
2H

Information/Action

General Session

Update on Induction Programs

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents a background review of the BTSA program and its expansion to the induction program, as well as an examination of the current context in which these programs are operating. In addition, this item presents some policy questions for Commission discussion to help guide the future of new teacher induction in California.

Policy Questions: What changes in state policy are needed in order to ensure that new teacher induction requirements are responsive to the needs of teachers, employers and the current conditions of schooling?

Recommended Action: That the Commission discuss the policy issues and provide direction to staff.

Presenters: Teri Clark, Director, Gay Roby and Karen Sacramento, Consultants, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal:

II. Program Quality and Accountability

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

September 2013

Update on Induction Programs

Introduction

California has successfully operated new teacher induction systems for the last 25 years, a period in which working conditions and expectations for new teachers have changed substantially. The state has experienced both unprecedented demand for new teachers and unprecedented shrinkage in the teaching workforce during this relatively short period of time. New teacher induction has remained a constant in the state's policy framework for teacher development, through times of expansion and contraction, in large part because of its well documented, positive impact on teacher retention and efficacy.

The last decade has been a period of relative stability for new teacher induction, which was made a formal part of teacher licensure for teachers beginning in 2002. Current changes in state policy, most especially the introduction of local control over funding decisions and the elimination of categorical program funding represent a fundamental shift that has implications for induction policy and practice. Recent research into new teacher policy and practice highlights both strengths in the system and areas where the system may not be meeting its policy objectives. Other research reiterates the importance of attending to the first years of teaching, in a supportive, structured way.

The Commission has responsibility for setting standards for and accrediting induction programs used for teacher licensure. During its September 2013 meeting, the Commission will hear from researchers and program administrators and begin a discussion of the current policy framework for induction and changes that may be needed to ensure that new teacher induction is responsive to teacher and employer needs and the current conditions of schooling.

Earlier this year a report was released, *California's beginning teachers: The bumpy path to a profession* http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/files/sri_bumpy-road.pdf, that reports on a case study of eight sites. The study examined new teacher induction as well as topics related to teacher evaluation. According to the report, a significant number of new teachers are not participating in induction during their first two years of teaching. One of the authors of this study will share the findings with the Commission.

The New Teacher Center (<http://newteachercenter.org/>) is a national non-profit that focuses on improving student learning by accelerating the effectiveness of new teachers and school leaders. The New Teacher Center has been working with new teacher induction since 1998. Representatives from the New Teacher Center will share best practices from their work within California and across the nation with the Commission.

Barbara Howard, Director of the Riverside County Office of Education's Teacher Support Center, will share information on the RIMS-BTSA Induction program. <http://rimsbtsa.ucr.edu/> RIMS-BTSA is a consortium program that serves districts in Riverside, Inyo, Mono and San

Bernardino counties in partnership with the University of California, Riverside and CSU San Bernardino.

Legislative and Historical Background

Induction for new teachers in California has evolved in significant ways over its 25 year history. The BTSA program was established by the Legislature and the Governor as a result of a pilot study conducted during 1988-1992 by the Commission and the California Department of Education (CDE). This pilot study, known as the California New Teacher Project (SB 148, Chap. 1455, Stats. 1988) demonstrated that the state could increase beginning teacher retention, success and effectiveness, by providing all new teachers with structured mentoring and support. The pilot project's summative report recommended a more effective induction of new teachers that would include:

- gradual introduction to the norms and responsibilities of teaching
- an extension of each teacher's professional learning as initiated during his/her prior preparation
- advice and assistance from experienced colleagues
- evidence-based information about each teacher's performance compared to established expectations for what beginning teachers should know and be able to do

In response to these recommendations, and after considerable legislative discussion of the pilot project report, (*Success for Beginning Teachers*, 1992) the Governor and the Legislature established the BTSA Program in the State Budget for 1992-93 to provide an effective transition for beginning elementary and secondary teachers into the teaching profession (SB 1422, Chap. 1245, Stats. 1992). This transition was facilitated by the assignment of a trained support provider to each beginning teacher. The support provider was charged with providing individualized support and assistance to the beginning teacher, guided by the results of the formative assessment of each beginning teacher's practice as measured by the [California Standards for the Teaching Profession](#). At that time, the program was a grant program designed to support new teachers and was not a credential requirement for teachers.

The successes of the California New Teacher Project grant programs influenced the Commission appointed SB 1422 Advisory Panel which conducted a review of the requirements for earning and renewing teaching credentials. Their recommendations were embodied in the passage of SB 2042 (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998), which created a two-tiered teaching credential system, significantly changed the BTSA program by establishing induction as the second tier in California's teacher preparation and credentialing system and instituting the completion of a standards based induction program as a path toward the Clear Credential for Multiple and Single Subject credentials. Through this change in structure, SB 2042 codified the "Learning to Teach Continuum". Initially the BTSA program was a general program of support and mentoring for new teachers in the public schools but SB 2042 transformed it to the preferred route to the Clear Credential. BTSA became BTSA Induction. The statutory purposes of BTSA Induction as defined in SB 1422 are provided in Appendix A and more detailed information on the early years of BTSA can be found in *A Decade of Policy Support for California's New Teachers* (http://www.teqjournal.org/TEQ%20Website/Back%20Issues/Volume%2028/VOL28%20PDFS/28_1/v28n1_olebe.pdf).

Passage of AB 2210 (Chap. 343, Stats. 2004) represented another milestone in the evolution of induction in California by establishing a Commission-approved Induction program, if available, as the *required* route for SB 2042 prepared Multiple and Single Subject teachers to obtain a clear teaching credential. AB 2210 clarified that, if an induction program is verified as unavailable by a beginning teacher's employer or the teacher needed to complete content area coursework for NCLB, then the teacher may complete a Commission-approved Clear Credential program sponsored by a college or university.

Passage of SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006) further influenced new teacher induction in California. SB 1209 required a review of teacher preliminary preparation programs and teacher induction programs and induction standards to eliminate duplicate requirements and reduce barriers in credentialing teachers. The focus of induction was defined to be for the new teacher to apply knowledge and skills previously acquired in a preliminary preparation program.

From 1995 until 2009 BTSA Induction programs operated with dedicated annual funding based on a per-participating teacher allocation (with a required LEA in-kind match). In February 2009 SBX3 4 Section 15, Education Code (EC) §42605, revised the 2008-09 enacted budget and also put into place a 2009-10 budget which provided LEAs with spending flexibility. LEAs were able to use funds from about 40 categorical programs, including the Teacher Credentialing Block Grant of which the BTSA Induction program was a part, for any educational purpose for a five-year period. This statute created greater program funding flexibility and removed the in-kind requirement but continued the funding to local education agencies that sponsor Commission-approved BTSA Induction programs.

Description of Induction

California's BTSA program has created a unique legacy of support for the professional growth and development of beginning teachers. Through the years, the BTSA program has provided standards-based, individualized advice and assistance that combined the application of theory learned in the preliminary teacher preparation program with intensive mentor-based support and formative assessment feedback. A hallmark of California's model has been the use of peer support providers for individualized guidance and assistance to teachers. The beginning teacher participating in the Induction Program has a dedicated, experienced, and trained colleague with whom they critically examine their practice and set individual growth goals, as well as to share concerns, successes, issues and questions in the context of a professional relationship during his or her first two key years in teaching.

Statewide evaluation and local program data have confirmed that beginning teachers who meet regularly with their support providers believe that those interactions helped the transition into teaching and made them more effective teachers. Further, Induction Programs have provided, and continue to provide, critical support and professional development to enable beginning teachers to be effective in teaching pupils who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse. Through the implementation of the Individual Induction Plan, each beginning teacher participates in professional development targeted specifically to his or her developmental needs determined through the formative assessment system. Commission-approved Induction programs have developed a document that depicts the activities a participating teacher experiences during the two year program. Two samples of this document are provided in Appendix B.

In summary, initially BTSA was a per-participating teacher grant program of new teacher support and mentoring for beginning credential teachers no matter what credential the teacher held (1992-2001). This was followed by BTSA Induction which was both a per-participating teacher grant program of new teacher support and mentoring for individuals holding a preliminary teaching credential and the way for an individual to earn a clear teaching credential (2001-2009). Education entities sponsoring a BTSA Induction program were required to meet the Commission's Induction standards and to satisfy the grant conditions from the California Department of Education (CDE). With the elimination of grant designated BTSA funding, currently programs are identified solely as Induction Programs. Induction is the required route to earning the Clear teaching credential (2009-current) and Induction programs are governed by the Commission's Induction standards but are no longer tied to CDE funding or grant requirements.

In addition to Induction Programs serving individuals holding Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject teaching credentials, the Commission's second tier program for teachers of special education is now an Induction Program: Clear Education Specialist Induction. Beginning in 2010, Induction is now the way an individual holding a Preliminary Education Specialist teaching credential earns the Clear Education Specialist Credential. In 2012, the Commission adopted induction as the route to the Clear Administrative Services Credential. Standards for Administrator Induction are currently under development.

Standards Governing Teacher Induction Programs

There are currently 156 accredited Induction programs in California. Most induction programs are operated by local school districts or county offices of education although there are four Commission-approved Induction programs sponsored by California institutions of higher education (IHE). The Commission adopted the SB 2042 Induction Standards in 2001 and the revised Induction Standards in June 2008 and January 2013 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/Induction-Program-Standards-2013.pdf>).

A major shift in the evolution of the BTSA Induction program was the inclusion, coincidental with the implementation of the revised Induction Program Standards, in the Commission's accreditation system. Through participation in the accreditation process, Induction programs must verify that they align to the Commission's standards. Each year, approximately 60 Induction Programs submit biennial reports, 20 Induction Programs submit program assessment documents, and another 20 programs host an accreditation site visit.

Formative Assessment

Formative Assessment is a cornerstone of a Commission-approved Induction Program. The Induction Standards require the participating teacher and support provider to collaboratively collect, analyze, and act upon evidence of the participating teacher's practice. Formative Assessment requires each participant to build upon his or her strengths and experiences in preliminary teacher preparation and customize the induction experience to address his or her individual needs.

Education Code §44279.25(c) charged the Commission to review and redesign the state-developed formative assessment system to align with the Induction Program Standards. Formative assessment in Induction has evolved over time. The first state developed formative

assessment process was the *California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers* (CFASST). CFASST was found by many participants to be too regimented and too much paperwork. One goal of formative assessment is to focus each participating teacher and support provider on planning instruction, analyzing student work, and using student assessment to plan future instruction. Formative assessment ensures that the participating teacher and support provider have substantive conversations about student learning. CFASST was retired and replaced with a new formative assessment system in 2008.

Formative Assessment for California Teachers (FACT) is the current state developed formative assessment system, <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2008-04/2008-04-2G.pdf>. There are also other models of formative assessment utilized in California Induction Programs. These include The Santa Cruz New Teacher Center *Formative Assessment System* (NTC FAS) and locally developed formative assessment systems. Each Commission-approved Induction program is responsible for implementing a formative assessment system in a manner that meets the Commission’s standards.

FACT is a process-based formative assessment system used within Induction to provide information and feedback to the participating teachers so that each teacher can build upon the knowledge, skills, and abilities that he or she brings to the induction experience. Through participation in four different FACT modules, the participating teacher examines current practice, researches an area for growth, and regularly reflects upon that growth. Currently work is planned to update FACT to address the English Language Development Standards and the Common Core State Standards. This work is scheduled for Fall 2013.

BTSA, Induction and Funding Provisions

Induction Programs are approved to support elementary, secondary and education specialist teachers who hold a preliminary credential during their first two years of employment in a teaching assignment. By working with teachers who have completed initial credential requirements, Induction is intended to build on the knowledge, skills and abilities teachers gain in their teacher preparation programs. Upon program completion, the Induction Program Sponsor recommends candidates for the Clear Teaching Credential.

The following chart shows the number of participating teachers who have been served through BTSA Induction since 1995 and the funding provided to the programs during the years of dedicated per participant program funding and flexible funding.

Year	BTSA Induction	
	# Participants	Total Funding in Millions
1995-1996	1,800	\$5.5
1996-1997	2,500	\$7.5
1997-1998	5,200	\$17.5
1998-1999	12,410	\$66.0
1999-2000	23,500	\$72.0
2000-2001	24,500	\$87.4
2001-2002	22,253	\$84.6

Year	BTSA Induction	
	# Participants	Total Funding in Millions
2002-2003	21,735	\$88.1
2003-2004	21,064	\$88.1
2004-2005	20,339	\$85.9
2005-2006	25,810	\$81.9
2006-2007	28,264	\$102.99
2007-2008	30,118	\$128.01
2008-2009	27,280	\$106.03
2009-2010	17,982	<i>\$90.397</i>
2010-2011	13,227	<i>\$90.397</i>
2011-2012	13,095	<i>\$90.397</i>
2012-2013	16,354	<i>\$90.397</i>

Italics: Flexible funding and may be used for any educational purpose

Beginning with the 2013-14 year, Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) is California’s new school funding system. The passage of LCFF legislation (Assembly Bill 97 and Senate Bill 91) extends the prior education reforms of 2009 and moves expenditure decisions from categorically state determined allocations to a locally determined system designed to be based on equity, transparency and performance. Under LCFF, LEAs will receive funding amounts based on the demographic configuration of their student population. LEAs will be required to base funding decisions on the state priorities in EC §52060(d) which are provided in Appendix C. Funds previously set aside for BTSA are included in the LCFF fiscal provisions. With LCFF, the districts and county offices with Commission-approved Induction Programs no longer receive funding based on the fact that they sponsor a Commission-approved induction program.

The LCFF accountability process is the Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). Through the LCAP school districts, COEs, and charter schools are required to develop, adopt, and annually update a three-year LCAP beginning on July 1, 2014. Concurrently the California State Board of Education (SBE) is establishing a timeline for the adoption of evaluation rubrics to assist LEAs and oversight entities in evaluating strengths, weaknesses, areas that require improvement, technical assistance needs, and where interventions are warranted. The LCAP is required to identify goals and measure progress for student subgroups across multiple performance indicators.

Routes to Licensure in California

Completion of an approved Induction Program is the legislated route to attaining a clear credential recommendation. If an employed teacher (employer is defined as a California public school, any school that is sponsored by a private California K-12 school, non-public, non-sectarian school or agency, charter school, or a school operated under the direction of a California state agency) does not have an Induction Program available to them then the teacher may enroll in a Clear Credential Program. Currently there are 22 Commission-approved Clear Credential programs operating in California (3 CSUs, 3 UCs, and 16 private and independent institutions).

General Education (MS/SS): Routes Candidates Take to the Clear Credential

Number of Candidates		2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Induction Programs	LEA	4941	5883	5977	6168
	IHE	0	0	41	44
Clear Credential Programs		260	420	458	676

Clear Credential programs must meet the Commission-adopted Clear Credential program standards. The Clear Credential standards are very similar to the Induction standards except for two key differences: identification of a Support Provider and the nature of Formative Assessment. In the Clear Credential program, the candidate must be supported during the program but the support does not need to come from an individual identified as the Support Provider. The support from a Clear Credential program may be provided by a number of individuals including faculty at the college or university. The Clear Credential program does not require the teacher to complete a formative assessment system, but instead requires the program to use systematic formative assessment to support and guide the development of the beginning teacher throughout the program.

Current Induction Program Status Information

Since the 2009 onset of flexible funding provisions, approved induction programs need only meet the induction standards to maintain ongoing program accreditation. A number of Commission-approved programs have become inactive or withdrawn since the per-participant funding ended. Of specific interest in terms of statewide program equity, access and parity is the issue of induction programs charging beginning teachers to participate. The induction programs sponsored by colleges or universities have always charged tuition. A few LEA-based induction programs were approved by the Commission after 2009 and never received any per participant state funding. These programs, sponsored by charter schools, have always charged candidates. An additional reality that appears to be surfacing is the fact that some programs are “capping” the number of new teachers they will serve, resulting in inequities within a district as some new teachers receive induction services and others are faced with having to search and pay for induction services outside of their district or teach, largely unsupported, in a classroom for a year or more until they reach the top of the program’s waiting list. A summary of the fee information is provided here and Appendix D provides the data gathered from the programs sponsored by local education agencies. Please note that programs may be represented in more than one of the following categories:

- Statewide 18 programs currently charge for in district/consortium general education participating teachers. The cost of this fee ranges from \$40-\$2,000 per teacher per year.
- Eleven programs have district contributions built into their fee structure.
- Four induction programs charge for in-district/consortium special education participating teachers. These reported fees range from \$1,000-\$2,000 annually per participating teacher.
- Many induction programs charge fees for out of district/consortium/private school teachers. The fee ranges from \$1500-\$2500 annually.

Stakeholder Meeting

With the implementation of the LCFF in 2013-14, the Commission was approached by Ventura County Office of Education about hosting a stakeholder meeting to discuss implications of LCFF

for induction. On July 16, 2013, major stakeholder groups involved in induction held a meeting to discuss how to ensure a high quality induction experience for new teachers within California's current education and budget context. The meeting surfaced challenges and opportunities afforded by the current fiscal context, the future viability and sustainability of induction services to new candidates, and implementation of the Common Core State Standards. The main purpose of the meeting was to examine options for sustainability of Induction Clear programs and equitable access for candidates. Stakeholders who attended the meeting came to consensus around the following assumptions:

- Induction Programs should improve retention, integration, and continual growth for all educators
- Induction Programs should provide a well-trained mentor to support effective instruction and student learning
- Induction Programs should engage preliminary credentialed educators in a job-embedded formative assessment system of continuous improvement that satisfies the requirements for the Clear Credential
- Induction Programs should be integral to the implementation of local initiatives as the candidate is acculturated into the employing LEA's context
- Equitable access to Induction Programs should be available to all new educators.

The participants at the July 2013 meeting reported that the discussion was very productive and expressed a desire for additional meetings that would include more of the Induction community in future discussions.

TAP Recommendations Regarding Induction Standards Revisions

The TAP panel was established by the Commission to review and make recommendations concerning potential improvements in teacher preparation in California. As highlighted in the August 2013 Commission agenda item, <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-08/2013-08-3A.pdf>, the TAP panel recommendations call for the following revisions to the Induction Program Standards. The rationale provided by the TAP Panel for these recommendations is provided in Appendix E.

1. The Commission should require a Transition Plan be developed at the end of the Preliminary program and be provided to the Induction Program by the candidate. This Transition Plan should be one basis for the Individual Induction Plan (IIP). The candidate, the employing district designee and the approved clear credential program representative, should develop the IIP. The IIP should incorporate a clear action plan, which incorporates the school and district goals. The candidate will leave induction with a program completion assessment learning plan to inform their next phase of professional learning.
2. The Commission should direct that the Induction standards be reviewed and revised to ensure that there: a) are clear and more rigorous expectations for mentors including teaching expertise, careful and rigorous selection, systematic assignment, and high quality ongoing development and support and b) is language about leadership, structures and resources necessary to operate an Induction program.
3. The Commission should direct that the induction program standards define Induction as two years of individualized support for participating teachers.

4. The Commission should direct that expectations be made more rigorous so that candidates are required to demonstrate comprehensive competence prior to recommendation for the clear credential.
5. The TAP panel recognizes the importance of a strong statewide infrastructure as an indispensable component to an effective teacher induction system in California. The state should renew its commitment to this successful model and take appropriate steps to ensure that it continues into the future. Further, the state should consider the benefits of expanding this highly successful concept of a regional infrastructure system used historically by teacher induction by building a more comprehensive regional system that is cohesive across, and supportive of, all educator preparation programs.

Induction Policy Considerations

It seems that it is time to review the implementation of induction, reaffirm what works, and adjust policy to ensure that programs are responsive to candidate needs and the current conditions of schooling. A review of policy issues related to new teacher induction should include the following:

Induction Program Design and Standards:

- a) Are the induction standards and induction programs responsive to the needs of the beginning teacher? What changes in standards are necessary in order to align with current conditions in the schools?
- b) Should the Commission look at the Induction formative assessment system and standards to focus emphasis on mentor based support that leads to effective measures of candidate competency?
- c) What role does formative assessment play in effective induction programs and should requirement for formative assessment be streamlined?
- d) The TAP recommendations suggest a Transition Plan that would move with the candidate from the Preliminary Program to the Induction program, that Induction should be 2 years of individualized support, that the standards should be more rigorous and clear regarding mentor qualifications and development, and that the expectations for the completion of induction should focus more on outcomes so that new teachers demonstrate competence prior to recommendation for the clear credential. Should these recommendations be forwarded to the planned standards writing team?

Induction Program Participation and Eligibility:

Current legislation and policy define key issues around employment and licensure. The first of these is eligibility for induction. Education Code §44279.1(2) states that a beginning teacher is eligible to participate in Induction and defines a beginning teacher as a teacher with a valid California preliminary teaching credential. There are individuals teaching in the public schools who do not yet hold a preliminary credential.

- e) Should the definition of eligibility for participation in induction be expanded to include non- preliminary credential holding candidates (i.e. individuals on short term permits, intern credentials or substitute permits) and should induction programs serve all

individuals in new teaching settings, regardless of credential status? If so, what is the role of the induction licensure and accreditation process under this set of expectations?

- f) Is the expectation of the Commission that induction should be available to all preliminary credentialed teachers?
- g) Can, and if so, should, the Commission formalize policy relating to the authorization of the preliminary credential so that all teachers holding a preliminary credential are required to receive induction program support in their two first years of teaching, regardless of employment conditions such as temporary, part time, full time, or probationary status?

Licensure, Employment and Evaluation:

Currently, the induction program support provider is trained in formative assessment, the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, the K-12 Academic Content Standards, the needs of beginning teachers, and *The Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs*. The support provider serves in an advisory role with beginning teachers and is not part of the district's employment process with respect to retention and tenure decisions. The purpose of the separation of induction support from the employment process has been to allow the beginning teachers to freely share information and receive assistance from the support provider, resulting in the maximum benefit from their advice and formative assessment feedback.

The report, *California's beginning teachers: The bumpy path to a profession* recommends that the firewall between induction and the evaluation process should be removed. The Educator Excellence Task Force put forward recommendations on the issue of tenure and licensure in the Greatness by Design Report (GbD)

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/greatnessfinal.pdf#search=greatness%20by%20design%20report&view=FitH&pagemode=none> which states:

The early career system should ensure that candidates are offered induction that builds on their performance in their preparation program, as reflected in their performance assessment completed for the initial license, among other things. With this information, support providers should design a personalized learning plan that guides mentoring and other learning opportunities over the first two years of practice. Ideally, a decision about permanent status should occur after the completion of the induction program so that the new teacher will have the full benefit of the induction program prior to a high-stakes evaluation, with appropriate safeguards for due process. In addition, the expiration of the preliminary credential should be synchronized with the credential recommendation made upon successful completion of an induction program.

- h) Should the Induction program measures of candidate competency be used beyond licensure purposes and available for local evaluation processes?

- i) Should the GbD recommendation above in terms of synchronizing the induction program and licensure recommendation be considered by the Commission?

Appendix A

Statutory Purposes of BTSA Induction Programs as defined in SB 1422

California Education Code 44279.1 establishes the following statutory purposes of the statewide BTSA Induction Program:

- provide an effective transition into teaching for first-year and second-year teachers in California;
- improve the education performance of pupils through improved training, information and assistance for new teachers;
- enable beginning teachers to be effective in teaching pupils who are culturally, linguistically and academically diverse;
- ensure the professional success and retention of new teachers;
- ensure that a support provider provides intensive individualized support and assistance for each participating beginning teacher;
- improve the rigor and consistency of individual teacher performance assessment results and the usefulness of assessment results to teachers and decision makers;
- establish an effective, coherent system of performance assessments that is based on the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)* adopted by the Commission in 1997;
- examine alternative ways in which the general public and the educational profession may be assured that new teachers who remain in teaching have attained acceptable levels of professional competence;
- ensure that an individual induction plan is in place for each participating new teacher and is based on an ongoing assessment of the development of the beginning teacher; and
- ensure continuous, ongoing program improvement through research, development and evaluation.



Appendix B

A Teacher's Journey Through the RIMS-BTSA Professional Teacher Induction Program (Riverside, Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino-Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment)

Sample Two-Year Induction Timeline	
Years 1 and 2 Orientation, Enrollment, and Support Provider Match	August September
Years 1 and 2 Context for Teaching IEP and SST/504 Meeting	October November December
Years 1 and 2 Self-Assessment of Teaching	
Years 1 and 2 Inquiry Support Sessions <i>(Professional Learning Linked to the Inquiry Process)</i> Year 1 Inquiry Year 2 Inquiries (2)	January February March April
Years 1 and 2 Reflection on the Impact of Inquiry	May
Statewide BTSA Survey	
Year 2 Clear Credential Eligibility	June

*“No good ending can be expected in the absence of the right beginning.” –
I Ching -*

Although new teachers may feel overwhelmed in their classrooms, they are not alone in facing common challenges. *The RIMS-BTSA Induction Program provides structured support to new teachers in overcoming those common challenges and refining their teaching practice.* Our teachers begin their induction journey at an **Orientation** that introduces the program and includes *enrollment* into the RIMS-BTSA Induction Program. *The employing agencies of the participating teachers assign carefully selected Support Providers (Mentor / Coaches) who provide ongoing reflective coaching* as they guide and support each teacher during the two-year process of the **Formative Assessment for California Teachers (FACT)**. FACT is an interactive and collaborative process for the teacher to identify individual areas of strength and areas for study by analyzing objective evidence of student learning and teacher practices. All Support Providers attend ongoing mentoring training with RIMS-BTSA throughout their entire tenure as a support provider. The Support Provider’s role is the key and the heart of the RIMS-BTSA Induction experience.

During the first year of induction, teachers examine their current settings to consider the diverse needs of their students and available educational resources. They also compare and contrast the outcomes and processes of their teacher preparation program with those of induction. Together, this information facilitates a deeper investigation specific to student learning needs and individual teacher growth.

The second year of induction follows a similar process of examination of current classroom context and self-assessment. However, the examination of teaching practice is even more comprehensive as teachers evaluate their instructional effectiveness and impact on student learning.

During both years, teacher’s engage in the **Inquiry Process**, collecting evidence of their teaching practice that demonstrates differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of students who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse. Attendance at individually selected **Inquiry Support Sessions** and observance of a student’s IEP meeting **and** a Section 504, SST, or other diagnostic Response to Intervention meeting are required embedded experiences. *The teachers’ deeper knowledge developed through these action research modules and subsequent data analysis guides classroom decision-making, strengthens professional practice, and improves student achievement through effective teaching to all students.*

The culminating annual year-end **Colloquium** provides the opportunity for teachers to share key insights from the holistic reflection of their teaching throughout the year. This reflection captures progress related to the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, the California Common Core State Standards, and the *Induction Program Standards*. Teachers also reflect on future areas for study in their continuing journey as a professional educator.

Upon completion of the program and credential renewal requirements, the teacher may request a *clear teaching credential* recommendation from the RIMS-BTSA Induction Program.

Activities a Participating Teacher Experiences during Induction

A Participating Teacher's Journey San Ramon Unified School District

When a teacher is hired in the San Ramon Valley Unified School District (SRVUSD), he or she is directed to report to the Human Resources Department (HR) to complete all the intake information required. The candidate is given a packet of information from the BTSA program that includes [a form](#) indicating who qualifies for BTSA, a [Welcome Letter](#), a copy of BTSA [Induction Standards 5, 6, and 7](#), and a copy of the [California Standards for the Teaching Profession](#). As part of that process, candidates complete a BTSA Induction form on which they indicate:

- the number of years and where they taught both in and out of state
- prior BTSA experience
- their credential information
- the IHE of record if the person is hired as an intern

HR sends this document to the BTSA office along with a copy of the candidate's credential(s).

The candidate is directed to view the [BTSA Orientation video](#) available at the BTSA website and to complete the [Memorandum of Understanding \(MOU\)](#) after viewing the video. That MOU is then sent to the BTSA office.

The Orientation Video helped me to understand the process and relieved my mind about what we were going to have to do. I look forward to finding out who my mentor will be.

PT email

When the BTSA Induction Coordinator receives this information she contacts the candidates, either through email, or a phone call. She welcomes them to the district, and informs them of their participation in BTSA, of the date of the New Teacher Breakfast, and reminds them to view the BTSA Orientation Video. She also makes herself available for any questions. This occurs throughout the summer recess.

As the start of the school year gets closer, another avenue of notification of BTSA Induction eligible hires, or Participating Teachers (PTs), comes from principals at each site, and from the Teachers on Special Assignment (TSAs) reporting new hires at their assigned sites. As more names of potential PTs come into the BTSA Induction Office, those candidates are also welcomed to the district, and notified of via email or phone of the date of the New Teacher Breakfast.

The PT attends the New Teacher Breakfast supported by both the District and the San Ramon Valley Education Association (SRVEA) the day before school starts. BTSA Induction is presented as one of the programs offered by the district. BTSA Induction TSAs are available for any questions at this time.

The BTSA office begins the work of matching an appropriate mentor with the PT as the list of new hires grows. The PT and mentor are informed of their match within the first three weeks of school. Sometimes this match is by PT or mentor request, sometimes it is by site administrator request, and sometimes it is because of availability. PTs are matched with either an on-site mentor who has been trained in the New Teacher Center mentor program, or with a TSA. They and their mentor are then invited to join DropBox where an electronic folder containing all the BTSA tools and directions are located.

Within the first three weeks of school, separate meetings for Year 1 PTs and their mentors, and Year 2 PTs and their mentors, are held. At this meeting the program is further explained, and PTs and their mentors are given time to review the Eight Essential Elements of the CSTP as defined by the New Teacher Center. PTs and mentors identify strengths and areas of growth in each of these elements, and determine which areas will be a focus for the school year. Because SRVUSD requires two goals for the official evaluation process, the PT and mentor select two appropriate CSTPs for further exploration, as the next steps in each CSTP will drive their collaborative work. These goals also become the evaluation goals used by the site administrator.

Once goals are established and agreed upon in partnership with the site administrator, the PT begins to examine practice through the Cycle of Inquiry (Plan, Teach, reflect, Apply). In collaboration with the mentor, the PT uses the New Teacher Formative Assessment System (NT-FAS) tools to *plan* differentiated instruction based on content standards, *teach* using adopted texts and supplementary materials, *reflect* on observation data and analysis of student work, and *apply* learning to future work, using CALs to document the process. This process ties in with the natural demands of the school year and is embedded in PT need and development.

I'm excited to meet you and discuss things about BTSA. Next week, it would be best for me to meet after school on Monday or Tuesday. If this doesn't work for you, just let me know and we can figure something out before or during school (prep time).

Mentor email

(PTs) are able to self-assess their strengths and areas for growth, and then select a customized plan for professional growth in each Induction Standard. These plans are well accepted by the beginning teachers because they price 'just right' mentoring at the 'just right' time.

Mentor comment

Here's what I'm thinking: On Tues., you could come in at 10:00/10:30ish and we could review the lesson and have a discussion about things. Then, I can do the lesson when the students get back from Science at around 11:15. Would this work for you? Let me know and I'll be in touch.

PT email

The first half of a Year 1 PT's BTSA experience involves setting professional goals, and understanding context. It is also a time for the mentor and PT to build a trusting relationship, and for the mentor to help the PT with any situations or issues that surface. Mentors should become the PTs' source of information and support, especially as the PT goes through the typical Attitudinal Phases of Teachers. (Anticipation, Survival, Disillusionment, Rejuvenation, Reflection, Anticipation). Timely support for a PT as he or she faces the issues, concerns, and daily questions is an essential part of the mentor's job. A mentor is careful to build on the PT's pre-service training, making sure that whatever they are collaborating on is relevant to the PT's current class assignment.

Things are extremely busy here at Quail Run. I think I may be losing my mind a little bit. About coming to read, could you come between 11:00-12:00 tomorrow? My schedule is pretty full on Friday. Let me know, or we could do it next week. Take care and I'll talk to you soon.

PT email

For Year 1 PTs the first half of the year specifically involves activities that help a PT know their students, understand how to create effective environments, and identify and utilize resources available. The mentor also helps with planning classes and informally observes the PT. These observations help the PT and mentor build trust. Observations also contribute to developing the sequence of teaching and learning experiences that will address the full range of student needs. Together, they reflect on the process and document all their work on *Collaborative Assessment Logs* (CALs). The first semester work concludes with a reflection which assesses their first semester experiences.

(PTs) are able to self-assess their strengths and areas for growth, and then select a customized plan for professional growth in each Induction Standard. These plans are well accepted by the beginning teachers because they price 'just right' mentoring at the 'just right' time.

Mentor comment

Year 2 PTs focus on developing culturally responsive practices. PTs and mentors discuss a Differentiation Profile that helps a PT identify five students who respond best to their teaching, and five students who respond least to their teaching. Together they delve deeper in to why these students are perceived in this way and determine strategies to help each student. They then read an article, *Culturally Responsive Practices*, and follow the strategies identified in the article to identify their own biases and determine strategies for reducing those biases. They identify two students about whom they will develop a deeper understanding using a Pre Assessment Iceberg tool. Finally they reflect together on the process, and any changes that occurred as a result of that process. Throughout this work, the mentor collaborates with the PT on planning lessons and observes the PT's teaching. Together they reflect on the processes, capturing those reflections on a Collaborative Assessment Log (CAL).

This process really made me examine my own practices and biases when it comes to individual students. I think the process helped me to evaluate better ways to work with the child and we have a much stronger and successful relationship now.

PT reflection

All PTs use the second half of the year to examine their practice through an [action inquiry process](#). First year PTs typically focus on Standard 5 – Pedagogy, while Year 2 PTs typically focus on Standard 6 – Equity. PTs and mentors minimally meet for at least an hour per week, and document those meetings on an *Activity Log*.

A workshop for PTs and Mentors on developing an effective inquiry question is held in January and facilitates their planning. PTs identify an area of concern or interest and the desired results from this action plan. They select two case study students and frame an inquiry question that addresses the content area, learning outcome, target student population and actions that the PT will pursue.

Any professional development activities that support this learning will be identified. PTs choose from a *Professional Development Activities Choice Board* listing nine separate choices, including one labeled “Create Your Own.” Professional development should be job embedded and focused on new learning. PTs use a *Professional Development Reflection Log* to reflect upon and document any learning and application of best practices through the Cycle of Inquiry. This allows the PT to individualize professional development and tailor it to his or her needs.

PTs reflect on their growth at mid-year ([Year 1](#) and [Year 2](#)) and at the [end of the year](#). Their portfolio is reviewed at those times for monitoring and documenting completion. All portfolios are electronic and located on DropBox.

Finally, in May, at the end of the school year the BTSA community, including PTs, mentors, TSAs, site and district administrators, gathers to celebrate the conclusion of a successful school year.

Take one step at a time. Teaching is all about trial and error.... attempting new things, even if they seem scary at first, is important to enable growth as a teacher. That's what makes teaching not only motivating, but fun!

PT evaluation

The choice board has really worked for me because I can decide what I really need instead of going to an assigned workshop. It just makes sense since I hated hearing things I already knew.

PT evaluation

My goal for the year was to immerse myself in the New York reading and writing programs and develop a greater understanding of the program. I wanted to engage students in writing that developed skills in various genres using the NY reading and writing programs. I also wanted to draw on students' background interests and make note of developmental learning needs. I wanted to bring technology into the classroom by utilizing a laptop and LCD projector for social studies lessons.

PT Reflection

Appendix C

Education Code §52060 (d)

(d) All of the following are state priorities:

(1) The degree to which the teachers of the school district are appropriately assigned in accordance with Section 44258.9, and fully credentialed in the subject areas, and, for the pupils they are teaching, every pupil in the school district has sufficient access to the standards-aligned instructional materials as determined pursuant to Section 60119, and school facilities are maintained in good repair as specified in subdivision (d) of Section 17002.

(2) Implementation of the academic content and performance standards adopted by the state board, including how the programs and services will enable English learners to access the common core academic content standards adopted pursuant to Section 60605.8 and the English language development standards adopted pursuant to Section 60811.3 for purposes of gaining academic content knowledge and English language proficiency.

(3) Parental involvement, including efforts the school district makes to seek parent input in making decisions for the school district and each individual schoolsite, and including how the school district will promote parental participation in programs for unduplicated pupils and individuals with exceptional needs.

(4) Pupil achievement, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

(A) Statewide assessments administered pursuant to Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) of Chapter 5 of Part 33 or any subsequent assessment, as certified by the state board.

(B) The Academic Performance Index, as described in Section 52052.

(C) The percentage of pupils who have successfully completed courses that satisfy the requirements for entrance to the University of California and the California State University, or career technical education sequences or clusters of courses that satisfy the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 52302, subdivision (a) of Section 52372.5, or paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of Section 54692, and align with state board-approved career technical education standards and frameworks.

(D) The percentage of English learner pupils who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by the California English Language Development Test or any subsequent assessment of English proficiency, as certified by the state board.

(E) The English learner reclassification rate.

(F) The percentage of pupils who have passed an advanced placement examination with a score of 3 or higher.

(G) The percentage of pupils who participate in, and demonstrate college preparedness pursuant to, the Early Assessment Program, as described in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 99300) of Part 65 of Division 14 of Title 3, or any subsequent assessment of college preparedness.

(5) Pupil engagement, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

(A) School attendance rates.

(B) Chronic absenteeism rates.

(C) Middle school dropout rates, as described in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 52052.1.

(D) High school dropout rates.

(E) High school graduation rates.

(6) School climate, as measured by all of the following, as applicable:

- (A) Pupil suspension rates.
- (B) Pupil expulsion rates.
- (C) Other local measures, including surveys of pupils, parents, and teachers on the sense of safety and school connectedness.
- (7) The extent to which pupils have access to, and are enrolled in, a broad course of study that includes all of the subject areas described in Section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable, including the programs and services developed and provided to unduplicated pupils and individuals with exceptional needs, and the program and services that are provided to benefit these pupils as a result of the funding received pursuant to Section 42238.02, as implemented by Section 42238.03.
- (8) Pupil outcomes, if available, in the subject areas described in Section 51210 and subdivisions (a) to (i), inclusive, of Section 51220, as applicable.

Appendix D Induction Fees

Type: 'D'=single district, 'C'=consortium Identifies the Program='MS/SS' and/or 'Ed Sp', 'P' indicates a program has been submitted for IPR

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
Alhambra USD	D	X		No	-		Hourly PT pay \$2500 per year	
Anaheim City SD BTSA	D	X		No	-			
Anaheim Union HSD BTSA	D	X		No	-		For PTs from outside the district \$2,000 per year	
Antelope Valley HSD	D	X	X	No	-			
Antioch USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Arcadia USD	D	X		No	-			
Aspire Public Schools	D	X	X	No	-			
Azusa USD	D	X		No	-			
Bakersfield City	D	X	X	No	-		Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	
Baldwin Park USD	D	X		No	-			
Bellflower USD	D	X		No	-			
Butte COE	C	X	X	Yes	Yes	\$250	Districts pay full cost of SP stipends and \$1500 per PT per year.	Consortium pays all sub cost for SP release time (up to 4 days per PT)
California School for the Deaf	D	X	X	No	-			
Campbell Union SD	C	X	X	No	No			
Capistrano USD BTSA	D	X		Yes	-	Yes	\$3750 for 2 years	\$3500 per year for non CUSD PTs
Castaic USD	D	X		No	-			
Central USD	D	X		No	-		Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	
Chaffey Joint UHSD	D	X		No	-			

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
Chula Vista ESD	D	X		No	-			
Clovis USD	D	X		No	-		Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	
Compton USD	D	X		No	-			
Conejo Valley USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Contra Costa COE	C	X	X	No	No			
Corona-Norco USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Culver City USD (Culver City-Beverly Hills Consortium)	C	X		Yes	Yes	1500/yr		
Cupertino Union SD	D	X		No	-			\$1000 for long term subs
El Dorado COE	C	X	X	No	Yes	No	Has continued to have matching funds from districts to support induction costs.	Will be looking at funding for 14-15 and beyond.
El Rancho USD	D	X	P	No	-			
Elk Grove USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Envision Schools	D	X		No	-			
Escondido USD BTSA	D	X		No	-			
Etiwanda SD	D	X	X	No	-			
Evergreen Elementary SD	D	X		No	-			
Fairfield Suisun USD	D	X		No	-			
Far East Contra Costa	C	X	P	No	Yes	No	Districts pay \$1,200 cost of SP stipends.	LEA pays \$2,700/PT to participating districts
Fontana USD	D	X	P	No	-			
Fremont USD	D	X	X	No	-			

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
Fresno COE	C	X	X	No	No	-	Serves all eligible general education and clear education specialist candidates, including temporary teachers at no cost within the consortium. LEA charges \$2,000/PT per year for Education Specialist candidates from districts outside of the consortium	Sanger USD pays for all associated expenses. Madera COE pays for the support provider while the candidate pays the \$2,000/year fee. LEA Distributes \$500/PT to participating districts.
Fresno USD	D	X		No	-		Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	
Garden Grove Unified BTSA	D	X		No	-			
Glendale USD (Glendale-LaCanada Consortium)	C	X		Yes				Partner districts pay \$3200 to LEA per PT. Only serving Yr. 2 & ECO. Phase out in 2014-15. ECO \$3200
Green Dot (Animo)	D	X		Yes	Yes	\$2,500/yr	Program did not receive TCBG funds	\$3,200 ECO
Grossmont UHSD	D	X		No	-			
Hacienda - LaPuente USD	D	X	X	Yes	-			
Hanford	D	X		No	-		Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	
Hayward USD	D	X		No	-			Only charging PT when they have not completed within 2 years, \$650/semester for SP stipend
High Tech High	D	X	X	No	-			\$2000/yr to non HTH teachers
Imperial COE	C	X		No	No			
Inner City Educational Foundation	D	X		No	-			

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
Irvine USD BTSA	D	X		Yes	-		\$1,500 per district new teacher; \$2,500 per private school teacher	
Kern County SOS	C	X	P	No	No	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers. Supporting first year teachers from Greenfield. Greenfield is charged \$1,200/PT.	LEA distributes \$1,200/PT to participating districts.
Kern High SD	D	X	X	No	-		Serves all eligible general education and clear education specialist candidates, including temporary teachers	
King Chavez	D	X		No	-			
Kings COE	C	X		No	No	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers.	LEA distributes \$1,000/PT to partnering districts.
La Mesa Spring Valley SD	D	X		No	-			
Lancaster ESD	C	X	X	No	No	No		
Lawndale ESD (Lawndale, Lennox, Hawthorne, Centinela Valley)	C	X		No	No	-		
Long Beach USD	D	X		No	-			
Los Angeles County Office of Education	C	X		Yes	Yes	\$1,000/yr		\$3000 for out-of-consortium candidates per year
Los Angeles Unified School District	D	X		No	-			
Los Banos USD	D	X		No	-		Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	
Madera USD	C	X		No	No	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers.	LEA does not distribute funds to partnering districts within the consortium.
Manteca USD	D	X		No	-		Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
Marin COE	C	X	X	No	No	No	Subsidy to district stays at \$2000 in 13/14	In conversation with Consortium partners regarding 14/15 and beyond
Merced COE	C	X		No	No	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers.	LEA distributes \$750/PT to partnering districts.
Merced UHSD	D	X	X	No	-	-	Serves all eligible general education and clear education specialist candidates, including temporary teachers	
Milpitas USD	D	X		No	-			
Modesto City	D	X		No	-	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers. Partners with Stanislaus COE to serve clear education specialist teachers.	District pays all associated expenses for inducting clear education specialist teachers.
Montebello USD	D	X		No	-			
Monterey COE	C	X	X	No	No	Yes	\$40 portfolio fee implemented this year	
Mt. Diablo USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Murrieta Valley SD	D	X	X	No	-			
Napa COE	C	X	X	Yes	Yes	No	Districts contribute \$570 per PT and substitute release time for both PT and SP in 13-14.	Still negotiating for 14-15 and beyond.
New Haven USD	D	X		No	-			
Newark Unified SD	C	x	P	No	No			
North Coast BTP	C	X	X	Yes	Yes	Districts Determine	Fee to Districts 13-14- 10% cost of \$330,	Estimated projections: 14-15 \$1100, 50% in 15-16 \$1650; subject to change
North Coastal	C	X		No				
North Orange County BTSA: Fullerton SD	C	X		No			Yes, FSD refunds Support Provider costs to participating districts.	

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
North State BTSA	C	X	X	Yes	Yes	No	Fee to Districts - \$3200/teacher full pa w/Tehama paying SP Stipend which is \$1600y, or \$1500/teacher and district covers the SP Stipend	Some districts are not enrolling eligible candidates 2013-2014 because they do not have the funds and are holding them for a year or two to receive more in their LCFF
Oak Grove SD	D	X		No	-			
Oakland USD	D	X	P	No	-		Currently a cap of serving 210 teachers	90 teachers on waiting list
Ontario Montclair SD	D	X		No	-			
Orange County DOE BTSA	C	X		Yes	No		Private School PT - \$3000 per year; Ed Specialist PT - \$2250 per year	Consortium covers all costs including mentor stipends, substitutes, and professional development offerings for PT's, SPs and Site Administrators.
Orange USD BTSA	D	X	X	Yes	Yes		Private Schools charged \$2,500. Other Public Schools for Special Ed. \$2,000 for Program	If assessment services are provided an additional \$700 per PT
Palmdale ESD	D	X		No	-			
Palo Alto USD	D	X		No	-			
Palos Verdes Peninsula (So. Bay Consortium)	C	X		Yes			Yr 1 TBD up to \$3300 total fee. The LEA has suggested that the minimum program participation fee to LEA alone would be \$1,000 this year. Year 2 TBD - up to \$3300 fee per year- Minimum would be \$500 this year to LEA.	
Panama Buena Vista USD	D	X	P	No	-	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers.	
Paramount USD	D	X		No	-			

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
Pasadena USD	D	X		No	-			
Placentia-Yorba Linda USD BTSA	C	X		Yes			\$1,200/Yr	
Placer COE	C	X	X	Yes	Yes	Districts Determine	Fee to Districts 13-14 \$763/PT	14-15 1500/PT, 15-16 \$2000/PT, 16-17 \$3000/PT, and 17-18 \$4000/PT
Pleasanton USD	C	X	X	No	No			Partner district reimbursement reduced to hire additional FTE coaches
Pomona USD	D	X		No	-		Cap at number of available SP:(19 in 2013-14. All others are waitlisted until next year. Receive site support and district PD while on waitlist.	
Poway	D	X	X	No	-			
PUC Schools	D	X		Yes	Yes	\$2000 /yr		No state funding since approved after Flexible Funding began
Reach	D	X		Yes	-	Schools Determine	\$1,800 per year	School is billed – some may pass on costs to teachers
Redwood City SD	D	X		No	-			
Rialto USD	D	X		No	-			
RIMS BTSA-RCOE	C	X	X	No	No		May pass less \$ to districts in 2014-15	
Riverside USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Rowland USD	D	X		No	-			
Sacramento City USD	D	X		No	-			
Sacramento COE	C	X	X	No	No	No	To be determined	
Saddleback Valley BTSA	D	X		Yes	-		\$2,000/Yr	

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
San Bernardino City	D	X	X	No	-			
San Diego COE	C	X	X	Yes	Yes		\$2000/yr	
San Diego USD BTSA	D	X		No	-			
San Dieguito UHSD	D	X		No	-			
San Francisco USD	D	X		No	-			
San Gabriel USD (San Gabriel Valley Consortium)	C	X		No	-	-		
San Joaquin COE	C	X	X	No	No	-	Serves all eligible general education and clear education specialist candidates, including temporary teachers.	LEA distributes \$750/PT to partnering districts.
San Jose USD	D	X		No	-		Currently a cap of serving 143 teachers	40 on waiting list
San Juan USD	D	X	X	No	-			
San Luis Obispo COE	C	X	X	No	Yes		The districts have agreed to fund either full-release teacher mentors or full-time teacher stipend model mentors to serve their participating teachers	
San Marcos USD	D	X	X	No	-			
San Mateo COE	C	X	X	Yes	Yes	Districts Determine	\$2,000 if district provides SP or \$4,000 if COE provides SP	
San Mateo/Foster City SD	D	X	X	No	-			
San Ramon Valley USD	C	X	X	No	-			
Sanger USD	D	X		No	-	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers. Partners with FCOE to support eligible clear education specialist candidates at no cost to the teacher.	
Santa Ana USD BTSA	D	X		Yes	-		\$1,500/Yr	
Santa Barbara CEO	C	X	X	No	-		Discussions for 2014-15	

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
Santa Clara USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Santa Cruz COE	C	X	X	Yes	Yes	Districts Determine	\$5000 for 2 years	
Santa Monica - Malibu	D	X		No	-			
Saugus (Santa Clarita Valley)	C	X		Yes	Maybe		Charging is still TBD for 2013-14 as of 06 Sept.	
Selma USD	C	X	X	No	No	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	
Sequoia Union HSD	D	X		No	-			
SIATECH	D	X		No	-			
Stanislaus COE	C	X	X	No	No	-	Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers.	Some districts outside of the consortium pay the \$2,000/per PT fee. PT in other districts outside of the consortium pay the fee to the LEA. LEA distributes \$1,400/general education PT to partnering districts.
Stockton USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Temple City USD (Duarte-Temple City Consortium)	C	X		No	No			
Torrance USD	D	X		No	-			
Tracy USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Tri County BTSA Induction	C	X	X	Yes	No		COE is allocating funds to partner districts	Examining district contribution for 2014-2015
Tulare City ESD	C	X	X	No	No	-	Serves all eligible general education and clear education specialist candidates, including temporary teachers	

Program Name	Type	MS /SS	Ed Sp	Fee Structure	Consortium Charge	Known Charge to Teacher	Description	Comments
Tulare COE	C	X		No	No	-	One district (Porterville) within the consortium charging year 1 and year 2 candidates to cover the cost of the support provider stipend.	Tulare COE distributes \$1,100 to all partnering districts.
Tustin USD BTSA	D	X		No	-			Only charging PT when they have not completed within 2 years- \$1,100
Vallejo City USD	D	X		No	-			
Ventura COE	C	X	X	Yes	Yes		\$150/year	
Visalia USD	D	X		No	-		Serves all eligible candidates, including temporary teachers	
Vista USD	D	X	X	No	-			
Walnut Valley USD Consortium	C	X	X	No			All PT will pay \$2500 as LCFF phases in	
Washington USD	D	X		No	-			
West Contra Costa USD	D	X		No	-			
West Covina USD (Foothill Consortium)	C	X	P	Yes	Yes	\$500/yr		
West Orange County : Oceanview SD	C	X		Yes			\$2,650 for private school teachers; \$250 for special ed teachers	
Westside Union ESD	D	X	X	No	-	No		
Wm. S. Hart Union HSD	D	X	X	No	-			
Yolo-Solano Consortium	C	X	X	No	Yes	No	Continued district "in-kind" match for SPs (\$2000)	in discussions with LEA for future.

Induction Programs that are Inactive or have been Withdrawn since Flexible Funding

Program	Status	Notes
Burbank USD	Inactive	District pays Glendale \$3200 per PT to serve candidates for 2013-14. Phase out year.
Chino Valley USD	Inactive	

Induction Programs that are Inactive or have been Withdrawn since Flexible Funding		
Program	Status	Notes
Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint USD	Inactive	Eligible candidates participate through another cluster 3 program (Merced Union High School District). Merced Union High School does not charge the district. Dos Palos pays support provider stipends and all other expenses associated with inducting candidates.
Downey USD	Withdrawn	Teachers sent to IHE or other BTSA programs where they pay
Greenfield Union SD	Inactive	Greenfield provides services to all eligible second year teachers at no cost. First year teachers are served through Kern County Superintendent of Schools at \$1,200.00/PT. Greenfield pays for all associated expenses -- no cost to the teacher.
Keppel UESD	Inactive	Partnering with Westside Union Induction. Keppel pays (\$3,500/yr) for participation of teachers
Lodi USD	Inactive	Member of the Stockton USD program to serve their participating teacher candidates
Norwalk USD	Inactive	
Santa Rosa City Schools	Inactive	Member of the North Coast BTP for their participating teachers

Appendix E

Rationale for TAP's Induction Recommendations

Induction

The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program was established by the Legislature and the Governor as a result of a pilot study conducted during 1988-1992 by the Commission and the California Department of Education (CDE). This pilot study, known as the California New Teacher Project, demonstrated that in order to increase beginning teacher success and effectiveness, state education policies governing teacher preparation, induction and certification needed to be redesigned to form a “learning to teach” system that begins with teacher recruitment, extends to new teacher preparation and moves into the beginning years of professional service in the classroom. The pilot project’s summative report recommended a more effective induction of new teachers that would include:

- gradual introduction to the norms and responsibilities of teaching
- an extension of each teacher’s professional learning as initiated during his/her prior preparation
- advice and assistance from experienced colleagues
- evidence-based information about each teacher’s performance compared to established expectations for what beginning teachers should know and be able to do

In response to these recommendations, and after considerable legislative discussion of the pilot project report, (*Success for Beginning Teachers*, 1992) the Governor and the Legislature established the BTSA Program in the State Budget for 1992-93 to provide an effective transition for all beginning elementary and secondary teachers into the teaching profession. This transition was facilitated by the assignment of a trained support provider to each beginning teacher. The support provider was charged with providing individualized support and assistance to the beginning teacher, guided by the results of the formative assessment of each beginning teacher’s practice as measured by the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. Passage of SB2042 (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998), which created a two-tiered teaching credential system, significantly changed the BTSA program by aligning it as the second tier in California’s teacher preparation and credentialing system and by establishing the completion of a standards based induction program as a path toward the Clear Credential for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials.

Passage of AB 2210 (Chap. 343, Stats. 2004) established completion of a Commission approved Induction program as the required route for SB 2042-prepared Multiple and Single Subject teachers to obtain a Clear Credential, if an approved Induction program is available. If an employer verifies that an Induction program is not available to a beginning teacher, the teacher may complete a Commission-approved Clear Credential Program to earn the Clear Credential. If changes are made to the standards governing Induction programs, it will be important to review the Clear Credential program standards to understand if comparable changes should be made.

In January 2012, Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson announced the formation of the Educator Excellence Task Force. The EETF began meeting in April 2012 and organized its work around five specific work groups: Initial Entry (Recruitment, Selection and Preparation),

Induction to the Profession, Professional Learning, Educator Evaluation, and Leadership and Career Development. The Commission served as a co-sponsor of the EETF and provided staff support for two of the five work groups: Initial Entry and Induction into the Profession. The product of the EETF work, *Greatness by Design* (GbD) was released on September 10, 2012 (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/greatnessfinal.pdf>). The following Induction recommendations and rationales are aligned with or in complement to the *Greatness by Design* report's Induction recommendations.

Rationale for a Transition Plan that moves with the Teacher from the Preliminary to the Induction Program

California *Induction Program Standards* require the providers of induction programs to differentiate the experience for each candidate. The facets of the program necessary to ensure this differentiation include an individual learning plan that is connected to summative performance assessments from preparation thus making for a seamless learning to teach system. Specifically, they require “individualized support and assistance” and “an inquiry-based formative assessment system.” There is a need to further refine and personalize this support. The induction experience should be job embedded and integrated with school and district goals and based upon assessments of teaching practice and student learning, thus ensuring full engagement of, and necessary support for, the candidate.

Recommendation

- The Commission should require a Transition Plan be developed at the end of the Preliminary program and be provided to the Induction Program by the candidate. This Transition Plan should be one basis for the Individual Induction Plan (IIP). The candidate, the employing district designee and the approved clear credential program representative, should develop the IIP. The IIP should incorporate a clear action plan, which incorporates the school and district goals. The candidate will leave induction with a program completion assessment-learning plan to inform his or her next phase of professional learning.

Rationale for Reviewing and Increasing Rigor in the Induction Standards

The skill of the mentor is paramount to provide effective coaching within the structure of the formative assessment system to support the new teacher in delivery of instruction, curriculum planning and problem solving. To be highly effective, rigorous competency standards are needed for mentors and coaches. Mentor teachers should be models of effective professionals who demonstrate clear evidence of teaching expertise, and possess characteristics such as openness to learning new ideas, receptivity to new practices and ability to use assessment data to refine instruction. They also must demonstrate the competencies of effective coaches, such as building on participant assets, asking good questions, practicing active listening and providing critical feedback in a supportive manner. The skilled mentor provides differentiated support through coaching designed to address both long-term and immediate needs of the candidate and promotes professional reflection and growth. Quality mentoring is created and developed through rigorous selection, and systematic assignment.

Skilled mentors should be available to provide in-classroom coaching and demonstration lessons that allow direct evaluation of, and assistance with, the delivery of instruction, as well as advice and counsel for curriculum planning and problem-solving.

The selection process should be rigorous, including steps such as an application, interviews with role-plays and/or scenarios, recommendations from peers and principal and a classroom visit. The role of the mentor teacher should be viewed as teacher leadership.

Providing resources for the many contributing factors needed to support induction will encourage success at sites and districts. This local support ensures the induction experience is normed into the activities of sites and districts. Assignments of new teachers need to be made to maximize success for new teachers and students. If challenging assignments occur, additional resources and support should be allocated. It takes the cooperation and collaboration of many levels within the system to ensure a positive induction experience for new teachers. Induction leaders need “voice” in their local LEA to gain support necessary to engage participating teachers in a successful induction experience. LEAs need to ensure quality of service by including a qualified, leader of induction programs and establishing program expectations for mentoring.

Recommendation

- The Commission should direct that the Induction standards be reviewed and revised to ensure that there: a) are clear and more rigorous expectations for mentors including teaching expertise, careful and rigorous selection, systematic assignment, and high quality ongoing development and support’ and b) is language about leadership, structures and resources necessary to operate an Induction program.

Rationale for Defining Induction as Two Years of Individualized Support and Assistance

California *Induction Program Standards* require the providers of induction programs to differentiate the experience for each candidate. The facets of the program necessary to ensure this differentiation include an individual learning plan that is connected to summative performance assessments from preparation thus making for a seamless learning to teach system. Specifically, they require “individualized support and assistance” and “an inquiry-based formative assessment system.” There is a need to further refine and personalize this support and to provide the program for two years of teaching. The induction experience should be two years of job embedded application and integrated with school and district goals and based upon assessments of teaching practice and student learning, thus ensuring full engagement of, and necessary support for, the candidate.

Recommendation

- The Commission should direct that the induction program standards define Induction as two years of individualized support for participating teachers.

Rationale for Rigorous Completion Criteria

The *Teaching Performance Expectations* (TPEs) and the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP) lay the foundation for rigorous educator preparation and induction expectations. Standards language needs to be clarified for complete and higher expectations to advance the level of practice to clear a credential in California. For determining demonstration of competence based on quality indicators, CDE and CTC should develop guidance for using the Continuum of Teaching Practice (<http://www.btsa.ca.gov/resources-files/Final-Continuum-of->

[Teaching-Practice.pdf](#)) which was developed by the Commission, the California Department of Education and the New Teacher Center.

Recommendation

- The Commission should direct that expectations be made more rigorous so that candidates completing Induction are required to demonstrate comprehensive competence prior to recommendation for the clear credential.

Rationale for the Statewide Induction Infrastructure

Regionally based program leadership and support has been a cornerstone of California BTSA Induction success. Many of the successes of the current BTSA Induction Programs can be attributed to sound legislation, cooperative leadership and co-administration with the CDE and CTC, along with comprehensive implementation strategies at the state, cluster region and local levels. Implementation has been a collaborative effort of state administrators and regional directors who serve approved induction programs in six areas, or clusters, in California. AB 1266 (Mazzoni) created the cluster regions; a structure without political or organizational affiliations so the structure is not influenced by local interests or state political complexities.

Among the activities supported by Cluster Region offices are: a state Academy for supporting new leaders; mentoring and formative assessment training for leaders and professional development providers; guidance for credentialing, program evaluation and accreditation; and needs-based resources and support to each approved LEA. Through cluster collaboration, each LEA receives opportunities to connect and collaborate statewide to support strong program implementation. It is important for CDE and CTC to ensure that state and cluster level offices are staffed at adequate levels with carefully selected leaders, to engage in the administration, leadership and support of implementation efforts. The BTSA induction model of local infrastructure should be both fortified for teacher induction and expanded on to build a comprehensive regional support system for all educator preparation programs.

Recommendation

- The TAP panel recognizes the importance of a strong statewide infrastructure as an indispensable component to an effective teacher induction system in California. The state should renew its commitment to this successful model and take appropriate steps to ensure that it continues into the future. Further, the state should consider the benefits of expanding this highly successful concept of a regional infrastructure system used historically by teacher induction by building a more comprehensive regional system that is cohesive across, and supportive of, all educator preparation programs.