
4F

Action

Professional Services Committee

Update on Induction: State Survey Information and Options to Strengthen and Stabilize Induction in 2014-15 and Beyond

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents findings from a recent statewide survey of induction programs and their participants and presents recommendations to strengthen the induction experience for new teachers.

Policy Question: How should the induction program standards and regulations be streamlined and strengthened to ensure the integrity of the General Education Clear teaching credential?

Recommended Action: That the Commission adopt staff recommendations and direct the Executive Director to convene a small panel of induction experts and teachers to advise staff on draft revisions to program standards and regulations for consideration at a future Commission meeting.

Presenters: Karen Sacramento and Katie Croy, Consultants and Teri Clark, Director, 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.

August 2014

Update on Induction: State Survey Information and Options to Strengthen and Stabilize Induction in 2014-15 and Beyond

Introduction

This agenda item presents findings from a recent statewide survey of induction programs and their participants and presents recommendations to strengthen the induction experience for new teachers.

Background

Nearly 30 years ago, a small innovative program called the “California New Teacher Project” provided mentoring and support to first and second-year teachers in a structured “induction” to teaching. The success of the California New Teacher Project led to the establishment of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) system, a state-funded induction program authorized by Senate Bill 1422 (Bergeson) in 1992. The vision for this grant program was to enable school districts to provide support for all first and second-year teachers that included guidance through formative assessment. The goal of the BTSA program was to improve teacher performance, improve teaching of students from diverse backgrounds, increase new teacher satisfaction, and improve retention rates of new teachers. The success of BTSA in reducing the number of teachers who leave the profession within the first five years of teaching and in strengthening the skills of new teachers eventually led to the expansion of this two-year program to include all beginning teachers. In 1998, SB 2042 (Alpert) established induction as a credential requirement for the clear teaching credential. The BTSA grant program provided \$3,000 for each enrolled beginning teacher and required an in-kind match by the employing school district of \$2,000 for a total of \$5,000 per participant per year.

In 2008-09, the Legislature consolidated most categorical programs, including BTSA into general purpose funding that removed the funding requirements for the programs and allowed local educational agencies (LEAs) greater flexibility to use funds to meet local needs. Beginning with the 2013-14 fiscal year, the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) replaced the previous K-12 school finance system. LCFF creates base, supplemental, and concentration grants in place of previous K-12 funding streams, including most state categorical programs. Within LCFF, each district was required to develop a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) and submit the plan by June 30, 2014.

The transition from a state-funded grant program to a locally-funded program has raised a number of operational issues for participants and their employers and has also raised questions about how, in this new context, the Commission can continue to ensure that preliminary credential holders have a meaningful and qualitative induction experience leading to a clear credential. Over the past year, the Commission has considered this matter on three separate occasions:

- A study session focusing on Induction programs was held in September 2013 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-09/2013-09-2H.pdf>).
- At the February 2014 Commission meeting information was presented on options for beginning teachers if the employer is not sponsoring or collaborating with a Commission-approved Induction program (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-02/2014-02-6G.pdf>).¹
- Following the February 2014 Commission meeting, staff facilitated a stakeholder meeting in March 2014. A further induction-focused agenda item presented in April 2014 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-04/2014-04-4C.pdf>) provided a number of possible actions the Commission could consider to stabilize and strengthen Induction to ensure the integrity of preparation for the clear credential.

The policy issues that have developed in conjunction with school finance changes provides the Commission with an opportunity to examine how it can stabilize and strengthen induction programs.

- Although the Commission integrated local education agencies that sponsor induction programs into its accountability system, it essentially continued to rely on the grant process to leverage compliance with requirements and best practices that were outside the Induction Standards, including relying on BTSA-funded cluster region staff to assist in the review of Commission-approved induction programs. This means that a number of issues are not addressed in the Commission's standards, such as the length of the program, and numerous decisions are left to the local program leading unevenness across the state.
- As programs transitioned from the certainty of a categorical funding model to locally-controlled funding, LEAs have made fiscal decisions about the allocation of resources to induction programs, and the quality gap between approved programs has become more apparent. This raises concerns about how the Commission can better ensure that candidates receive adequate mentoring, support, and assistance throughout the induction experience.
- Finally, as the leadership infrastructure that was present in the former BTSA categorical program dissolves and those regional leaders are no longer available to provide technical assistance and conduct accreditation site visits, the Commission needs to find new ways to provide technical assistance to induction programs and re-think the accountability process for induction programs.

To inform the Commission's discussion about ensuring strong induction programs across the state, this agenda presents findings from the 2013-14 BTSA Induction state survey and provides a summary of a recent meeting with stakeholders concerning induction.

¹ A document (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/files/options-genl-ed-clear.pdf>) for individuals earning a Preliminary General Education teaching credential was finalized, posted on the Commission's web page and sent to all Preliminary Preparation programs with a request to share the document with all program completers. Staff has developed a process where every individual recommended for a Preliminary Multiple or Single subject teaching credential receives the document through an email from the Commission.

Part I: 2013-14 BTSA Induction State Survey Findings

The Commission has administered the BTSA Induction Consent Form and State Survey since 2001-02. The Consent Form was initially developed when BTSA was a categorical program to identify the teachers participating in BTSA programs. During this time the Commission provided the total participant number in each of the Commission-approved BTSA Induction programs to the California Department of Education (CDE). The CDE would then allocate funds to local educational agencies (LEA) sponsoring the programs based on the number of participating teachers. At that time, the Commission and the Department shared responsibility for statewide administration of BTSA, with the CDE distributing the funding. The Consent Form process also provided verification that each participant held a Preliminary teaching credential and was not concurrently enrolled in another Induction program or an intern program. During the time that BTSA was a categorical program, no institutions of higher education (IHE) sponsored induction programs. Since 2008 five IHEs have been approved to offer General Education Teacher Induction programs. These institutions charge candidates a tuition fee to participate. The IHE candidates have not been included in the Consent Form or State Survey processes. Starting in 2014-15, the state survey process will include all clear credential candidates, including those in IHE-based induction programs.

For over a decade, the Commission has gathered a significant amount of data based through the BTSA Induction State Survey. The survey has been conducted annually in the spring (March-May) and each program receives a detailed report before the end of June. The program reports provide local program-specific information (as long as a minimum of 10 responses per program were received) as well as the statewide report. The programs analyze their state survey data and report on their analysis in the Biennial Report.

Presented below and in Appendix A is a portion of the 2013-14 BTSA Induction State Survey data. This is the last year that the BTSA Induction State Survey will be administered. More information about this process is provided later in this agenda item.

Table 1 provides the response rates for the 2013-14 BTSA Induction State Survey. The total number of participating teachers and support providers is known from the 2013-14 BTSA Consent Form. Statewide, 83.4% of Participating Teachers (PTs) and 85.5% of Support Providers (SPs) completed the state survey. This represents a very strong response rate.

Table 1: 2013-14 BTSA Induction Responses			
	Total	Completed Survey	Response Rate
Participating Teachers (PT)	18,591	15,491	83.4 %
Support Providers (SP)	8,853	7,564	85.5 %
Site Administrators (SA)	unknown	2,939	NA

Table 2 provides information on how many SPs and Site Administrators (SAs) were once themselves participants in a BTSA program. When the Commission began administering the BTSA State Survey in 2001-02, less than 4% of SPs reported that they had participated in a BTSA

program. Now over 44% of SPs and over 28% of SAs report that as new teachers, they participated in a BTSA program.

	Yes	No	No response
Support Provider (SP)	3,357 (44.4%)	4,207 (55.6%)	3 (0.0%)
Site Administrator (SA)	832 (28.4%)	2100 (71.6%)	9 (0.3%)

Tables 3a and 3b provide information on the frequency and length of the PTs and SP work together. Table 3a shows the frequency of meetings both *in person* and *other than in person*. About 70% of PTs report working with their SP at least weekly, *in person* and *other than in person*. Table 3b provides information on the length of the *in person* meetings. Over 75% of PTs and SPs report that they meet together for 31-90 minutes.

Meetings with PTs and SPs

Response Options	... <u>in person</u>				... <u>other than in person</u>			
	PT (15,491)		SP (7,564)		PT (15,491)		SP (7,564)	
Daily	692	4.5%	564	7.5%	905	5.8%	616	8.1%
2-3 times per week	1843	11.9%	1262	16.7%	3807	24.6%	2344	31.0%
Weekly	8517	55.0%	4245	56.1%	6419	41.5%	3076	40.7%
Twice per month	2915	18.8%	1212	16.0%	2628	17.0%	964	12.8%
Once per month	1108	7.2%	228	3.0%	983	6.4%	267	3.5%
Less than once per month	347	2.2%	47	0.6%	672	4.3%	209	2.8%
I never met with my SP/PT	66	0.4%	8	0.1%	66	0.4%	84	1.1%

Length of Meetings

	PT (15,491)		SP (7,564)	
I never met with my SP/PT	69	0.4%	8	0.1%
30 minutes or fewer	1,891	12.2%	798	10.5%
31-60 minutes	8,824	57.0%	3,942	52.1%
61-90 minutes	3,864	25.0%	2,278	30.1%
More than 90 minutes	834	5.4%	541	7.1%

Table 4 reports how frequently the SP observed the PT teaching—from both the PTs and SPs. A very small group of PTs (0.7%) and SPs (0.3%) report that the SP never observed the PT teaching. A larger percentage of PTs (34%) and SPs (33.9%) report that the SP observed the PT teaching only once or twice over the year. Just under 30% of PTs and SPs report that the SP

observed the PTs three times over the year. Over 37% of PTs and 36% of SPs report that observations in the new teacher’s classroom took place more than 3 times over the year.

Observations in New Teacher’s Classroom

Table 4: On average, how frequently did your Support Provider observe you in your classroom this year?				
	PT (15,491)		SP (7,564)	
I was not observed/Never	105	0.7%	24	0.3%
Once	577	3.7%	183	2.4%
Twice	4740	30.6%	2380	31.5%
Three times	4253	27.5%	2223	29.4%
More than three times	5808	37.5%	2754	36.4%

Table 5 provides information from both PTs and SPs on the perceived adequacy of the time spent working together in Induction. The information in this table is color coded—green shading indicates an appropriate or positive response, yellow shading indicates responses that are somewhat concerning, and red shading indicates negative responses or responses that raise significant concerns. When appropriate, both the PT and SP are asked the same question so that the program can view the issue from points of view. As far as the adequacy of time to complete the Induction program, over 91% of PTs and 88% of SPs report that they had “Adequate” or “More than adequate” time together to meet the PT’s needs and complete the Induction program requirements.

Adequacy of Time with PT/SP

Table 5: In terms of meeting your overall needs and completing program requirements, how adequate was the time you spent with your Support Provider/Participating Teacher?				
	PT		SP	
Not adequate	232	1.5%	75	1.0%
Somewhat adequate	1005	6.5%	767	10.2%
Adequate	5830	37.7%	4864	64.5%
More than adequate	8405	54.3%	1831	24.3%

The connection between and work of the SP and the PT is usually reported as the one of the most valuable parts of BTSA Induction. Table 6 provides feedback from PTs as to how the PT felt about the match to the SP. About 92% of PTs report being “Moderately well matched” or “Well matched.” In previous years, PTs were asked about the grade level and content match, but feedback showed that a grade level/content match did not always indicate the PT felt the SP was well matched.

Participating Teachers’ View of How Well Matched with Support Provider

Table 6: How well matched were you with your Support Provider?		
Not well matched	299	1.9%
Somewhat well matched	912	5.9%
Moderately well matched	1,864	12.0%
Well matched	12,396	80.1%

Table 7 provides details of how the PT views the impact of a variety of SP and Induction program activities. Over half of all responses show at least a moderate to strong impact of induction activities.

Impact of Support Activities

Table 7: Participating Teacher (15,491) views on impact of the following activities and the support provided	Impact				NA*
	None	Some	Moderate	Strong	
a. Coaching and feedback from my SP based on observations of my teaching and analysis of student work.	2.6%	17.0%	29.9%	50.5%	0.3%
b. Collecting and analyzing evidence of my teaching practice and comparing my teaching practice against criteria (e.g. "Continuum of Teaching Practice")	5.3%	25.9%	34.5%	34.3%	0.3%
c. Developing my Individual Induction Plan/Individual Learning Plan (IIP/ILP) with my SP.	5.5%	25.9%	32.4%	36.2%	0.8%
d. Designing and engaging in professional development as identified on my IIP/ILP.	4.6%	26.0%	34.3%	35.1%	1.3%
e. Observing experienced teachers at my school or district(s).	3.3%	20.9%	27.9%	47.9%	15.7%
f. ... to develop my repertoire of teaching strategies from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	2.3%	21.7%	32.4%	43.5%	0.9%
g. ... for developing my repertoire of assessment strategies from my ... Provider and/or professional development opportunities.	3.9%	26.1%	34.0%	36.0%	1.3%
h. ... for using results from assessment data to design instruction from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	4.2%	27.1%	33.9%	34.8%	1.3%
i. ... for managing my classroom and fostering a safe environment that promotes student well-being from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	5.0%	22.8%	30.7%	41.5%	1.5%
j. ... for minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	8.2%	30.1%	31.6%	30.1%	4.0%
k. ... in assessing student needs and differentiating instruction (including analysis of student work) from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	3.3%	23.6%	32.6%	40.5%	0.7%
l. ... for teaching to content standards from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	6.3%	27.0%	32.3%	34.4%	1.7%
m. ... for teaching English Language Learners from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	6.8%	30.2%	31.2%	31.8%	4.7%

Table 7: Participating Teacher (15,491) views on impact of the following activities and the support provided	Impact				NA*
	None	Some	Moderate	Strong	
n. ... for teaching students with special needs from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	6.5%	31.1%	30.6%	31.8%	4.8%
o. ... to develop my ability to collaborate with families of my students, including communicating learning goals and progress.	8.9%	32.4%	30.9%	27.8%	3.6%
p. ... in using technology as a teaching tool from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	10.4%	29.8%	29.3%	30.5%	4.0%
q. ... in using technology as a learning tool from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	10.5%	30.7%	28.8%	30.0%	4.2%
r. ... in collaborating productively with colleagues and resource personnel, and navigating the protocols, policies and culture of my school and district from my SP and/or professional development opportunities.	5.4%	26.5%	30.6%	37.4%	2.1%
s. ... in prioritizing the professional workload.	13.2%	29.0%	28.9%	29.0%	4.1%

* Did not participate in this activity

Table 8 reports the SP and Site Administrator's (SA's) views on the observable growth of the BTSA Induction participating teacher. For each of the fifteen areas surveyed, a minimum of 80% and up to 97% of the SPs and SAs report 'Some' to 'Significant' growth of the participating teachers.

Growth of New Teachers

Table 8: Support Providers (7,564) and Site Administrators (2,939) Report on Observable Growth of Participating Teachers	Who	Observable Growth				I do not know
		None	Little	Some	Significant	
a. Developing a repertoire of teaching strategies	SP	0.3%	2.6%	44.3%	52.8%	0.6%
	SA	0.8%	3.2%	52.6%	43.4%	5.6%
b. Developing a repertoire of assessment strategies	SP	0.7%	5.3%	54.7%	39.3%	1.4%
	SA	1.1%	5.9%	60.8%	32.1%	6.9%
c. Using assessment data to design instruction	SP	1.0%	6.7%	48.7%	43.6%	1.8%
	SA	1.9%	7.5%	58.8%	31.8%	7.6%
d. Ensuring access to the curriculum for all students	SP	0.6%	3.9%	43.8%	51.8%	1.2%
	SA	1.2%	4.4%	52.8%	41.7%	6.3%
e. Managing the classroom and fostering a safe environment that promotes student well-being	SP	0.9%	3.9%	37.8%	57.4%	0.6%
	SA	1.4%	4.7%	44.7%	49.1%	5.3%
f. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy	SP	1.6%	8.2%	50.5%	39.7%	7.4%
	SA	2.7%	7.9%	54.1%	35.4%	13.9%
g. Assessing student needs and differentiating instruction	SP	0.5%	4.5%	43.3%	51.6%	0.9%
	SA	1.7%	8.0%	54.0%	36.4%	5.8%
h. Teaching to content standards	SP	1.1%	4.0%	42.3%	52.6%	2.0%
	SA	1.1%	3.4%	48.0%	47.5%	5.9%

Table 8: Support Providers (7,564) and Site Administrators (2,939) Report on Observable Growth of Participating Teachers	Who	Observable Growth				I do not know
		None	Little	Some	Significant	
i. Teaching English Language Learners	SP	1.9%	8.0%	52.1%	38.0%	5.9%
	SA	2.9%	9.5%	58.4%	29.2%	12.2%
j. Teaching students with special needs	SP	1.6%	8.1%	50.2%	40.1%	6.1%
	SA	2.9%	9.7%	55.7%	31.7%	10.7%
k. Collaborating with families, including communicating learning goals and progress	SP	2.5%	10.7%	48.1%	38.7%	8.9%
	SA	2.3%	8.4%	53.1%	36.3%	9.2%
l. Using technology as a teaching tool	SP	2.3%	8.7%	39.7%	49.3%	3.4%
	SA	1.9%	9.0%	48.5%	40.6%	7.7%
m. Using technology as a learning tool	SP	2.9%	10.1%	42.5%	44.5%	4.8%
	SA	2.6%	11.0%	49.9%	36.4%	9.1%
n. Collaborating productively with colleagues and resource personnel at their site or district(s)	SP	1.5%	5.8%	38.2%	54.6%	3.7%
	SA	1.4%	4.2%	39.8%	54.7%	6.1%
o. Prioritizing the professional workload	SP	2.2%	8.6%	49.6%	39.6%	4.4%
	SA	1.6%	6.8%	57.6%	34.0%	10.6%

Next Steps for Induction Completer Surveys

Since BTSA Induction is no longer a categorical program with per-participant funding, the Commission will not be administering a Consent Form beginning with the 2014-15 year. Beginning in 2014-15, instead of administering the BTSA Induction State Survey, the Commission will implement a **Clear Credential Completer Survey**. The Clear Credential Completer Survey will be provided to all individuals who complete a General Education or Special Education Induction program—sponsored by an LEA or an IHE—as well as those individuals who complete a General Education Clear Credential Program.

The Commission will provide feedback to each program. The program will receive a program specific report that includes the state data for comparison purposes. If a program has fewer than 10 responders on any of the demographic questions (e.g., gender and ethnicity) the program will not receive demographic information in its report due to the need to preserve the responders' anonymity. It is expected that the Clear Credential Completer survey will be analyzed as part of the Commission's accreditation activities.

Part II: Options to Strengthen and Stabilize Induction in 2014-15 and Beyond

Pursuant to Commission direction at the April 2014 meeting, additional discussion has taken place with stakeholders regarding Induction. The California Teachers Association (CTA) sponsored two Induction focused meetings following the April 2014 Commission meeting. The first meeting was in late May 2014 with the second meeting in the middle of July 2014. Individuals from a variety of stakeholder groups and constituencies attended the meetings including:

- California Teachers Association (CTA)
- California Federation of Teachers (CFT)
- Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)

- California School Boards Association (CSBA)
- California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
- New Teacher Center (NTC)
- Public Advocates (PA)

Additional individuals with expertise in new teacher induction also attended the meetings: Julia Koppich, co-author of *California Beginning Teachers: Bumpy Path to a Profession*; Barbara Howard, Director, Riverside County Induction program; and LaRie Colosimo, BTSA Induction Cluster Region Director.

The group participated in two full days of rich conversation and came to consensus on a number of topics. Each of these topics, followed by a staff analysis and a recommendation for selected topics, is discussed below.

1) Purposes of New Teacher Induction

The Stakeholder group concluded that the two linked purposes of support and assessment are foundational both now and for the future of new teacher induction in California.

1) Support for new teachers. Support will assist new teachers as they transition from preliminary preparation to beginning practitioner. When teachers receive adequate support, teacher retention is raised.

2) Assessment and Guidance so that teachers improve their practice. The new teacher needs to work with the support provider/coach/mentor in the new teacher's classroom focusing on instructional practices.

The group agreed that each new teacher's induction experience should include both of the purposes identified above. Stakeholders feel very strongly that induction must be individualized and address the needs of the new teacher in his or her teaching assignment. Stakeholders report new teachers often need significant mentoring and support early in the first year of teaching but not all new teachers may need the same amount. For many teachers the most significant observable growth takes place in the teacher's second year of induction. If a new teacher completes induction in a one year program, the support and assessment/guidance would all take place within the one year.

Staff Analysis: Having a common understanding of the purposes of induction for new teachers is foundational to the development of revised program standards. The purposes the stakeholder group agreed to are supported by research on new teacher induction and the purposes reflect the experience that new teachers and employers report as being most helpful during an induction program.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission affirm the purposes of Induction as mentoring, support and demonstration of competence, to facilitate the development of revised program standards.

2) **Essential Design Features of New Teacher Induction**

The Stakeholder groups' consensus regarding the essential design features of new teacher induction included that:

- Each participating teacher must be assigned a specific support provider/coach/mentor.
- Induction should be defined as a minimum of one school year in length.
- The new teacher and assigned support provider/coach/mentor must meet on a weekly basis—in person or through technology.
- The new teacher's growth must be guided by a system of support, which includes the assigned support provider, which focuses on the new teacher's needs.
- A key focus of Induction must be on supporting the new teacher. Support and guidance must include:
 - Just-in-time practical support;
 - Guidance in understanding the importance of the local context—including the expectations and challenges of the specific school, district and community;
 - Instructional coaching that includes demonstrating teaching strategies, observing and providing feedback to the new teacher, focusing on lesson planning, designing assessments, delivering instruction, and analyzing student work;
 - Guiding the participating teacher in reflecting on practice framed by criteria, within a trusting, confidential environment;
 - Planning for professional growth, being a part of a professional community, and building leadership skills;
- Support Providers must be carefully selected, oriented, trained, and supported throughout the induction program. The support provider is key to the new teacher's growth as an educator so it is imperative that support providers are well prepared for the role.

Staff Analysis: Agreement about the essential features of new teacher induction is also foundational to revising the program standards and resetting the expectations for new teacher induction in California. In general, the design features the stakeholders have identified are soundly based in research. In addition, the *Greatness by Design (GBD)* report, p. 41, provides the following elements:

- Regular coaching within the educator's context by a carefully selected and trained mentor
- Personalized learning that is integrated with school and district goals
- Competency indicators required for program completion that support a recommendation for the clear teaching credential.

Staff suggests that the stakeholder identified features of high quality induction and the GBD report are good places to begin for the revised Induction Standards. For example, pages 43-46 of the GBD report outline standards for programs that are compatible with the stakeholder ideas but expand the areas pertaining to the training of mentors, the nature of the mentoring experience, and the way competency should be gauged. The

responsibility of the mentor in conducting observations of the new teacher is an essential aspect of induction.

Classroom observation is a critical tool for mentor teachers to observe the practice of beginning educators and for those new teachers to observe the classroom of the mentor or other effective veteran peers. A sustained cycle of repeated observations, feedback and discussion is a necessary induction component if the intent is to advance beginning teacher development. To observe intentionally and effectively, mentors should receive foundational training in data collection, analysis, and interpretation skills and obtain experience with classroom observation and formative assessment protocols that become the foundation of coaching. <http://www.newteachercenter.org/sites/default/files/ntc/main/resources/brf-ntc-policy-state-teacher-induction.pdf>

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission affirm the induction program design features identified by stakeholders and the *Greatness by Design* report, or amend and then affirm these design features, to guide revisions to the induction program standards.

3) Standards for Induction and Clear Credential Programs

Alignment for General Education Teachers

The Stakeholder group recommended that the Commission align the program standards for general education teacher Induction Programs and the alternative option Clear Credential Programs (used by candidates when induction is certified as not being available to a new teacher). The group discussed the need to focus on the qualifications of the individual providing support to the new teacher—the support provider, coach, and/or mentor. The group recommended the standards be rigorous and clear on the criteria for the support provider; the type, duration, and frequency of training that should be provided to all support providers. There are some aspects of the Clear Credential program standards, such as the expectation that the program focus on a system of support for the new teacher, that the group believes should also be in the Induction program standards.

Standards Alignment across the Types of Induction Programs

The Commission requires that General Education teachers, Special Education teachers and administrators complete an induction program in order to earn the Clear Credential. The group recommended that the requirements for these three types of Induction programs should be aligned, and that all sets of induction-related standards address:

- The time when a candidate must enroll in a program once employed as an educator
- The time the candidate must begin working with the support provider once enrolled in a program
- The provision of an Initial Individualized Plan developed with the participant, employer and Commission-approved Induction program
- The criteria for the selection of and training requirements for the support provider

Staff Analysis: The stakeholders have identified areas where new teacher induction would be strengthened by modifying the program standards. Standards play a role in identifying the essential program design elements that will ensure that all participating teachers receive the support and mentoring they need to develop their competence. The General Education Clear Credential program standards as well as the Induction program standards for special education teachers and administrators need to be examined to assess shared aims.

Since the Induction and Clear Credential programs are alternate routes to the same credential, both routes need equivalent expectations, including criteria for mentor selection, orientation, training, and support as well as when the SP-PT work begins and the frequency and focus of the SP-PT work. It is important that all second tier credential programs, those provided by employers and those sponsored by universities, are of high quality and provide the support and guidance that new teachers need.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that revised induction standards for General Education teachers be aligned, conceptually, with induction standards for other credentials, and that the Induction and Clear Credential standards be made equivalent.

4) *Eligibility for Participation in Induction*

The Stakeholder group addressed issues of concern around program inequity and unevenness across the state. Following are the main areas of concern that were raised by the group:

- 1) The inequity that some new teachers are required to pay for LEA-based Induction while others are not and the issue of unregulated program cost for teachers.
- 2) The fact that in some districts, new teachers are not eligible to enroll in the local Commission-approved Induction program. The group discussed the inequity that in some districts, candidates believe that they are restricted to enrolling only in the employer's induction program, and in other districts some candidates are told they may not participate in the district's induction program in the current year but must wait, or that they may not enroll at all in the district's induction program. The group felt that these district-level policies unnecessarily and/or unfairly restrict access to induction for qualified beginning new teachers who are employed in a teaching position by the districts. The group recommends that:
 - Anyone holding a Preliminary teaching credential who is employed as a teacher should be eligible to enroll in an induction program. The employment status of the new teacher as a probationary or temporary teacher should not determine eligibility for induction. This is equally important for the K-12 students who are taught by a Preliminary credential holder who is on a temporary contract rather than a probationary contract. The stakeholders do not include day-to-day substitute teachers in the group of individuals teaching on a Preliminary teaching credential. A day-to-day substitute most likely does not have sufficient

responsibility for planning lessons and assessing students to allow the individual to engage in professional conversations that take place in induction.

- An individual who holds a Preliminary teaching credential but is not employed as a teacher should not be eligible to enroll in an induction program. The group agreed that this should only apply to initial enrollment in an Induction program. If a new teacher has been enrolled in an Induction program and then is no longer employed as a teacher, it is up to the individual and the specific Commission-approved program to determine how the individual can complete Induction.

Staff Analysis: The stakeholders have identified two key issues: 1) any individual teaching on a Preliminary teaching credential is eligible for Induction— independent of the individual’s status as a district employee and 2) an individual holding a Preliminary credential who is not teaching should not be eligible to complete induction or earn a Clear Teaching credential.

The Commission does not differentiate among individuals holding a Preliminary teaching credential based on contract status—temporary or probationary—regarding eligibility for Induction. The Commission could develop guidance for employers, induction programs, and Preliminary Credential holders stating that the type of employment contract the teacher has does not impact the eligibility of the individual to enroll in and complete a Commission-approved Induction program. The Commission can also clarify its expectation that induction begin during the first year of service on a preliminary credential.

Currently the Induction Standards and Preconditions allow an individual who is not employed as a teacher to enroll in and complete a Commission-approved Induction program to earn the Clear Teaching credential. The standards require that the individual have sufficient experiences with students to complete the requirements of the Induction program. If the individual does not have the day to day responsibility for planning, instructing, and assessing students, the local program will need to decide if and how it can serve them and ensure that they have sufficient, deep experiences with planning, teaching, and assessing students to complete Induction and meet the expectations for a Clear Credential.

Recommendations

Provide guidance to the field that all individuals holding a Preliminary teaching credential who are employed as teachers, including probationary and temporary teachers, are eligible to enroll in an Induction program and are expected to do so if they hold a teaching position.

5) *Completion of an Induction Program*

A rich discussion took place among the stakeholders around the topic of how to determine when a teacher has “completed” the Induction program. When there was state funding, the normative length of Induction was two years and two years was one

component of completing the program. The Commission's standards do not define the length of an induction program. The Greatness by Design (GBD) report (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/greatnessfinal.pdf>) states that, "...(S)upport providers should design a personalized learning plan that guides mentoring and other learning opportunities over the first two years of practice ."

The group was able to come to agreement on a number of issues related to program completion, and made the following recommendations:

- The teacher needs to authentically engage with the Induction process, meaning that the teacher must meet with the support provider and receive in-classroom coaching and other support focusing on instructional practices, reflecting on what worked and what did not, and planning his or her professional growth.
- Completion requirements of an induction program should include demonstrated competency on the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP-<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/CSTP-2009.pdf>) as measured by the Continuum of Teaching Practice (CTP-<http://www.btsa.ca.gov/resources-files/Final-Continuum-of-Teaching-Practice.pdf>) or another descriptive rubric that addresses the CSTP.
- Each Commission-approved Induction program must define program completion in alignment with the Commission's adopted program standards and also must define the process through which the program will determine if each candidate has successfully completed the program.

The group feels that some of the language in the recently adopted *Administrative Services Credential Clear Induction Program Standards* focusing on program completion could be adapted for teacher induction. For example, for new teacher induction the standards would focus on developing teacher competency based on the CSTP rather than the CPSELs (referenced below as "Standard 5 of the Administrative Induction Program standards". The relevant language is:

Prior to recommending each candidate for a Clear Administrative Services Credential, the program determines that each candidate has reached a level of competence meriting possession of a Clear Administrative Services Credential. This determination is based on a review of observed and documented evidence, collaboratively assembled by coach and candidate. This **summative** review includes a defensible process, an appeal process, and a procedure for candidates to repeat portions of the program as needed. The induction program sponsor and the coach verify that the candidate has met competency expectations for performance as outlined in Standard 5 of the Administrative Induction Program standards.

Staff Analysis: Defining completion of an Induction Program is essential to developing revised program standards. When BTSA induction was funded categorically, each new teacher was funded for two years, and the program has grown over the last twenty years

around that normative expectation. The GBD report recommended that new teachers should be guided and mentored over the first two years of practice (p. 48) as well. However, two years can be considered an arbitrary time parameter if it is not driven by the individual needs of the particular participating teacher. The approach taken in the Administrator Induction Standards calls for the completion of a program, and also establishes the determination of competence against standards for performance as the primary method of determining when an individual is ready to be granted a clear credential. This approach for teachers seems both reasonable and timely. To accomplish the goals of strong induction, teachers should receive at least one year of high quality mentoring and support. Borrowing from the Administrator Induction standards would move new teacher induction away from an exclusive focus on completion of “seat time” toward a more critical focus on mentoring, support, and competency guided by and judged against the CSTP.

This approach aligns with the GBD recommendations, and with current statute [Education Code §44468(e)(3)], which provides for an Early Completion Option, which allows an individual to complete induction in a shorter period of time based on demonstration of their knowledge and skills in relation to the CSTP.

Recommendation

Consistent with research findings about the positive impact of at least one year of induction for teachers, staff recommends that induction programs be defined as at least one year in length, with a focus on mentoring, support and development and demonstration of competence. A second year of induction should be available to support teachers in meeting expectations and addressing local priorities. Requirements for the Clear Credential would then include completion of an accredited program that includes these features. Staff further recommends that the language in the adopted administrator induction standards regarding program completion be adapted and incorporated into induction standards for teachers. This language clarifies how induction offers the opportunity for mentoring, support and demonstration of competency to earn the Clear Credential.

6) Clarifying Expectations for New Teachers and their Employers

The stakeholders discussed that the responsibility to enroll in and complete an induction program should be viewed as a shared and mutual responsibility of both the credential holder and the employer. The stakeholder group recommends that individuals holding a Preliminary Teaching credential be expected to enroll in an Induction or Clear Credential program within a limited amount of time, for example, 30 days from beginning work as a teacher. The group further recommends that employers be expected to ensure that the Preliminary Credential holder has access to and enrolls in Commission accredited Induction or Clear Credential Program within a specified period of time from gaining employment as a teacher.

Current Title 5 regulations state that the employer must verify if Induction is not available, allowing the Preliminary Credential holder to find and enroll in a different program. When this regulation was put in place, each new teacher in California's public schools generated state funding when the teachers enrolled in a local education agency-sponsored induction program and no induction program was charging teachers to participate in induction to earn a clear credential. As mandated funding has shifted to local control, the current Title 5 regulations no longer align well with the ways in which programs may be operating locally.

The group agreed that passing on the cost of LEA-based induction to the new teacher was an unintended consequence of LCFF. The group believes that Induction is "available" to the participating teacher when it is available at no cost to them (other than a nominal registration fee up to \$250). The stakeholders were in agreement that if there is a charge to the new teacher to participate in Induction, the teacher should have the ability to select which Commission-approved induction program to enroll in and complete.

Staff Analysis: Current Title 5 regulations define the employer as the entity to make the determination of availability of induction but do not require when this determination should take place. This is an artifact of a different context, in which induction was fully funded as a categorical program. What is essential is that new teachers have access and support to participate in high quality induction during their first year of teaching. Employers are not required to offer these programs, but when they hire new teachers, they need to ensure that their new teachers have access to an accredited induction program. Current Title 5 regulations should be updated to align with this new context.

Recommendations

Staff recommends that Title 5 regulations and standards be amended to state it is an expectation of the Preliminary Credential holder to enroll in a Commission-approved Induction Program within a specified time after gaining employment as a teacher and an expectation of employers who choose to hire Preliminary credentialed teachers to ensure that they have access to an accredited induction program beginning in their first year of teaching.

Summary of Staff Recommendations

1. Affirm the purposes of Induction as mentoring, support and demonstration of competence, to facilitate the development of revised program standards.
2. Affirm the induction program design features identified by stakeholders and the *Greatness by Design* report, or amend and then affirm the design features, to guide the development of revised program standards.
3. Revise standards for General Education teachers so that they align conceptually with induction standards for special education teachers and administrators, and so that the Induction Standards and the Clear Credential standards are equivalent.

4. Provide guidance to the field that all individuals holding a Preliminary teaching credential who are employed as teachers, including probationary and temporary teachers, are eligible to enroll in an Induction program and are expected to do so if they hold a teaching position.
5. Consistent with research findings about the positive impact of at least one year of induction for teachers, staff recommends that induction programs be defined as at least one year in length, with a focus on mentoring, support and development and demonstration of competence. A second year of induction should be available to support teachers in meeting expectations and addressing local priorities. Requirements for the Clear Credential would then include completion of an accredited program that includes these features. Staff further recommends that the language in the adopted administrator induction standards regarding program completion be adapted and incorporated into induction standards for teachers. This language clarifies how induction offers the opportunity for mentoring, support and demonstration of competency to earn the Clear Credential.
6. Amend Title 5 regulations and standards to state it is an expectation of the Preliminary Credential holder to enroll in a Commission-approved Induction Program within a specified time after gaining employment as a teacher and an expectation of employers who choose to hire Preliminary credentialed teachers to ensure that they have access to an accredited induction program beginning in their first year of teaching within this same time frame.
7. Direct the Executive Director to convene a small panel of induction experts and teachers to advise staff on draft revisions to program standards and regulations for consideration at a future Commission meeting.

Next Steps

Based upon the discussion at the meeting and action(s) taken by the Commission, staff will move forward as directed by the Commission.