
3D

Information

Professional Services Committee

Update on the Induction Standards Review

Executive Summary: This item presents information from the initial meeting of the Induction Standards Design Team which is charged with reviewing and revising the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs*, as required by SB 1209 (Chap. 527, Stats. 2006).

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Terry Janicki and Karen Sacramento, Consultants, 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.

March 2008

Update on the Induction Standards Review

Introduction

This agenda item presents information from the initial meeting of the Induction Standards Design Team which is charged with reviewing and revising the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs* (induction standards), as required by Senate Bill 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006).

Background

SB 1209 reflected a number of recommendations contained in *The Status of the Teaching Profession, 2005*, a report issued by the Center for 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) Program and the California Intern (Intern) Program, culminating with a report that was submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2007. At the January-February 2008 Commission meeting, an agenda item was presented that addressed the evaluation and its recommendations. This item is available on the Commission's website at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2008-01/2008-01-2H.pdf>.

SB 1209 further required that a review and revision of the induction standards be completed by July 1, 2008, and that the review take into consideration the findings of the external evaluation. The purpose of the review and revision of the standards included: 1) reducing barriers and redundancy in teacher credentialing; 2) streamlining the credentialing process; and 3) ensuring that the adopted standards do not require programs to introduce new content, but instead require teachers in induction to demonstrate the knowledge and skills that were previously acquired in the preliminary teacher preparation program.

Initial Induction Standards Design Team Meeting

The Induction Standards Design Team met on January 9-10, 2008 as was described in the January-February agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2008-01/2008-01-2I.pdf>). The members of the Induction Standards Design Team are listed in Appendix A. The charge to the team is included as Appendix B.

The design team began by reviewing two major areas: 1) the relationship of the Commission's *Common Standards* to the induction standards; and 2) possible redundancies in the preliminary teacher preparation standards and the induction standards. A summary of these two areas as well as other critical issues to be discussed by the design team follows.

Consideration of the Use of the Common Standards for Induction Programs

At the January 2008 meeting, the Design Team began to discuss whether it would be appropriate for induction programs to use the Commission's *Common Standards*. The *Common Standards* address an educator preparation institution's capacity to offer one or more educator preparation programs, including a focus on the areas of Educational Leadership, Resources, Faculty,

Admission, Advice and Assistance, and Assessment of Candidate Competence. The *Common Standards* are included as Appendix C.

All credential programs approved by the Commission, with the exception of induction programs, address the *Common Standards*. The induction standards were originally developed incorporating the concepts from the *Common Standards* within the program standards and, therefore, the induction programs do not respond to the Commission's *Common Standards*. The Design Team reviewed the induction standards against the *Common Standards* with the focus of assessing the degree of alignment between the two sets of standards and the feasibility of induction programs using the *Common Standards*.

At this point in time, the Design Team does not have consensus regarding the use of the *Common Standards* for induction programs. In some respects, the language of the *Common Standards* does not work well for the nature and role of induction programs. An example of this situation is that there are no field or university supervisors in induction programs as there are in almost all other educator preparation programs. Instead, a support provider works with the participating teacher. The critical difference is that the support provider does not provide evaluative feedback or supervise the participating teacher. The language of Common Standard 8, which addresses the role of field experience supervisors, does not match the role of a support provider in induction programs.

The Design Team's initial discussion of how the *Common Standards* might be best integrated into the revised induction program standards will be continued at the February meeting.

Analyzing the Induction Standards for Redundancy and Duplication

During the January 2008 meeting the Design Team started the review of the induction standards for redundancy and duplication both within the standards themselves and with the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Preliminary Preparation Programs*. This review work will continue at the February and March Design Team meetings.

Format of the Induction Standards

With the adoption of the policy statement in January 2008 that the Commission's standards will not have required elements, the Induction Standards Design Team is developing standards with comprehensive and specific standard statements, but no required elements.

Content of Specific Standards

The Design Team is focusing on three specific program standards at its February meeting: Standard 16: Technology; Standard 19: Teaching English Learners; and Standard 20: Teaching Special Populations. The Design Team has reviewed the recommendations from the external evaluation completed by UC Riverside. The design team is considering moving the content of the technology standard into the preliminary preparation standards. The focus on technology in induction would shift to the use technology with K-12 students in a manner that enhances learning. The February meetings will focus on both the English learner and the special populations standards and how best to revise them so that teachers in induction are asked to demonstrate the skills they have acquired in the preliminary preparation program and are able to work with the full range of learners.

Next Steps

Pursuant to SB 1209 the Design Team was charged with completing its work in a very short time frame. Two additional Design Team meetings are planned following the March 2008 Commission meeting. Staff would appreciate input and/or feedback from the Commission to guide this work.

Activity	Time Frame
Design Team Meeting: Focus on Induction Program Standards 15-20 with additional individuals to provide expert advice on Special Education and Teaching English Learners	February 19-20, 2008
Information item presented to the Commission	March 5, 2008
Design Team Meeting: Finalize the draft proposed standards	March 13-14, 2008
Proposed Induction Standards posted on the CTC web page for stakeholder feedback	March 15, 2008
Proposed standards presented to the Commission for information	April 10-11, 2008
Stakeholder feedback due	May 1, 2008
Design Team Meeting: Review stakeholder feedback and revise standards, if necessary	May 6-7, 2008
Final proposed standards presented to the Commission for adoption.	June 5, 2008

Appendix A

Members of the Induction Standards Design Team

Lois Abel	Sinclair Research Group
Kathy Athey	San Joaquin County Office of Education
Wendy Baron	Santa Cruz/Silicon Valley New Teacher Project and New Teacher Center at UC Santa Cruz
Gilda Bloom	San Francisco State University/California Teachers Association
Nancy Brownell	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
John Grow	Madera Unified School District
Karen Harvey	Wm. S. Hart School District
Charlotte Kutzner	Poway Unified School District/California Federation of Teachers
Cancy McArn	Sacramento City Unified School District
Debbie Meadows	California State University, Bakersfield and Saugus Union School District
Corrine Muelrath	North Coast Beginning Teacher Program (SCOE)
Paula Motley	Monterey County Office of Education
Kenneth Pride	Los Angeles Unified School District
Gay Roby	Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District
Ruth Sandlin	CSU San Bernardino/California State University
Judith Schierling	San Jose State University
Jodie Schwartzfarb	New Haven Unified School District
David Simmons	Ventura County Office of Education
Chantell Tarver	Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District
Mariam True	San Diego Unified School District
Mary Lou Weinrich	San Bernardino City Unified School District
Peter Williamson	Stanford University/Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities

Additional Special Education and English Learner Content Experts

Janet Barrett	Capistrano Unified School District
Irma Bravo Lawrence	Stanislaus County Office of Education
Adele Arrellano	CSU Sacramento
Susan Andrews	Ventura County Office of Education

Appendix B

Charge to Induction Standards Design Team

Each member of the Induction Standards Design Team is charged to:

- Fully participate in the discussion and work of the group
- Share knowledge and beliefs in a professional manner, respecting differing perspectives
- Work together in a timely manner to meet the requirements of the Education Code

The members are charged to review and suggest revisions to the SB 2042 Induction Standards considering all of the following:

1. Induction Programs are credentialing programs that satisfy the requirements for the Clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential.
2. The Induction Program Standards must address individuals who hold preliminary multiple subject and single subject credentials. There are 16 different single subject credential areas.
3. When the Commission adopted recommendations from the Accreditation Study Work Group (August and September 2006) a recommendation was adopted that all programs leading to a credential or certificate should participate in the accreditation system. All Commission approved educator preparation programs must address the Commission's *Common Standards*.
4. The Induction Program Standards must apply to the 3 different types of entities that are eligible to sponsor Induction Programs: LEA based BTSA Programs, Alternative Induction Programs, and University-sponsored Induction Programs.
5. SB 1209 requires the elimination of duplication and redundancy between preliminary teacher preparation programs and induction programs.
6. SB 1209 requires Induction to be a "demonstration of the knowledge and skills previously acquired in the preliminary teacher preparation program."
7. Induction for the individual teacher must be aligned with that individual's experience in the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA).
8. SB 1209 directed that a study of BTSA Induction be completed. The study provided the following recommendations related to the Induction Program Standards:
 - Delete the stand-alone Induction technology standard
 - Revise and update the content of the English Learner and Special Populations Induction standards
 - BTSA Induction needs to rethink the relationship between program standards and their elements

Appendix C

Common Standards

(Adopted by the Commission, June 2007)

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service and unit accountability. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of program faculty and relevant stakeholders. Unit leadership, with institutional support, creates effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution or program sponsor. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Evaluation System

The education unit implements an assessment system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes and utilizes data on candidate and program completion performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, competence, and program effectiveness. Data are analyzed to identify patterns and trends that serve as the basis for programmatic and unit decision-making.

Standard 3: Resources

The institution or program sponsor provides the unit with the necessary budget, personnel, facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum development, instruction, field and clinical supervision, and assessment management. Library and digital media resources, information and communication technology resources, and support personnel are sufficient to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Standard 4: Faculty

Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach and supervise all courses and field experiences in each credential and certificate program. Faculty are knowledgeable in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, teaching and learning. They are reflective of the diverse society and knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. Faculty collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings, faculty in other college or university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution or program sponsor provides support for faculty development and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching, regularly evaluates the

performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Standard 5: Admissions

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness. Each individual has personal qualities and pre-professional experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional success and effectiveness.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Standard 7: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that they meet state adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its school partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel and site-based supervising personnel. Fieldwork and clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching and learning and develop strategies for improving student learning.

Standard 8: Program Sponsor, District and University Field Experience Supervisors

Field supervisors provide systematic and continuing support for candidates. Based on identified criteria, field experience supervisors are carefully selected, knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role and evaluated in a systematic manner. Supervisory activities are evaluated and recognized. District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content area(s) or performing the services authorized by the credential or certificate.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidates preparing to serve as teachers and other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the appropriate program standards.