
2H

Information

Professional Services Committee

Report on the Study of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) and Intern Programs

Executive Summary: Staff will present the study completed by the University of California, Riverside, under the direction of the California Department of Education and the Commission, on the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) and Intern programs. This study, mandated by SB 1209 (Chap. 527, Stats. 2006), was submitted by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor and Legislature in December 2007.

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Michael McKibbin and Teri Clark, Administrators, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs.

January-February 2008

Report on the Study of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) and Intern Programs

Introduction

This agenda item provides an overview of the California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Induction and Intern Alternative Certification Evaluation Study Technical Report that was completed by the University of California Riverside as was required by SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006). A related issue, the review of induction program standards, is presented in a separate agenda item.

Background

SB 1209 reflected a number of recommendations contained in *The Status of the Teaching Profession, 2005*, a report issued by the Center of The Future of Teaching and Learning. In addition to other mandates, SB 1209 required an external evaluation of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Induction (BTSA) and California Alternative Certification (Intern) programs culminating with a report that was to be submitted to the legislature by December 1, 2007.

Evaluation of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Induction and Intern Alternative Certification Programs

In compliance with SB 1209, the California Department of Education (CDE), in consultation with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) contracted with an external entity, the University of California Riverside, to complete an evaluation of the two state funded teacher preparation programs. The study was funded with federal money that had to be expended by September 30, 2007. Dr. Douglas Mitchell and Dr. Linda Scott-Hendrick were the lead researchers for the study. SB 1209 and the Budget Bill of 2006-07 provided eight questions to be addressed by the evaluation.

1. How well are BTSA programs meeting the objectives set forth in the Education Code?
2. How well are University and District Intern programs meeting purposes specified in the Education Code?
3. What policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that district and university interns receive appropriate district assistance from experienced teachers?
4. What policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that beginning (induction) and intern teachers are prepared to address the needs of special populations of students – especially English learners and special education students?

5. What state, regional, and/or local administrative structures could improve the support services for induction and intern teachers?
6. What would be sufficient levels of funding for induction teacher and intern programs, and what criteria should state agencies use to help facilitate legislative passage of appropriate funding levels?
7. What, if any, revisions of the BTSA Induction and/or the Intern Program Standards would facilitate increased teacher competency and/or reduce engagement in unproductive activities?
8. What, if any, changes in laws, regulations, and/or policies would help eliminate duplicative requirements, streamline and coordinate support services for beginning teachers and interns?

The evaluation study of the programs assessed multiple levels of data to address the 8 questions. State level data from the Consent Forms, Statewide Surveys, and Retention Reports collected by the Commission beginning with the 2001-02 year and continuing through 2006-07 were shared with the researchers. In addition, the UCR Study Team conducted program visits and focus group interviews with 11 Intern Program and 10 BTSA Induction Program participants and stakeholders. Due to time constraints imposed by the requirement to expend the federal monies by September 30, 2007 and the Legislative Report due date, the study was not able to provide responses to all eight of the study questions. The conclusions drawn by the research team were varied and are found in the summary recommendations that follow below. The Executive Summary of the evaluation study technical report is provided in Appendix A. The complete *California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment and Intern Alternative Certification Evaluation Study: Technical Report* can be found at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports/BTSA-Intern-Technical-Report-23-Oct-2007.pdf>.

University of California, Riverside BTSA Induction and Intern Program Study Recommendations:

1. Improve Data Management
2. Improve BTSA and Intern program designs
 - 2a) Strengthen focus on performance and capacity building
 - 2b) Support Provider training
 - 2c) Enroll interns in BTSA early completion option
 - 2d) Reduce BTSA paperwork and documentation
 - 2e) Evaluate alternative Intern program designs
 - 2f) Control Intern enrollment options
 - 2g) Strengthen support provider commitment to interns
 - 2h) Strengthen intern program accountability
 - 2i) Assure formal training for intern support providers
 - 2j) Complete work already underway to revised formative assessment instruments
3. Program Standards Modifications
 - 3a) Delete the stand alone Induction technology standard

- 3b) Revise and update the content of the English Learner and Special Populations Induction standards
 - 3c) BTSA Induction needs to rethink the relationship between program standards and the elements that compose them
 - 3d) Intern program standards need more careful monitoring
4. Adjust program recruitment and participation
 - 4a) Encourage second career and internal promotion for intern programs
 - 4b) Provide better support to the interns not in funded programs
 - 4c) Provide better support for new teachers not eligible for BTSA
 5. Improve program management and governance
 - 5a) Make sure program managers have needed status with district officials
 - 5b) Expand the Regional Coordinator concept to the intern program
 6. While overall funding levels appear adequate, three important adjustments are needed.
 - 6a) Increase funding for the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors
 - 6b) Equalize state support for interns and BTSA teachers
 - 6c) Raise compensation for support providers

Implementation of the Recommendations from the Study

The recommendations presented by the research team address many aspects of both the Intern and BTSA Induction programs. Some of the recommendations from the study would require legislative action to implement the recommended change. Other recommendations could be addressed by modification of program standards and program management policies, or are issues of local program implementation. Commission staff has reviewed the recommendations for the Intern Program and is working with the CDE to assess the recommendations that address the BTSA Induction program to determine the feasibility, costs, and benefits of implementing the recommendations.

The following recommendations require *legislative action* for implementation. At this point in time, it has not been possible to ascertain the legislative interest in implementing any of these recommendations. Staff presented information about the report to legislative staff members in January.

2. Improve BTSA and Intern program designs
 - 2f) Control Intern enrollment options
5. Improve program management and governance
 - 5b) Expand the Regional Coordinator concept to the intern program
6. While overall funding levels appear adequate, three important adjustments are needed.
 - 6a) Increase funding for the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors
 - 6b) Equalize state support for interns and BTSA teachers

The following recommendations could, at least partially, be implemented through *modification of the adopted program standards*, if the Commission (Intern) and the CDE and Commission (BTSA Induction) so directed. With respect to recommendations 2a, 3a, 3b, and 3c, the Induction Standards Review Panel has been apprised of the recommendations related to the BTSA Induction

Program and will address these recommendations in its work to review and propose revisions to the Induction Program Standards:

2. Improve Intern and BTSA program designs
 - 2a) Strengthen focus on performance and capacity building
 - 2i) Assure formal training for intern support providers
3. Program Standard Modifications
 - 3a) Delete the stand alone Induction technology standard
 - 3b) Revise and update the content of the English Learner and Special Populations Induction standards
 - 3c) BTSA Induction needs to rethink the relationship between program standards and the elements that compose them.
4. Adjust program recruitment and participation
 - 4b) Provide better support to the interns not in funded programs

The following recommendations could be addressed, at least in part, by the *Commission's management policies* related to the implementation of the Intern Program. Staff is discussing the implications of addressing these recommendations.

1. Improve Data Management
2. Improve Intern program designs
 - 2a) Strengthen focus on performance and capacity building
 - 2b) Support Provider training
 - 2e) Evaluate alternative Intern program designs
 - 2f) Control Intern enrollment options
 - 2g) Strengthen support provider commitment to interns
 - 2h) Strengthen intern program accountability
 - 2i) Assure formal training for intern support providers
4. Adjust program recruitment and participation
 - 4b) Provide better support to the interns not in funded programs

The following recommendations could be addressed, at least in part, by the *CDE and Commission's management policies* related to the implementation of the BTSA Program. Staff is working through the BTSA Task Force and the State Leadership Team structure to implement these recommendations.

2. Improve BTSA program designs
 - 2c) Enroll interns in BTSA early completion option
 - 2d) Reduce BTSA paperwork and documentation
 - 2j) Complete work already underway to revise formative assessment instruments

In addition, the BTSA Task Force is working to implement recommendation 2j) Complete work already underway to revise formative assessment instruments. At the April 2008 Commission meeting, an agenda item will be presented to the Commission to describe the *Formative Assessment for California Teachers* (FACT), the revised formative assessment system, which some BTSA Induction programs are currently field testing and which will be available to all approved BTSA Induction Programs in 2008-09. The revisions have taken into consideration other recommendations related to reducing paperwork and documentation in the BTSA Induction program.

The following recommendations could be addressed, at least in part, by *local program implementation* and/or *employers of the interns and newly credentialed teachers*. Staff, in consultation with the CDE with respect to the BTSA Induction program, is working to disseminate the recommendations to all approved programs and provide technical assistance to the local programs to support the implementation of the recommendations. But with respect to some of the recommendations, it is up to the approved teacher preparation program to implement its approved program within the structure of the adopted program standards and the local education agency (LEA) to provide services to individuals that it employs.

1. Improve Data Management
2. Improve BTSA and Intern program designs
 - 2a) Strengthen focus on performance and capacity building
 - 2b) Support Provider training
 - 2c) Enroll interns in BTSA early completion option
 - 2d) Reduce BTSA paperwork and documentation
 - 2g) Strengthen support provider commitment to interns
 - 2i) Assure formal training for intern support providers
4. Adjust program recruitment and participation
 - 4a) Encourage second career and internal promotion for intern programs
 - 4b) Provide better support to the interns not in funded programs
 - 4c) Provide better support for new teachers not eligible for BTSA
5. Improve program management and governance
 - 5a) Make sure program managers have needed status with district officials
6. Funding
 - 6c) Raise compensation for support providers

Next Steps

Staff is working with the CDE to review and address the recommendations regarding the BTSA program and discussing the recommendations related to the Intern program. In addition, the recommendations will be discussed early in 2008 with the local program leaders of both BTSA and Intern programs.

In March 2008, a primary focus of the Intern Directors' conference will be to discuss the recommendations of the study and to create plans for improving support, support provider training, transition to BTSA programs, tracking of budgets and matching contributions. There will also be opportunities to discuss some of the other recommendations such as creating an intern infrastructure similar to the BTSA regional structure, better data management procedures, creating an accountability system separate from the accreditation process, and proposing ways for all funded intern programs to engage in the Enhanced funding program option.

Each of the BTSA regions has a Cluster Meeting in January. These meetings include the directors for each program within a region, the Cluster Regional Director, and CTC or CDE staff. The UCR Study and the plan to review and revise the Induction Program Standards are on the agenda for the cluster meetings. It is expected that the revision of the program standards will address many of the recommendations from the study.

After these meetings and discussions Commission staff will return with examples of the ways that individual programs have responded to the recommendations as well as proposals for legislation, modifications in standards, and changes in management policies.

Appendix A

*California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment
and
Intern Alternative Certification Evaluation Study:
Technical Report*

Executive Summary

California
Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment
and
Intern Alternative Certification
Evaluation Study

Technical Report



Submitted by:

Douglas E. Mitchell and Linda Scott-Hendrick
University of California, Riverside

Tom Parrish and Jill Crowley, American Institutes of Research
Rita Karam, RAND Corporation

David Boyns, California State University, Northridge
Tedi K. Mitchell, University of California Riverside

With contributions from

Michael Batie, Matthew Grindal, Thomas Hale, Mary Knox
Nori J. Naylor, Lisa Romero, Jennifer Stuckey and Xinhua Zheng
University of California, Riverside
LaRena Woods, American Institutes of Research

October, 2007

Executive Summary

This executive summary reports the most salient findings and implications from a State supported study of California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) new teacher induction program and the State’s Alternative Certification (Intern) program. The summary is presented in three parts. First, we summarize what is known about the effectiveness of alternative certification and new teacher induction programs. Here we combine findings from the current study with a broad overview of findings from other research studies. Second, we outline what this study has learned about the overall functioning of BTSA and Intern programs. This second section presents an overall model of success for each program, and describes briefly how individual programs develop unique features in response to the combination of state policies, local conditions and historical circumstances. In the third section of this summary we directly address the eight broad questions provided by the California Department of Education to guide study design and execution. We conclude the executive summary with a summary of issues that should be addressed in evaluating these two programs, but could not be addressed in this study due to a combination of limited study time and difficulty in linking critical data elements together in order to answer important research questions.

The Knowledge Base

The previous research studies reviewed for this evaluation study (described in section III of the report) reveal a fairly broad consensus about the goals and objectives of new teacher induction and alternative certification programs. In both cases, California policies are unique, but they also share, to a considerable degree, the broad purposes being investigated in professional discussions and in scholarly research and analysis.

The California BTSA Induction program, like other new teacher support and induction programs, rests on two broadly supported research findings. First, it is widely believed that the performance level of teachers throughout the public school system is in need of significant improvement. The need for improvement is seen as substantially beyond what can be expected from university-based pre-service training programs. There are diverse explanations for why this substantial improvement is needed. Some observers look upon the schools as a protected publicly supported monopoly which has been a haven for relatively low performance personnel. Others see the need as arising from the globalization of economics and politics which puts us in direct competition with other national education systems – and a number of

studies have indicated that we are substantially behind other, more competitive, national systems. Still other observers see the need for improvement as arising from the dramatic growth and cultural and economic shifts in our school age population. Whatever the reason, these concerns converge to produce substantial pressure to improve school and teacher performance.

A second broadly supported research conclusion that lies behind the creation of BTSA, and other induction programs across the nation, is the proposition that there is an unacceptably high level of teacher turnover at the school level and attrition rate from the occupation. This high turnover and attrition rate, research tells us, can be significantly ameliorated by programs that provide substantial direct personal support to new teachers through experienced teachers who serve as mentors, coaches, consulting teachers, trainers or, as the BTSA program calls them, support providers.

The goals of alternative certification programs are also broadly agreed upon and supported. These programs are intended to attract individuals from usually under-represented social, academic and occupational groups into the teaching workforce. In part, this is to provide access to teaching for individuals who would otherwise not be able to move into this occupational group because they lack the time or resources needed to pursue the standard, university-based teacher pre-service programs. Also, in part, the motivation is to get individuals who have leadership, subject matter or social skills needed by the schools to consider this occupation. And, in part, the motivation is to build a teaching workforce that is far more representative of the diverse students they must teach than is currently the case.

Alternative certification programs are also being created as a means of bringing much needed teaching staff into hard to staff schools and hard to fill teaching specialties. Science and math teachers, special education teachers and, to a lesser extent, English teachers are most needed at the present time, but when California was hard pressed to implement its massive class size reduction program in the 1990s, the need for alternative certification was focused on the multiple subject credential programs that prepare teachers for elementary school classrooms.

Not all analysts agree that either the BTSA Induction or an alternative certification approach are the most effective ways to meet school needs for staff and program improvement. While almost all authors are enthusiastic about the potential of some form of new teacher induction to enhance teacher skills and career commitments, the alternative certification approach to recruiting from different pools of potential teachers and prepare them to solve a significant teacher shortage problem is much more controversial. Analysts with a positive view see the potential for stronger, more practical and more substantial teacher training, but critics see the

potential for abuse and emphasize the ways in which children are put at risk of receiving an inadequate education from inexperienced and potentially ill-trained teachers.

Induction programs also face some significant critics, though they tend to be fewer in number and less strident in their criticisms. Two criticisms of induction programs give some pause for reflection, however. First, the issue of teacher retention may be less serious than previously thought as more recent research finds that, in part because the workforce is predominantly female, teachers tend to take child bearing and family nurture leaves after which they return to teaching and thus are not lost to the occupation in the way early studies had concluded. Second, some questions have been raised about whether new teacher effectiveness is as substantially improved as the early advocates expected. As described in the summary of prior research found in the body of this report, the most critical reviewers insist that there is little really reliable evidence that expected improvements in student achievement are actually forthcoming from new teachers who have undergone induction programs.

The alternative certification programs are succeeding in bringing new populations into the workforce – more minorities and a significant number of career changers. The largest number of individuals pursuing intern programs are recent college graduates, teachers' aides and substitute teachers moving up in the school systems' internal labor markets, and first generation college goers who cannot afford to resist the lure of a full-time teacher salary while they are in training. In creating a market-driven response to teacher shortages, however, the alternative certification programs are often tempted to make training less rigorous and to concentrate on “filling classrooms” rather than training teachers. California policy makes it quite clear that the intern programs are expected to produce better teachers by capitalizing on prior experience and building rigorous training components. In the market environment, however, lowering the cost to applicants and facilitating the placement of teachers in hard to fill classroom can easily squeeze program quality.

BTSA and Intern Program Models of Success and Variation

Among the most useful findings in this study are those statistically documenting what features of each program play a central role in determining overall program success, and what interpretive findings resulting from intensive case studies account for the most visible variations in program operations. For both the BTSA Induction and the Alternative Certification intern programs statistical analysis of participant survey data produced clear and powerful models of program success. In both cases, matching support providers with novice teachers with regard to location, teaching responsibilities and grade level were deemed a basic building block for success. Proper matching is not enough by itself, however. Unless the matched

support provider and the beginning teachers have build a strong working relationship the match contributes noting to program success. In both programs, beginning teacher judgments about the extent and quality the support they receive is the second powerful factor determining overall program success. In the case of the BTSA programs, quality support has to be matched by confidence in the program's formative assessment system before the program success can be expected. In the case of the intern programs, it is the frequency and duration of communication between the interns and both their school based support providers and their university-based supervisors are clear pre-requisites to the development of an appropriate support system.

With regard to variations among local programs, the field data indicate that there are very different forces at work in the two types of programs under review. The intern programs are best understood as creating a regulated and subsidized market for the delivery of teacher preparation services. Since the local program operators must operate in an environment where both potential program applicants and local school districts have options for meeting their respective needs, they must be constantly aware of what it takes to attract quality applicants and work with the school districts who hire them. This market driven environment means that any policy that drives away applicants or alienates school district administrators is likely to be resisted. While the state provides a subsidy for this training, the amount of the subsidy is well below the cost of the training provided. Thus the state has only limited influence over how intern programs will operate and program innovations can be predicted from an analysis of changing market conditions for these program services. The limited influence of state regulations and fiscal controls is amply evidenced in the obvious variations in program design found across the state.

In the case of the BTSA Induction program there are no important market forces for program managers to contend with. These programs operate as state sponsored monopolies, individual teachers have no choice as to which BTSA program they will participate in, and all new teachers are required to participate in the program serving their school and district. What does generate significant variation among BTSA programs, however, is their professional beliefs about the nature of professional development, educational system improvement and standards based accountability. Of these the most potent variable is the view of accountability held by the program leaders. Overall there is significant pressure generated by BTSA program design structures for program participants to view accountability as a matter of responsibility for good faith implementation of program requirements. In tension with this view are two more complex views – one emphasizing the importance of accountability for actual teaching performances and the other emphasizing the importance of focusing on the development of teacher capacity and professionalism. While many program leaders feel that these three

different views of accountability can be integrated into a single comprehensive system of accountability, our field data suggest that, in practice, local program staff experiences them as in competition and demanding loyalty to one view over the other two in order to produce a successful program implementation.

Answering the Eight Study Questions

In accordance with the study questions specified in SB 1209 (Scott) on behalf of the Legislature and the Governor, this Scope of Work collected, analyzed and interprets the data needed to answer eight core research questions that were outlined the project Scope of Work. The core questions are:

Question #1. How well are BTSA programs meeting the objectives set forth in the Education Code?

The first study question focused attention on how well the Beginning Support and Assessment programs are meeting legislative expectations. Though much more detail is provided in the body of this report, six observations provide a broad overview of how to answer this question.

1. Senior BTSA staff are competent, enthusiastic professionals who display substantial loyalty to the legislative intent and the standards and guidelines for BTSA.

Morale is high, cooperation with statewide and regional leadership is generally quite fulsome, and turnover among program directors is modest. There are some local programs in which the program directors do not appear to have sufficient administrative authority or status to secure full cooperation from local schools and school district executives, and this issue could well be addressed as a program development priority.

2. Commitment to and implementation of explicit training activities aimed at fulfilling the requirements of the new teacher induction standards (program standards 15 through 20) can be easily recognized in both the case study transcripts and the statewide survey data.

While commitment to this training is obvious, so is the fact that some aspects of the training programs need to be reviewed and improved. To a significant degree, the places where BTSA training is not working well have arisen because university-based pre-service programs have been significantly revised in compliance with the expectations of SB2042 and SB1209. These university programs are now providing training that was not being provided with BTSA began.

With the emphasis in university programs moving toward the same conceptions of high quality teaching as those underlying BTSA training objectives there has emerged a significant level of push back from participating teachers. Resistance to current BTSA training programs is most noticeable in the areas of technology, special populations and support for English language learners. In the case of technology utilization, participating teachers urge significant improvement or abandonment of this as a training component. Participating teachers frequently report that they have already had experience with most of the technologies being addressed in BTSA training programs. In the cases of work with special populations and support for English language learners, we find a lot of interest in the topics, but substantial concern that the training activities are repeating work already covered in the pre-service training programs and not providing the new teachers with the depth of understanding or effective applications needed to turn their fledgling knowledge into professional skill. The challenge for BTSA is to provide more sophisticated training in these areas without substantially increasing the overall participating teacher workload – a workload perceived as creating serious problems of stress and to be intruding on needed time for day-to-day instructional planning.

3. There is strong evidence that retention among mid-career teachers in California has improved every year since about 2000. The interpretation of this improvement is far from straightforward, however.

Although they cover only the last four years or so, the BTSA Induction program tracking system shows high rates of retention among new teachers entering the occupation through this program. And a longer term analysis of average tenure relying on the CBEDS/PAIF data confirms that teachers with 3 to 12 years of teaching experience are staying in teaching longer (raising the average tenure of this group by about six-tenths of a year since 2000).

It is, however, not possible to know with certainty that the improved retention among these younger teachers is the result of the BTSA or intern training and support activities. Broad trends in the CBEDS files are found well before these programs were adopted and implemented. These data indicate that California teachers in the mid-1980s had at least as good a retention rate for the younger professionals in the workforce as those found since 2000. Deeper demographic analysis of workforce trends is needed. The “baby boom” generation was well represented in the teaching workforce by the mid-80s. Many have accumulated 25 or 30 years of experience and are starting to retire in relatively large numbers. During this period, student populations have also fluctuated substantially. And policy changes, like California’s class size reduction initiative, the high stakes high school exit examination, enforcement of the No Child Left Behind “highly qualified teacher” requirements, and above all, the vicissitudes of the state budgeting process have contributed to substantial volatility in the teacher labor

market. Potential teachers appear to get the picture of job opportunities and requirements for entering the occupation quickly and to respond accordingly. The process of scaling up for the mid-90s class size reduction initiative, followed by a retreat from full implementation due to budget crises quickly led to a sharp reduction in the number of candidates seeking multiple subjects credentials, dramatically shifting the composition of intern programs. At the same time, the California State University system experienced a sharp decline in applicants for their pre-service programs.

Thus, while retention is up, it is difficult to attribute this fact to any particular program, policy or demographic trend. BTSA Induction programs have been, and remain, committed to improving teacher retention, and they have documented high levels of retention among their participating teachers. One caveat regarding relying on BTSA tenure tracking data to assess teacher retention needs to be kept in mind. About 40 percent of BTSA participating teachers report that they earned their California teaching credentials a year or more before entering this program (presumably as long term substitutes, on emergency permits, waivers, etc.) . And another modest portion of the BTSA participating teachers were fully credentialed in other states for one or more years before enrolling in BTSA. Researchers studying the retention of regional or national samples of teachers do not take this filtering into account, and can be expected to see substantially higher attrition rates because they are studying a different population of teachers.

4. BTSA programs are structured to provide intensive individualized support for new teachers. While the structure is broadly effective, some important areas for improvement were identified.

Every participating teacher has an assigned support provider. The majority of the support providers are full time teachers who care for from one to four new teachers, typically ones with similar grade level or subject area teaching responsibilities and often located in the same school. A substantial number of BTSA programs rely on full time support providers who carry case loads ranging from a dozen to more than thirty new teachers.

At least three factors influence the working relationship between support providers and their participating teachers. Teacher personalities vary widely, and some are much better suited to the care, nurture and support of new teachers than others. This consideration has become increasingly important as local BTSA programs have encountered difficulty recruiting and retaining the number and quality of support providers that are needed for the more than 20,000 new teachers entering the profession each year. The recruitment of highly motivated and sensitive support providers might be facilitated by adding more money to the stipends or

salaries paid. It is more likely, however, that increased encouragement and support from district and site administrators – particularly in the form of relief from other school level duties – would be more helpful.

A second area of potential improvement for the BTSA personal support system involves the time available for communication, observation, consultation and counseling. The BTSA program is quite busy with structured activities, completion of required documentation, training seminars and formative assessment procedures. Time for responding individually and uniquely to new teacher developmental needs can sometimes be hard to find. One reason that this time is hard to find is that California schools are very busy places. Everyone's activity schedules are tightly packed. Support providers who are themselves full time teachers typically have to take time from their own teaching if they are going to observe their participating teachers. Some have suggested that giving secondary level support providers the same preparation period as their participating teachers would allow more time for collaboration and conversation. While this would help with opportunities to talk, it would also make cross-observation of each other's teaching very difficult to schedule.

The third area of concern has to do with support provider training and development. The skills needed to mentor and guide novice teachers are quite different from those required to manage one's own classroom. It was fairly easy to observe a range of support provider skill and to recognize that the best providers have undergone a rigorous and extensive developmental process of their own. Supporting professional growth requires commitment to the process and ample time, but it also requires complex and subtle skills that can be learned and practiced if the support providers are given the opportunity to do so. Every BTSA program observed in this study has a support provider training program, but more resources and more time devoted to this purpose would probably pay off in better and more successful support for new teachers.

Making heavier investments in support provider training would, in turn, focus attention on the question of how long support providers should remain in this role in order to allow a substantial investment in their training to pay dividends. Some BTSA program leaders see the support providers as a cadre of school program reformers and want this aspect of the BTSA program to involve a broad range of rank and file teachers who will return to regular classroom service and continue to identify with and forward the professionalization agenda that BTSA seeks to support for all teachers. This view leads naturally to the belief that supporting new teachers should be something many experienced teachers learn to do on a part-time basis. Others see the need for intensely training a much smaller cadre of full time support providers who may or may not return to routine classroom instructional duties once their service in this role is ended.

Indeed, some see becoming a support provider as a transition position leading to other school leadership roles.

5. BTSA programs, across the board, display a strong commitment to adoption and utilization of formative assessment systems based, in principle, on the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP). This commitment has been substantially moderated in the last three or four years, however, by the emergence of the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs* (Program Standards) as a potent set of guidelines for BTSA program operations and evaluation. The commitment to the CSTP principles has also been substantially reified in the relatively stable formative assessment system activities and data recording forms used in each local program.

The two BTSA core documents (CSTP and Program Standards) articulate both the target for new teacher development – high performance on the CSTP – and the program operations expected to produce the desired outcomes – the 20 Program Standards. Although many observers see these two documents as mutually supportive of a common framework for facilitating movement along a learning to teach continuum, case study data make it clear that in day-to-day BTSA program operation they play very different roles. The CSTP document provides much of the rhetorical and theoretical grounding for discussions of new teacher progress toward professional competency, but the Program Standards document, combined with key elements in each program’s formative assessment system are, by far, the most potent control elements – pushing the CSTP into a more philosophical and apologetic role.

Formative assessments come in three flavors. The most widely used is the state developed California Formative Support and Assessment System for Teachers (CFASST). A few local programs use, instead, the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project’s Formative Assessment System (SCNTP/FAS), and a handful of other programs use state approved locally developed assessments. Since developing and implementing a comprehensive formative assessment system is a time-consuming and relatively expensive process, once adopted they tend to remain relatively stable in format and substance. The SCNTP/FAS system is relatively expensive for local programs to license and is therefore not likely to become widely used without significant state level investment in making it available to local BTSA programs. The state developed CFASST system has been the object of continuing pressure for modification and simplification as users tend to feel that it is too prescriptive, relies too much on filling out forms, and is not thoroughly integrated with the Program Standards that are driving program evaluation and accountability. Local formative assessment system users have been heard to complain that the tightly structured Program Standards are not synchronized with the approved assessment

systems they have been using and thus they are forced to change the local assessment system for compliance rather than substantive reasons.

As this report is being written, the state is at work revising both the CFASST system and preparing to review and revise the Program Standards, so complaints about these structural elements have not fallen on deaf ears. It is too soon to try to assess whether revisions of either CFASST or the Program Standards will resolve the issues described in various sections of this report.

6. The BTSA Induction program at both the state and local levels is making a continuing effort to generate program improvements. The basic framework for this evaluation and improvement process is appropriately described as a Standards Based Accountability (SBA) model. And the standards that predominate in this model are the Program Standards which specify in substantial detail what evidence needs to be presented by local BTSA programs to show that they are meeting the SBA goal of systematic documentation, review and revision of program activities.

The SBA framework is given substantive meaning through the development of a new program review and evaluation process called an Induction Program Review (IPR). The IPR involves a process of self-study and program narrative preparation by the directors of local BTSA programs. These self-study documents are submitted to a team of four experienced BTSA program leaders who review this self-study document and then come to the local program site to examine documentary evidence and interview program directors and all key stakeholder groups regarding the fulfillment of the 20 Program Standards.

Close observation of the IPR made it clear that this standards based accountability model not only identifies local program strengths and weaknesses, it also has a number of not always anticipated consequences. Details of the observed consequences of the IPR process are described in the body of this report. For this summary, the following are the most important to be reminded of:

- Because the IPR examined fulfillment of most program standards by examining fulfillment of each specific standard element the process required assessment of local program evidence regarding a total of 104 standards and elements. Trying to competently review all of these 104 standards and elements targeted for review tended to fragment the process.

- Adoption of an adjudication model for evidence evaluation tended to narrow the focus of assessment to observable data rather than its substantive meaning leaving some participants in the process unclear as to whether they were missing expected performance or only required documentation.
- A heavy emphasis on meeting the induction standards has led to a shift in local program emphasis away from the interpersonal work of the support providers, toward courses, seminars and other organized activities conducted by professional development specialists or third-party marketed services.
- As implemented, the IPR process tends to elevate the definition of “Standards Based Accountability” to mean meeting implementation guidelines through compliance, rather more than teaching performance or teacher capacity development. That is, the evidentiary emphasis in this model of accountability led the review teams to concentrate on documentation of actions taken rather than evidence of growth in teacher performance or professional capacities.

Question #2. How well are University and District Intern programs meeting purposes specified in the Education Code?

On the whole, evidence regarding the recruitment and placement of intern credential teachers is making significant progress toward fulfilling legislative goals for this program. The match with legislative goals regarding recruitment and placement of credential candidates is not perfect, but there is room for some pride of accomplishment. As described in much more detail in the body of this report, intern programs have moved nimbly from a concentration on helping meet the demand for more multiple subject teachers to staff schools undergoing class size reduction to a point where about half of all interns are working toward education specialist credentials to meet a crushing need demand for more special education teachers. Moreover, when the requirements of the No Child Left Behind law calling for “highly qualified” teachers in every California classroom came on line, the intern programs expanded their enrollments substantially to facilitate the acquisition of preliminary and then clear credentials by emergency permit holders and long term substitute teachers. The data even indicate that there was a sharp spike in the number of teachers being prepared for single subject credentials in art when the so-called f-requirement for admission to California universities was added to insist that at least one high school arts course be provided for all university-bound students.

With regard to recruiting candidates from diverse population groups into the intern programs the results are a bit mixed. The largest group of intern credential holders report that they came

into the program right after finishing their college degrees and without substantial prior work experience. Nevertheless, second-career candidates do represent a significant proportion of the intern population and represent individuals who would probably not be seeking careers in education without this program.

Though not spelled out in the legislative intent, there are two other groups of individuals for whom the intern programs represent career opportunities that would probably be denied them without this avenue of access to teaching credentials. The first is the large group of candidates who have become upwardly mobile in the school systems' internal labor markets – the paraprofessionals and the substitute teachers. These groups come with substantial relevant work experience within the public school system and are using the intern programs to pursue full professional credentialing. By providing advanced training for significant numbers of these committed but underprepared educators the intern programs are providing career opportunities to groups otherwise largely cutoff from advancement. This pool of candidates has the added advantage of containing relatively large numbers of multi-lingual and ethnically diverse individuals. The other substantial group that would probably have a much harder time entering this occupation without the intern program is the first-generation college goers whose families are not prepared to bear the cost of post-baccalaureate training.

It is not possible to tell from the record whether interns moving into education from other careers have substantial or relevant work experience. No doubt, many do, but it is not possible to know whether these applicants are seeking to leave careers where they have failed rather than moving into education from prior successes without undertaking a substantial number of individual case studies. Intern program staff are well aware that not all second career recruits have successful or relevant prior experience, but it was not possible for them to say what proportion of the total second career group this might be.

On the placement side of the equation, evidence of compliance with legislative intent for this program is quite strong, but this success has also become the focus of criticism. A public interest law suit against federal regulations accepting California intern teachers as meeting the criteria for “highly qualified” has been filed in the federal court system. Interns are working in schools with substantially more non-white students, greater poverty, more English language learners, lower average parent education and substantially lower Academic Performance Index scores than other teachers of record. This exactly what the legislature intended, but it is an open question as to whether students being taught by these intern teachers are securing equal access to a quality education. Some site administrators interviewed for this study are convinced that interns are superior teachers, and expressed a preference for hiring them over other new teachers if possible. Systematic data covering multiple years of student achievement

is needed to test the real consequences of staffing classrooms with intern teachers, and that data could not be assembled for this study.

The statutory provision of incentive funding has been incorporated into the intern program under the designation of “enhanced program” funding. As important as it is to know whether these incentive funds aimed at enriching intern preparation are having the desired effect, it is simply too soon to tell. The program is just too recently implemented to know what will happen with the recruitment and training of interns enrolled in these financially and substantively enhanced programs. The current year’s funds for this enhancement came too late for serious program planning and adaptation to requirements to have much effect. Indeed, late authorization meant that funds had to be distributed to programs that had already met the minimal qualifications for enhancement funding without regard to the specific purposes for which the funds would be used. Moreover, current fiscal records for this and most other state program initiatives are too sparse to allow an adequate review of expenditures without an on-site audit level study of cash outlays.

By and large, intern skill levels are being assessed using the same tests and measurements used for pre-service credential candidates – course grades, supervisor evaluations, CBEST passage prior to admission and teaching performance assessment prior to completion. Perhaps a more appropriate assessment of intern competency than any currently available tests or assessments is to examine their retention rates over time. Since school administrators can generally exercise their discretionary authority to terminate intern credential holders without triggering teacher union involvement or creating a basis for legal redress, they are probably more stringent in renewing contracts for these teachers than for most others.

The question of how interns are being trained produced what is probably the most interesting and important set of insights in the study of this program. We found four distinct approaches to training interns distributed across the case study sites examined in this study – approaches that appear to be dictated by the alternative ways in which intern program sponsors orient toward and answer two basic marketplace questions.

The intern programs are local training agencies -- each fiscally managed by a sponsoring public school agency (local district, county office of education). In offering to fund these programs the state has established a nominally competitive market structure for offering teacher training services. When local program sponsors enter the subsidized and regulated market for teacher preparation services, they must answer two fundamental questions: 1) to what extent should the service (teacher preparation) be redefined and restructured, and 2) should marketing alternative certification programs be directed primarily toward the school districts needing staff

or toward the intern candidates seeking entry to the occupation. Data show that program sponsors have answered these questions in very different ways. Some local programs give primary emphasis to redefining pre-service training, others concentrate on new marketing strategies, and some devote substantial attention to doing both. The table below summarizes the alternatives generated by answering these questions.

		Redefine the nature of pre-service teaching?	
		No, the issue is efficiently producing more teachers to meet pressing needs	Yes, this is an opportunity to change the whole culture of preparation
Focus on marketing to:	Teacher Employers	School Oriented Traditional Programs Type A	School Oriented Local Culture Emphasis Type B
	Intern Candidates	Candidate Oriented Traditional Programs Type C	Candidate Oriented Intensified Training Type D

Generally Type A programs are well represented among the CSU campuses. They tend to emphasize using their traditional pre-service courses and supervision system, together with a declaration that they are “market driven” responses to district staffing needs.

Type B: tends to be found in single district and county office of education programs where training is undertaken primarily by experienced teachers and not by university faculty, where emphasis is placed on working with districts and on keeping close to issues of professional practice rather than theoretical concept development.

Type C: tends to be private and entrepreneurial programs that emphasize multiple, convenient locations and direct candidate recruitment efforts.

Type D: is illustrated by one program with restrictive enrollment, limited aim of providing science, math and English single subject preparation and insistence on substantial pre-program preparation.

The important point here is that intern program designs are, in substantial part, structured by managerial decisions regarding the marketplace where these services must be bought and paid for. State funds are incentives for program development but, to become operational, institutional resources must also be tapped and therefore the programs have to be seen as wise investments by intern applicants and school districts as well as the sponsoring agencies. This motivates program operators to cooperate closely with school districts and with candidate training institutions, but it also limits their willingness to see program priorities in terms of state interests.

Question #3. What policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that district and university interns receive appropriate direct assistance from experienced teachers?

There are, no doubt, many different ways to tweak the management of the BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification Intern programs that would facilitate the development of more adequate direct support by experienced teachers for the development of their novice colleagues. Most of the good management practices are probably untouched by this evaluation study. There are, however, three domains in which data collected and analyzed for this study do suggest likely ways to improve overall support provider performance.

Focus on the support providers themselves

First, focus on the support providers themselves. The provision of support for new teachers can be no better than the recruitment, training and motivations of the support providers selected to work with them. As previously mentioned, a number of BTSA programs are facing a significant shortfall in their efforts to recruit support providers for their new teachers. The problem is even worse for intern programs who often find that the best support providers have been retained by the district's BTSA program which is offering higher stipends for this sensitive and time consuming work. Resources matter, and none of the support providers who are also serving as full time teachers are being over compensated for the work they are expected to do. In the absence of increased funding, however, management can do some other things that will make the support provider role more attractive. Arranging for better released time to do this work, securing more reliable substitute teacher assistance to make absence from their own classes more palatable, providing more obvious recognition of the important work support providers are doing, maintaining direct contact with the support providers and letting them know their efforts are understood and endorsed, providing support providers with state of the art communication hardware and software so that they can stay in touch with their beginning teachers more easily are but a few of the things that might be done by managers who see

support provision by experienced teachers as a high priority part of their overall professional support and development program.

At least as important as stronger recruitment and incentives for engaging in this vital work is the provision of training in adult learning, counseling, observation and analysis of teaching performances, professional role development and other dimensions of the adult development process that support providers are expected to provide would enable the support providers to enjoy their work more and to do it more efficiently and effectively. This is not a new idea in the BTSA program, but it is relatively foreign to the intern support providers. And, in the BTSA environment, much more could be done to raise the sophistication and effectiveness of the support providers.

Because of the importance of acquiring and using the subtle and complex skills associated with the provision of support for novice professionals, our research team did reach the conclusion that full time support providers have a better chance of realizing the goals of quality support provision than do full time teachers who are carrying support provider responsibilities as an overload. This conclusion is not unequivocal, however, as the benefits of close to the work site of the novice teacher are real, and the positive influence that a large cadre of support providers can have on schools and districts is potentially quite important.

In part, our embrace of the full time model for support providers, despite the fact that this a marginally more expensive approach, lies in thinking about the third dimension of quality support provision – the creation of the time needed by support providers to do their support work. There needs to be enough time and at the right time for support work to have the needed impact. There are too many stories of low frequency contacts between support providers and novice teachers for this issue to go unaddressed. Moreover, as our statistical modeling of intern and participating teacher survey responses evaluating the effectiveness of their program experiences amply demonstrates, providing quality and timely support is probably the most significant factor in determining whether these novice teachers feel that their program experiences have been successful.

Focus on distractions to quality support provision

Once management has secured motivated and trained support providers who have the time needed to assist the new teachers, attention should be given to aspects of the BTSA and intern programs that are tending to distract support providers from attending to this important work. Here the two programs are quite different. BTSA support providers report being distracted by an accountability program that focuses heavily on providing evidence of program

implementation which leads to too much paperwork. The intern program goes too far in the other direction, there is often too little accountability and too little direction for support providers to really understand what is expected of them. Planning support work is just as important to this activity as lesson planning is to classroom support.

Focus on program management

There are several management decisions that would help secure high quality support provision in the intern programs. First, prevent late enrollment in the intern program by pre-service teachers who are pressed into service because districts have not accurately estimated staff needs or have not managed their recruitment and hiring processes well enough to get teachers on contract in time to allow them to prepare for this role by completing required foundational pre-service work in a timely way. Second, insist on timely appointment of support providers – perhaps by insisting that the granting of an intern credential is contingent upon providing the CTC with the identity of the person who is accepting responsibility for providing district support, then monitoring the adequacy of that support and preventing support providers who have been that in name only from being used in support of future intern credentials. Third, help school districts overcome the weak planning and late hiring processes that make raiding pre-service programs for intern teachers necessary.

BTSA program management is generally quite streamlined. There are, however, some programs and some school districts within consortium programs where the BTSA program managers do not have the status and respect needed to secure cooperation for the new teachers and their support providers. This concern is expressed in the Program Standards guidelines and has been reviewed where appropriate in the Induction Program Review process, so it is not entirely clear what more needs to be done, but this issue is important enough to deserve further study.

Question #4. What policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that beginning (Induction) and intern teachers are prepared to address the needs of special populations of students – especially English learners and special education students?

Issues associated with addressing the instruction of special needs populations are quite clear in the BTSA program, and were described in this summary in answering question #1. To make the implications of that discussion explicit, we would make the following recommendations.

First, it seems appropriate to simply eliminate the technology standard as a standalone component of the BTSA program standards. We make this recommendation, not because

technology utilization is unimportant, but because it keeps changing faster than formal programs of preparation can cope with and school systems are moving at their own pace to incorporate new technologies and technology support into their routine management processes. Additionally, BTSA participating teachers are reportedly doing more to assist their support providers with new technologies than they are receiving help from them. By weaving appropriate use of technology into the other program standards, BTSA would be acknowledging that technology utilization is not an end in itself, but a vehicle for meeting other standards.

Second, there is a need to review and upgrade curricula and other methods for meeting the special populations and English learner standards. In their present form these standards are being met through training seminars that too often seem, to the participating teachers, to be a repetition of their pre-service training experiences.

Third, there is a need to differentiate training in meeting the needs of special populations and English learners based on the participating teachers actual classroom assignments. Rather than packing the entire training into the first two years, it would make sense to allow BTSA program completers to secure appropriately sophisticated and updated training as their teaching assignments bring them into contact with new language groups, ethnic sub-cultures or special needs students.

In the case of the intern programs, the issue of addressing special needs populations is particularly difficult to tackle. These teachers are getting much of the same training provided to pre-service teachers who do not have full classroom responsibilities, and they have very basic needs that BTSA participating teachers have already addressed. Nevertheless, without adequate preparation interns are often required to face a full range of student needs. For them the important thing is to be able to get help addressing the special needs they are facing on a daily basis, and must perforce let larger issues be put off until later. And with half the interns in the state working with special education students, their need for training and support is focused quite tightly. For this group of new teachers one can only recommend that more help be made available to them and that they be empowered to insist on having that help when it is needed most.

Question #5. What state, regional and/or local administrative structures could improve the support services for Induction and intern teachers?

Two program structures found in the BTSA program are models of effective program organization and improvement that are to be commended to for use in the intern programs and probably for a number of other state-sponsored program initiatives. The first is the

development of a series of Cluster Regional Directors located within six geographical regions of the state for the purpose of providing guidance, direction and support to local BTSA programs

The BTSA Induction program's Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) constitute a program management and consulting group comprised of a dozen experienced BTSA leaders that are funded separately from the local BTSA programs and serves as an intermediate governance structure – separate from the state Task Force which consists of official representatives from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education (the state agencies jointly responsible for overseeing BTSA funding, policy and regulations). Because they are hired by local education agencies, they see themselves as responsible for supporting local programs, facilitating their improvement, and representing their interests to local school districts and to the state BTSA Task Force. Moreover, because they are separately funded, and do not work for the same local district officials that manage the various local BTSA programs, these Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) are also able to critically appraise the appropriateness and effectiveness of the local programs with whom they work.

Over time, the CRDs have become the primary working group for monitoring BTSA program performance, developing new procedures, mechanisms, materials and guidelines for program improvement, and studying how issues affecting program success should be conceptualized and dealt with. There are two primary reasons why this governance mechanism looks like a very promising way of successfully joining state policy priorities with local program designs and implementation processes. First, and most importantly, by separately commissioning and funding the CRDs, the state has succeeded in creating a group of professionals who are neither caught up in the complexities of state level politics nor captured by the aims and interest of local program operators.

The second reason why the CRD structure has become important to BTSA and represents a promising strategy for state program governance rests in the size of the group and the method of selecting its leadership. With only twelve individual CRDs, strategically located throughout the state, with sufficient resources and autonomy to meet together regularly, and with the knowledge that their influence rests on their capacity for intellectual rather than political leadership, the CRDs have become an important Professional Learning Community.

The CRD structure for BTSA is underfunded and a significant augmentation to their funding is highly recommended. Additionally, if adequately funded, a similar structure would serve the Alternative Certification intern programs very well.

The second BTSA administrative structure which represents a powerful tool for program accountability and improvement is the Induction Program Review (IPR). The IPR process is both intensive and broad ranging. The central ingredient in the process is a 4-day visit by an IPR team consisting of four experienced BTSA participants (typically program local administrators and lead support providers from around the state). The IPR team is supported by one or two facilitators (typically one of the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors) whose job it is to facilitate team deliberations, remind team members of IPR guidelines, and work with the leadership of the program being reviewed to facilitate accumulation of the evidence to be reviewed by the IPR team. The IPR team members have participated in a one-day IPR training session during which they learn about how local program administrators are asked to assemble evidence regarding their program performance, and are briefed on guidelines for the conduct of the 4-day review.

Our evaluation team was quite impressed by the consistency and depth of commitment to the Induction Program Review process by local BTSA directors, the IPR review teams, cluster regional directors, local school officials, state level BTSA Task Force members and the various stakeholder groups involved in BTSA programs. While we had a number of observations about the limitations and diverse understandings of this mechanism that are found in the field (these observations are described in detail in the report section covering the IPR process), we concluded that this mechanism is valuable and should continue to be supported. Moreover, we felt that a similar process should be generated for the Alternative Certification intern programs whose operations are currently facing much too little review or pressure for improvement.

Question #6. What would be a sufficient level of funding for Induction teacher and intern programs, and what criteria should state agencies use to help facilitate legislative passage of appropriate funding levels? How is funding divided between infrastructure operations and direct support to new teachers? Is this division the most effective use of funds?

All conclusions regarding the adequacy of current funding levels for either the BTSA Induction or the Alternative Certification intern program are extremely tentative as fiscal data are not easily accessed and are not organized in ways that make it possible to readily connect expenditure patterns with important program outcomes. That said, for the BTSA programs, resources do seem to matter in relation to the BTSA participant experience – programs that record greater expenditures also tend to report higher participant satisfaction. But recorded budget amounts are so little regulated as to have relatively little meaning and other factors are so important in mitigating the relationship between how much is invested and perceptions as to how much is available. Such factors would seem important to understand from an efficiency

perspective, but are not well captured through current reporting or program monitoring and evaluation processes.

Given these limitations, the qualitative perceptions of local BTSA providers are that program resources are generally sufficient to allow them to implement the program in ways they deem effective. Hence, we have concluded that current data provide no basis for suggesting that current BTSA allocations are fiscally inadequate. With the exception of funding for the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors, available data provide no basis for deciding whether future funding should be substantially different from what is currently being provided.

With regard to using intern program fiscal data to estimate funding sufficiency, we must emphasize that the data currently collected are insufficiently defined and are not measured with enough accuracy to reliably address this question. Some estimates of funding levels and fund usage are developed in the body of this report, but they are quite speculative and the primary focus of our recommendations here is to take steps to improve data uniformity and recording accuracy.

From a practical standpoint, it is very difficult to conduct a reliable fiscal analysis or to interpret historical budget shifts when the only available budget records are found in paper files at the BTSA and intern program offices at the state capital. The lack of budget data with uniform reporting categories, in sufficient detail to track the consequences of alternative expenditure patterns for each local program, and in electronic data file formats that can be economically utilized for analysis will continue to stymie useful fiscal analyses until better financial data systems are developed. Both the intern and BTSA program directors need clearer instructions with regard to identifying and recording in-kind and local financial contributions to these programs. At a minimum, all programs need to accurately report the actual value of matching resources provided by the local program agency. Clearer instructions are needed on what can and cannot be counted as eligible matching contributions. Moreover, program reviews like the IPR need to request and analyze fiscal data in order to insure that it is maintained in understandable formats. Both intern and BTSA directors need clearer direction in the preparation of budgets, particularly in the allocation of program costs to standard accounting categories that will allow comparison of program expenditure patterns that can be linked to program outcome measurements.

Question #7. What, if any, revisions of the BTSA Induction and/or Intern Program Standards would facilitate increased teacher competency and/or reduce engagement in unproductive activities

The program standards for both the BTSA Induction and the Alternative Certification intern programs are clearly stated, thoroughly vetted by professional educators and grounded in a fairly widely supported body of research. The issues we found in reviewing the use of these standards had much more to do with how they are incorporated into program reviews and management decisions than with how they are conceptualized and written. There is one important exception to this generalization and that concerns the technology utilization standard in the BTSA Program Standards. After reviewing the text of the standard and the complaints about its use in the field we concluded that this standard should be abandoned as a stand-alone standard and be woven into the operationalization of other standards as appropriate. There are two reasons for this recommendation. First, the BTSA program staff are frequently behind rather than ahead of the technology needs of the participating teachers. Second, the utilization of technology is both being better taught in pre-service training programs and being better supported by local school districts than was the case when this standard was originally developed. The BTSA induction training programs are very tightly packed and the participating teachers are feeling much more need for advanced training in how to work with English language learners and special education certified children than for more technology training as a subject independent of these core instructional issues.

In implementation, there are two problems with the use of program standards that should be addressed through management and training within the BTSA program. First, there is too little attention to accounting in the accountability usage of these standards. That is, standards reviews are generally aimed at securing evidence of program attention to them with too little attention given to whether this attention is securing the desired outcomes. The second problem, seen vividly in the Induction Program Review process, is the tendency for subordinate elements in each of the standards to emerge as needing the same level of attention and evidence of compliance as the overarching standard. When local BTSA programs are asked to submit evidence of meeting more than a hundred discrete elements and standards, the result is an explosive disaggregation of their programs into a search for bits of evidence that have lost coherence as indicators of overall program quality. The BTSA programs should adopt the view that any program service or activity that deserves independent review is, by that fact, to be identified as a program standard. Or to put the point in the other way, that no standard should be judged to have not been met because evidence on one of its elements is not forthcoming.

We think that both of these weaknesses in the use of program standards could be fruitfully addressed if evidence were solicited in a matrix format, rather than on the standards one at a time. That is, if the assessment of evidence for meeting program standards were placed in a framework like the table below, it would invite an accounting of why submitted evidence should be considered appropriate to each standard.

Standards	Program Activity 1	Program Activity 2	Program Activity 3	... et cetera
Standard 1	Accounting for how Standard 1 is met			Accounting for how Standard 1 is met
Standard 2			Accounting for how Standard 2 is met	
Standard 3	Accounting for how Standard 3 is met	Accounting for how Standard 3 is met		
... Standard N	...etc.	...etc.	...etc.	

In this format, the evidence of enacting appropriate activities would be presented just once for each activity while the interpretation of how that activity meets diverse program standards would be presented in the appropriate cells of such a matrix of accountability data.

For the Alternative Certification intern programs, the program standards are equally clear, but since the accreditation process was suspended in 2002 there is very little in the way of accountability for meeting those standards built into the intern program management and policy systems. Staff at the CTC report that the accreditation system is being re-established, but there were no instances available for review during this study. A vigorous accountability system is strongly recommended, but in building an accountability system for the intern programs it will be important to remember that these programs are market driven and must maintain a level of service to both intern candidates and school districts that will allow this program to continue to broker intern teacher placement and supervision.

Question #8. What, if any, changes in laws, regulations and/or policies would help eliminate duplicative requirements, streamline and coordinate support services for beginning teachers and interns?

Redundancy and duplication of requirements are arising largely within the BTSA Induction program. Intern teachers feel a need for just about all the help they can get and rarely complain about any redundancies prior to encountering BTSA program requirements. The issues of redundancy and duplication are concentrated in two areas: completing training activities associated with meeting the induction standards (Program Standards 15 through 20), and finding activities associated with BTSA formative assessment systems repetitive, particularly repetitive with regard to recording the completion of various required activities.

Several of the problems of duplication and redundancy can be solved through updating the BTSA training curricula, particularly in the domains of work with special education students and English language learners. If the technology standard is maintained as a stand-alone program standard it should be possible for participating teachers to challenge requirements by showing that they can apply technologies appropriately within their classroom responsibilities and be excused from training on matters they have already mastered. Indeed, it would probably be very helpful to have a system of challenge exercises to allow participating teachers to challenge a number of program training activities.

At a more conceptual level, it is important that BTSA program staff come to recognize that the distinction between skill development and skill application that is frequently used to justify requiring participating teachers to engage in activities that they feel they have already mastered is more mystique than reality. Pre-service teacher trainers simply do not believe that they are providing skill development in the absence of skill application, and the BTSA program staff are finding that they must be just as concerned about skill development as about application because incoming participating teachers are often not able to learn applications because they lack needed skills and must learn them as well as apply them. In the final analysis a skill that cannot be applied is not yet learned. It may be important to impress this truth more forcefully in pre-service training programs, but the question of how important that might be is beyond the purview of this evaluation study.

Recommendations for Policy and Program Improvement

Based on the work summarized above, the study team has developed 23 concrete policy and administrative recommendations summarizing our judgments regarding how best to enhance and improve California's BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification intern programs. The recommendations are organized according to the topics that each addresses.

Recommendation #1: Improve Data Management

Program evaluation and improvement can be only as effective as the comprehensiveness, reliability and accessibility of the data upon which they are based. Data must not only be accessible and reliable it must also be structured in ways that allow both comparisons across program functions and local program sites and across time and levels of analysis. The data required need to include program resources, operational characteristics and attainment of outcomes. For the California BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification intern programs, present data systems are desperately inadequate. Fiscal data are difficult to access, inconsistently categorized and inadequately reported. At the state level, student achievement data are only available in aggregated files that preclude tracing the effects of teacher efforts,

program designs, contextual constraints or longitudinal change. Teacher retention data that could be utilized to address this issue are inaccessible from state data files and must be collected by hand by individual BTSA programs. Program operational data are reasonably well developed but cannot be connected to fiscal inputs, contextual constraints or outcome data measuring student achievement or teacher performance. For all these reasons:

It is recommended that the California Department of Education and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing create a joint task force that includes individuals with substantial program evaluation expertise, support this task force with adequate resources, and commission the task force to develop a comprehensive and systematic data management plan for the BTSA and intern programs. With this plan in hand, staff with data management expertise should be mandated to provide the recommended data elements and linkages.

Recommendation #2: Improving BTSA and Intern program designs

There are a number of steps that can be taken to improve the design and operation of these two programs. Hence this recommendation comes in eight parts:

Recommendation 2A: Strengthen focus on performance and capacity building

There has been a drift toward defining program quality in terms of compliance with program standards that threatens the intended aim of raising teacher performance and professionalism. This is exacerbated by a not entirely convincing assertion that BTSA training focuses on skill application while pre-service training focuses on theory and abstract skill development. Program standards should urge more documentation of teacher performance and less recording of program implementation practices.

Recommendation 2B: Support Provider training

Careful matching of support providers with beginning teachers in both the BTSA and intern programs is an appropriate first consideration. Of equal importance, however, and not always adequately supported in either program, is providing support providers with the skills needed to make their work with new teachers effective. Support providers need significant training in such skills as: observation and analysis of instruction, peer coaching, adult learning theory, trust building, reflective conversations, diagnosis of instructional practices, conflict management, teacher legal rights and obligations, etc. It is recommended that local programs give preference to the employment of well trained full time support providers in order to assure that beginning teachers have access to high quality assistance. It is also recommended

that the cost-effectiveness of this approach be given careful review once data management systems make monitoring impact on student achievement possible.

Recommendation 2C: Enroll interns in the BTSA early completion option

Interns who have acquired their preliminary credential enter BTSA with significantly different prior experiences than those of other preliminary credential holders. They should routinely be given access to a BTSA early completion option. Beyond that, because issues of practice are paramount during their training period, interns can easily end participation in this program without some of the theoretical and conceptual foundations that power professional innovation in the classroom. Consideration should be given to providing graduates of intern programs with access to advanced conceptual and theoretical training as part of their BTSA experience.

Recommendation 2D: Reduce BTSA paperwork and documentation

Too many BTSA program participants (at all levels, but especially the participating teachers and their support providers) see documentation of program participation as requiring repeated filling out of forms that have little or nothing to do with the quality of the participation experience itself. A concerted effort needs to be made design program participation activities that are self-documenting so that the artifacts of participation, rather than separate documents reporting participation, become the evidence used to evaluate program compliance.

Recommendation 2E: Evaluate alternative Intern program designs

Intern programs having evolved in diverse ways now display designs that serve different purposes and provide quite different services to the interns and to the public school system. It is important to recognize these differences and formulate policy guidelines regarding which ones deserve continued funding. This report describes four distinct types of intern programs. While more detailed study would be required to make strong recommendations, the data collected in this study suggest that the program designs aimed at filling classrooms as quickly as possible and those aimed at lowering the effort and financial costs for teacher candidates are probably much less valuable to the state of California than are those that emphasize fitting teacher trainees to the needs of the district where they are being trained and those that see internship as an opportunity to dramatically intensify the amount and quality of teacher pre-service training. Our study team was particularly impressed by an intern program decision to limit interns to substantially less than full-time employment so that their training could be given highest priority. On the basis of the case studies conducted for this report, we would recommend that this option be considered for all interns.

Recommendation 2F: Control Intern enrollment options

Children are put at risk, teacher training is undermined and California is not well served when intern credentials are sought and granted on or after the opening day of school. Except for special cases where intern credentials are given to individuals who have been enrolled for some time in a pre-service program, this practice should be forbidden. If it is not, the arguments of those who are challenging the federal decision to consider intern credential holders to meet the No Child Left Behind requirements of “highly qualified” are likely to become persuasive.

Recommendation 2G: Strengthen support provider commitment to interns

Stronger local school and district commitment to providing interns with trained and capable district-based support providers is needed. It would probably help if the local support provider had to be identified by name and qualifications at the time the intern credential is awarded. Part of the problem is financial, the BTSA program is better funded and can afford to out bid intern programs for the services of quality support providers.

Recommendation 2H: Strengthen intern program accountability

Intern programs have been far less seriously evaluated than the BTSA programs and have hardly been evaluated at all since the CTC had to discontinue accreditation in 2002. In addition to the much anticipated revitalization of the accreditation process, however, it is recommended that the intern program adopt the BTSA model and create a system of regional staff (e.g. Cluster Regional Directors) who can provide ongoing coordination, support and program evaluation.

Recommendation 2I: Assure formal training for intern support providers

Support provider training for local intern support providers is important and typically neglected. Although interns have faculty based supervision from the sponsoring agency, their needs are legion and the local district support provider, if properly trained and motivated, can provide invaluable assistance. Formal training for district support providers should be included along with their explicit identification as part of the sponsoring agency’s responsibilities – adequately funded, of course, or neglect of this duty can be expected.

Recommendation 2J: Complete work already underway to revise formative assessment instruments

It is already clear to BTSA program staff members at all levels that some aspects of the state approved formative assessment systems are cumbersome and focused too much on

documenting activities. Completion of the revised formative assessment system underdevelopment will be much appreciated by staff and participating teachers alike.

Recommendation #3: Program Standards Modifications

Although program standards are part of the overall program design, they are important enough to be treated separately here. We make four recommendations related to the content and use of program standards.

Recommendation 3A: Delete the standalone technology standard

It is recommended that BTSA do away with the technology standard as a standalone program standard and, instead, incorporate appropriate references to technology utilization into other program standards. As argued above, these technologies change rapidly and new teachers often have leap-frogged past their support providers. This approach recognizes that technology utilization is not an end in itself; it is a means to realizing other program goals.

Recommendation 3B: Revise and upgrade the content of the English Learner and Special Populations BTSA standards

Testimony from BTSA participating teachers makes clear the importance of revising and upgrading training associated with these two standards. They are recognized as addressing fundamental classroom needs and new teachers feel the need for more sophisticated training in both areas. Present content too closely parallels pre-service training.

Recommendation 3C: BTSA needs to re-think the relationship between program standards and the elements that compose them

It should be recognized that any element aspect of BTSA program operations that needs to be independently evaluated constitutes a program standard and should be characterized as such. Any interpretive element that is intended to convey to program managers the underlying character or the multiple dimensions of a program standard is appropriately characterized as an “element” within the standard it elaborates. Standards should be embedded within the program review and evaluation process in ways that lead them to be reviewed holistically. When this principle is applied, BTSA leadership should quickly recognize that identifying more than a hundred standards for program reviews will undermine program integrity and lead to a “check off” approach to program accountability. Twenty or so standards is about all that can be independently monitored and held in mind as benchmarks for program implementation.

Recommendation 3D: Intern program standards need more careful monitoring

Intern program standards, designed as they are to parallel the standards for all pre-service programs are clear enough, but there are inadequate mechanisms for determining whether they are being met. Intern programs need more routine review and assessment of the adequacy with which standards are being met.

Recommendation #4: Adjusting program recruitment and participation

Several issues regarding participation in both the BTSA and Intern programs should be considered.

Recommendation 4A: Encouraging second career and internal promotion for intern programs

Although there has been notable success in the recruitment of second career candidates into the intern programs, more should be done to bring this opportunity the attention of potential candidates. This can best be done through a statewide public awareness program; local programs have a hard time getting media attention or access to the places where second career decisions are being made.

Intern programs have been particularly successful in providing promotion opportunities for individuals already engaged in public education as paraprofessionals or substitute teachers. Again more could be done to encourage this group to see internship as an opportunity for promotion. And this group is a particularly rich source of individuals from diverse backgrounds. Here districts are the target for recruitment efforts and state level support for reaching out to his group would be productive.

There is one group that is well represented in the intern programs that would probably be better served through scholarships or other forms of assistance to participate in full time teacher preparation programs. That is the group of recent college graduates who are coming from families with limited ability to support them through the teacher preparation process. These students, often from the first generation in their families to graduate from college and typically more ethnically diverse than other pools of teacher candidates are likely entering the intern programs out of financial need rather than preference for this kind of training. It is in the interest of the state and of the children they serve to provide access to teaching in ways that are less stressful for this group.

Recommendation 4B: Providing better support to the interns not in funded programs

One of the surprises in this study was the discovery that more than 25 percent of California intern credential holders are not supported in funded intern programs. While some members of this group are, no doubt, functioning comfortably and at a high level of success, most of the group is nearly invisible to state officials and their effectiveness is uncharted. It is quite likely that many of these interns are in need of support at a level similar to that being provided in the funded programs. The state should commission a careful study of this intern group and develop appropriate mechanisms for insuring that they receive the support they need.

Recommendation 4C: Providing better support to new teachers not eligible for BTSA

Another surprise in the data collected for this study is that a substantial proportion of the teachers entering the BTSA program have already worked for a year or more in California schools before becoming eligible for this program. State policy makers need to take a careful look at this cadre of new teachers and develop mechanisms to provide them with appropriate support *as they earn the credentials needed to become BTSA participants*.

Recommendation #5: Improving program management and governance

There are several adjustments to program governance and management that could improve overall effectiveness.

Recommendation 5A: Make sure program managers have needed status with district officials

To assure that new teachers get the support they need and are given the opportunity to benefit fully from participation in BTSA or intern programs the managers of these programs need to be seen as important executives in the districts or universities that employ them. In working with sponsoring agencies, it would be helpful if stronger efforts were made to assure that program managers are given the status and authority they need to coordinate support, integrate BTSA and intern program activities into the school systems' overall professional development efforts and maintain control over budgets and resource allocations. Difficulties with status are not frequent, but when they arise they are important.

Recommendation 5B: Expanding the Regional Coordinator concept to the intern program

As detailed in the body of this report, the Cluster Regional Director structure for BTSA has had important positive benefits for this program. A similar structure should be created for the intern programs.

Recommendation #6: While overall funding levels appear adequate, three important adjustments are needed

In addition to creating a much more useful fiscal record keeping system, there are two relatively simple adjustments in financing that would help improve program operations.

Recommendation 6A: Increase funding for the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors

These key individuals are obviously under resourced to the extent that funding limits their effectiveness. It is not easy to say how much additional funding would be cost effective, but a 50 percent increase in funding for this group is probably justifiable. Although detailed budgets were not studied, it appears that the state BTSA Task Force is also significantly underfunded.

Recommendation 6B: Equalize support for interns and BTSA teachers

One of the negative consequences of lower level per-teacher funding for intern teachers is that it puts this program at a disadvantage in recruiting and compensating support providers. Both programs are reporting significant difficulty in recruiting support providers, but the intern programs seem to be losing out in the competition for needed talent.

Recommendation 6C: Raise compensation for support providers

While money should not be the most important consideration in becoming a support provider for new teachers, it is becoming increasingly clear that the amount of compensation provided is not enough and programs are having a hard time securing talented professionals to do this important work. Increased compensation will be particularly important when steps are taken to substantially improve support provider training.