsored by a local education agency (LEA). Funding was awarded on a per-participant basis initially with \$3,000 from the state and a required \$2,000 match by the employing LEA. By 2007-2008, the last full year of categorical funding, the Budget Act provided \$128 million, which supported 30,118 beginning teachers.

In 1998 SB 2042 (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998) formally incorporated the completion of an Induction program into the teacher preparation and licensure process, making Induction one of the routes for earning a clear teaching credential. The other route to the clear credential was through a coursework-based Clear Credential program offered by an institution of higher education. The primary difference between these programs is how the local context—class, school and district—is addressed. In an Induction program where the work is between a new teacher and his or her mentor at the school site, the local context can more easily be addressed whereas when a new teacher is enrolled at a college or university it maybe more challenging for the support and mentoring to truly be job-embedded. With the inclusion

³ Pearson, M.J. & Honig, B., 1992, *Success for Beginning Teachers: The California New Teacher Project 1988-1992*.

⁴ Ingersoll, R., 2003, *Is there a Shortage of Teachers?*; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004, *Do Teacher Induction and Mentoring Matter?*; Ingersoll, R., 2014, *What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teacher attrition?*

of BTSA Induction programs as one route to the clear credential, BTSA became both a categorical program administered by the CDE as well as an educator preparation program leading to a credential that was monitored by the Commission. In 2004 emergency legislation, AB 2210 (Chap. 343, Stats. 2004), was enacted making Induction the preferred path for earning the clear general education teaching credential and limiting access to Clear Credential programs. This measure allows the completion of a Commission-approved Clear Credential program offered by an institution of higher education only when a teacher's employer verifies that an Induction program is not available. The Commission reviewed and modified its accreditation system in 2006 and made the policy decision that any program leading to a credential should be included in the accreditation system. BTSA Induction programs were transitioned into the Commission's accreditation system beginning in 2010-11, tightening the linkage between induction and credentialing. Following California's lead, 22 states have built induction into their credentialing system although only 10 of the states require an induction program to be a minimum of two years⁵.

Beginning in 2009-10, the State moved several categorical programs, including BTSA, into a large flexible block-grant in order to provide LEAs with greater flexibility to respond to budget reductions brought about by the recession. From 2009-10 through 2012-13 LEAs were allowed to use these funds for any educational purpose. Fewer than five Commission-approved Induction programs closed during the time of flexible funding.

Beginning in 2013-14 California restructured its funding for education, consolidating revenue limit and categorical program funding into a Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). With LCFF, each LEA that sponsored a Commission-approved Induction program continued to receive the funding it had been receiving. The Commission conducted a survey of approved Induction programs in January 2015. The survey data indicate that approximately 88.5% of new teachers were not being required to pay for Induction services in 2014-15. A summary of findings from the survey is provided in the Appendix of this report.

The Commission's Induction Program Standards are used to accredit Induction programs leading to the Clear Credential and are the State's only vehicle, currently, for monitoring program quality. The standards incorporate the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and define what a program must provide to candidates and what each candidate must know and be able to do at the conclusion of the Induction program prior to earning the clear teaching credential. The Commission's standards do not specify how programs should meet the requirements, which allows for regional and local variation. Programs vary in terms of structure, specific program requirements and local employer participation and expectations. Over the past 20 years the number of Induction programs operating in California has grown from 15 pilot programs to over 150 accredited programs.

The Commission's standards for Induction programs have evolved over the last twenty years as the program has expanded and contracted. The most significant change in recent years was driven by Senate Bill 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats 2006) which directed the Commission to "...eliminate duplicative requirements between teacher preparation and teacher induction programs...." As a result, the twenty

⁵ NTC Policy Brief: Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction (2012)

<http://www.newteachercenter.org/sites/default/files/ntc/main/resources/brf-ntc-policy-state-teacher-induction.pdf>

BTSA program standards that called for advanced preparation for new teachers during Induction were substantially revised and replaced with six Induction program standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/Induction-Program-Standards.pdf>, 2009). These 6 Induction standards were updated in 2013 to strengthen requirements related to teaching English learners (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/Induction-Program-Standards-2013.pdf>). The Commission is currently considering needed revisions to Induction standards to bring them into alignment with other changes in preparation, assessment, accreditation, and conditions in local schools and districts.

In 2015 there are 156 Commission-approved General Education Induction programs (2 CSU, 1 UC, 4 private colleges and universities, and 149 LEAs) in California. There are 17 Commission-approved Clear Credential programs (2 CSU, 3 UC, and 13 private colleges and universities). In addition, there are a total of 105 Special Education Clear Induction programs (20 sponsored by IHEs and 85 sponsored by LEAs). Induction continues to be the primary route for new teachers to complete requirements for and earn a professional teaching credential.

To continue to have the kind of induction programs California became famous for, the Commission is in the process of strengthening both the standards that guide and govern induction programs and the accreditation procedures that guarantee a consistent level of quality in this system statewide. These upgrades will help ensure, to the extent possible, that candidates have access to effective mentoring and induction during their first two years of teaching, and that public schools and the students they serve are taught by teachers who have had every opportunity to learn and become highly effective teachers.

Current Challenges Facing New Teachers and Induction Program Sponsors

The Budget Act directed the Commission to evaluate any burdens of the existing Induction requirements. Over the past 20 years, teacher, employer and program experiences have guided needed revisions and updates to the state's policies governing new teacher induction. In 2013 a study was undertaken by Julia Koppich and Dan Humphrey focused on new teachers. The report, [California's Beginning Teachers: The Bumpy Path to a Profession](#), details findings from some districts where new teachers were not being supported in their first years of teaching and where some programs were not providing activities and experiences that addressed the needs of new teachers. The findings from this study of eight school districts shed light on issues that need to be addressed in the state's review of induction policies and procedures. Five key issues are identified here and discussed below:

- Induction is in some cases a repeat of the preliminary preparation program
- Induction is a sequential process that does not apply to the new teacher's assignment
- Induction has too much required documentation that detracts from supporting the new teacher in his or her teaching assignment
- Some districts have difficulty prioritizing their induction responsibilities
- Ensuring quality in all Induction Programs

Repeat of Preliminary Preparation: While the Induction program is intended to advance the skills learned in the credentialing program, some teachers reported that significant parts of the Induction curriculum duplicated portions of their teacher preparation program. Because both programs are structured around the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP), it is inevitable that some topics will be revisited during induction. When done well, repetition can reinforce newly learned skills in ways that are beneficial. When done superficially, this can lead to frustration as new teachers feel either that they are “running in place” or that their limited time is being misused in re-covering recent ground. The goal of induction is to apply the knowledge gained during preliminary preparation in ways that take that learning deeper and help the new teacher to be more grounded and effective.

Sequential Process not Individualized to New Teacher: Some programs are organized in a manner that delivers a common set of experiences for all participants, with inadequate personalization based on the new teacher’s particular context. The Induction program was designed to serve multiple purposes. It helps to retain new teachers by encouraging and equipping them with basic classroom skills. It also provides support in the form of an experienced mentor. And finally, it serves to advance a teacher’s practice by helping them develop their skills. However, while all beginning teachers need some mentoring in all aspects of the CSTP, each teacher needs more or less help in particular areas based on their skills and the specific circumstances of their classroom. The tension between common and individualized experiences can lead to frustration if a teacher and mentor feel that time is being wasted on unnecessary activities.

Excessive Documentation: Concerns about excessive documentation have long plagued induction programs. A certain amount of documentation on each candidate was considered necessary when induction became linked to the credentialing system. In prior years, the formative assessment system used by new teachers and their mentors was the vehicle that documented new teacher development and demonstrated completion of tasks and activities. When Induction programs were integrated into the accreditation system, programs were counseled to document that each participating teacher or candidate completed all program requirements and provide that documentation for review during accreditation site visits. Teachers interviewed by Koppich and Humphrey in 2013 reported that many of the program’s paperwork requirements continue to be onerous, duplicative, and do not contribute significantly to their development as effective teachers. Induction programs have been seen as being too focused on measurable inputs, such as written assignments and documentation of actions, rather than focusing on the mentoring and support of beginning teachers. This presents a challenge to both participants and mentors in balancing the tasks required by Induction with the responsibilities of being a classroom teacher.

Difficulty in Prioritizing Induction Responsibilities: Some program sponsors have been challenged in their prioritization of Induction responsibilities with other educational priorities of the LEA. Many sponsoring districts argue that their primary responsibility is to their K-12 students, rather than the adult population of teachers in their Induction program. This can lead to challenges in allocating resources, focusing the work of administrators, and prioritizing of the needs of the Induction program. As a consequence, some districts have failed to provide mentoring and coaching to all of their novice teachers, and some teachers are not receiving induction services until their third, fourth or fifth year

of teaching. In addition, the responsibilities of sponsoring a Commission-approved educator preparation program include participation in the Commission's accreditation system. Some LEAs have shared that developing, submitting and participating in the biennial reports, program assessment, and accreditation site visits is burdensome.

Ensuring Quality in All Programs: As a credential program that was initially developed as a grant program, Induction has been subject to multiple quality oversight strategies since its inception. Grant funding requirements in the early years of BTSA focused on compliance issues, like budget management, resource allocation, and staffing. Accreditation standards, on the other hand, focused on the selection and training of mentors, the content of professional development, expectations for new teacher development, and tended not to be as compliance oriented as grant conditions. Recently, the accreditation review process has revealed variations in program quality and the experiences that new teachers have across different programs. The current standards do not adequately address the amount of mentoring, support, and assistance, which are the most essential features of high quality induction programs. The Commission's standards and accreditation system can and should be adjusted to strengthen oversight of program features that are known to be critical to effective induction programs, like the amount of protected time mentors and new teachers have together.

Four options for strengthening and reforming teacher induction are presented in the next section of this report. These analyses and options were developed in concert with a broadly representative Task Force consisting of teachers, employers, induction stakeholders and higher education faculty.

Options for Streamlining and Reforming Beginning Teacher Induction

The Commission has identified a variety of changes that could strengthen, streamline and reduce the identified burdens of an Induction program for both the new teacher and program sponsors. The primary vehicle for enacting these proposed changes is the Commission's soon to be revised standards for induction programs and the accreditation system. These changes provide the broad framework to support induction as a statewide priority, and will guide needed changes in regulation. These options do not require new statutory authority to enact.

1. The Commission's Induction Standards should be focused primarily on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CTSP).

The CSTP represent the knowledge and skills that individuals must master in order to be effective teachers. These include cycles of inquiry, engagement within a professional community, integration of elements of the professional knowledge base in the service of learning, growth, and development of diverse students across varying contexts and a common set of professional and ethical obligations that includes a profound and fundamental commitment to the growth and success of the individual students. While the CTSP have always been a component of California's induction standards, this recommendation would ensure that Induction programs are built on the foundation of the CSTP.

2. Mentoring should be the primary focus of the Induction program with an emphasis on meeting the new teacher's immediate needs and supporting long term teacher growth through ongoing reflection on and analysis of teaching practice.

There is wide consensus across all stakeholder groups that strong and effective mentoring is one of the primary factors contributing to teacher retention and classroom performance and is the most important aspect of induction. Ensuring adequate time for teachers and mentors to work together and providing robust tools to support the mentoring relationship are critical features of effective induction programs. The mentoring should include the new teacher observing experienced, effective teachers as well as the mentor observing and providing feedback to the new teacher. These priorities and qualities of effective induction need to be addressed in the Commission's accreditation standards and regulations guiding and governing induction programs.

3. An Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) should serve as the primary method for determining the nature and scope of the new teacher's induction program. The ILP should include a cycle of inquiry guided by the candidate's current assignment, career aspirations, and local and state initiatives.

Induction participation should be based on inquiry wherein teachers use evidence and analysis of students' academic progress, and the teacher's performance, goals and context to guide their practice in support of student learning. Based on teacher concerns that their programs did not always apply well to their specific circumstances, the Commission has determined that Induction, while meeting certain generalized requirements, should be customizable, in order to appropriately reflect and build upon the experiences of the individual teacher.

4. Streamline the Accreditation System to eliminate unnecessary and time consuming documentation activities and increase reliance on outcome data submitted by each program to determine the quality and effectiveness of programs.

Currently all Commission-approved program sponsors participate in the Commission's accreditation system in the same way. The Commission is revising the accreditation system to reduce and streamline the amount of documentation needed and relied upon to determine program quality, and shifting its focus to a more thorough examination of program outcomes as a key indicator of quality. Induction programs differ in some fundamental ways from preliminary preparation programs, and the revised accreditation system needs to be sensitive to and appropriately structured to accommodate these differences.

Funding Considerations

Beginning teachers are required to complete Induction to earn a Clear Teaching Credential. The value of this requirement, in terms of grounding new teachers in their practice and retaining them in the profession, has been well documented and is widely understood in the policy, K-12 and higher education communities. California has had a long tradition of supporting new teacher participation in an induction program, recognizing it as an investment in the overall quality of our public schools.

The 2015 Budget includes \$490 million for activities that promote educator quality and effectiveness, including beginning teacher and administrator support and mentoring, support for teachers who have been identified as needing improvement, and professional development that is aligned to the state academic content standards. These funds will be allocated to school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and the state special schools in an equal amount per certificated staff and are available for expenditure over the next three years.

Induction into the teaching profession is not unique to teachers in California's credentialing system. The lessons learned from new teacher induction have informed changes in other credential areas as well. Special education teachers and administrators are also expected to participate in a well- designed, mentoring-centered induction program that moves them from novice to experienced and effective educators. The "learning to teach" and "learning to lead" systems are a hallmark of licensing and certification in California, and have yielded significant benefits in terms of developing a well prepared workforce for the schools. As local education agencies continue to develop and refine their capacity to exercise local control in ways that strengthen and improve public education, the state monitoring system could be refined to ensure that educator induction remains a priority for local education agencies. Specific strategies that would be helpful in this regard include adding language to the LCAP requirements and to the annual statewide auditing system to monitor the availability of mentoring to beginning teachers.

Appendix

Induction—Information on PTs paying for Induction

A survey was conducted to gather information from Commission-approved teacher induction programs. The information requested included 1) the number of participating teachers in 2013-14, 2014-15 and the expectation for teachers in 2015-16, 2) if participating teachers are charged to participate in the induction program and the amount and 3) if there are eligible teachers who were not accepted into the program in 2014-15. Of the 165 Commission-approved induction programs, 7 are sponsored by IHEs and 158 are sponsored by LEAs. 126 programs, all LEAs, provided information in response to the survey. Of the 126 programs responded to the survey, 82 of the programs are single district programs and the other 44 programs are consortium programs. Not all institutions provided responses to all questions in the survey.

Commission-approved induction programs accept and support teachers on preliminary teaching credentials and then recommend the completer for the Clear Teaching credential: general education teachers-Multiple Subject and Single Subject (GE), special education teachers (SpEd), including teachers who work in Charter schools and private schools. Not all induction programs are approved to work with Special Education teachers (There are a total of 105 SpEd Induction programs-20 sponsored by IHEs and 85 sponsored by LEAs).

1) Number of Participating Teachers

# Districts in Program	# Programs	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2	
1*	82	3525	2835	3735	3380	Asked if significantly fewer (1), slightly fewer (2), about the same (3), slightly more (4) or significantly more (5) Mean response was 3.65—the programs are expecting to grow slightly in 15-16
2-5	15	433	381	672	440	
6-10	6	283	233	301	254	
11-20	10	906	791	1035	1036	
21-50	9	1559	1165	2178	1616	
51-100	1	19	26	29	31	
101-200	3	1415	1071	1702	1498	
TOTALS	126	8140	6502	9652	8255	
		14,642		17,907		

*Single district programs. All other programs are consortium programs

2) Programs Charging the Participating Teacher and the Fee

# Programs	Average PT Fee and # of Programs Charging PTs in 2014-15								General Ed Induction	
	GE		SpEd*		Charter*		Private*		% Programs Charging a Fee by # Districts	# PTs Paying Fees in 2014-15/Total # PTs for the Group of Pgms
	Avg Fee	# Pgms Charge	Avg Fee	# Pgms Charge	Avg Fee	# Pgms Charge	Avg Fee	# Pgms Charge		
82	\$1,640	5	\$1,750	3	\$2,180	9	\$2,358	12	6 %	373/7,115
15	\$1,750	1	\$1,750	2	\$3,266	3	\$3,350	7	7 %	109/1,112
6	\$2,500	1	\$2,000	1	-	0	\$2,250	2	17 %	60/555
10	\$390	2	\$390	2	\$1,093	3	\$2,430	6	20 %	205/2,071
9	\$1,667	3	\$1,500	2	\$1,667	3	\$2,380	5	33 %	1,256/3,794
1	\$2,000	1	-	0	\$2,500	1	-	0	100 %	60/60
3	-	0	-	0	-	0	\$3,000	3	0 %	0/3,200
126	14 (11 %)		10 (8 %)		19 (15 %)		35 (28 %)		2,063/17,907 11.5 %	

*the program may not have SpEd, charter school or private school teachers enrolled

3) Are there eligible new teachers that the program is NOT serving in 2014-15

# Districts in Program	# Programs	# Programs NOT serving <u>all</u> eligible teachers in 2014-15	Notes
1	82	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many programs report that if there is a PT fee, the teacher has declined to enroll this year, and is hoping to complete through the Early Completion Option and pay less to the program. Other programs report that teachers hired after November or December have been put on a waitlist until the 2015-16 school year. A few programs report that there have insufficient SPs to work with all new teachers.
2-5	15	1	
6-10	6	0	
11-20	10	1	
21-50	9	1	
51-100	1	0	
101-200	3	0	
TOTALS	126	12	

Consortium Programs

Many consortium programs report that the fee varies if the district is a partner in the consortium or if the PT is joining ad hoc. In some consortia the fee varies depending on what services each district wants the consortium to provide to the district.

Stipends paid to Support Providers (SP)

Programs report a range of SP stipends-- \$1,000-\$3,000 per year per PT, the average SP stipend is around \$2,000

Average Cost to run an Induction program

The survey also asked each program to calculate the **Total Cost per PT** for a **Year in Induction** (2014-15; 75 programs responded). Responses ranged from \$1,000 to \$9,468 per PT with a mean of **\$4,249**. For the programs that provided both the number of participants and the cost per PT, the following scatter plot was developed.

