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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Executive Summary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This item presents three Professional Teacher Induction Programs recommended for approval by the appropriate review panel, according to procedures adopted by the Commission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fiscal Impact Summary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Professional Services Division is responsible for reviewing proposed induction programs, consulting as needed with external reviewers, and communicating with program sponsors about their program proposals. The Commission budget supports the costs of these activities and no budget augmentation is needed to continue program review and approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy Issues to be Addressed</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should the Commission approve the Professional Teacher Induction Programs recommended for approval by staff?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Commission approve the three Professional Teacher Induction Programs presented in this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Passage of SB 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) resulted in significant reforms in California’s teacher preparation and credentialing system designed to improve the preparation of K-12 teacher candidates. One of the most notable changes was the creation of a two-tiered teaching credential that established the completion of a standards-based induction program as a requirement for the Professional Clear Credential for the Multiple and Single Subject credentials.

This item presents a description of the process currently underway to review program submissions for initial approval of professional teacher induction programs. It also includes the first three induction programs deemed to have met all of the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs by the appropriate review panel, which are recommended to the Commission for approval.

Adoption of Standards

In September of 1998, the Commission launched an extensive standards and assessment development effort that led to the development of four sets of draft standards:

- Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirements for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential;
- Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs;
- Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation; and
- Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs.

In March 2002, the Commission adopted the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Program. These standards established the expectations of the Commission, the State Board of Education, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction for BTSA-type induction programs and alternative induction programs sponsored by a college or university.

Process for Initial Approval

Consistent with protocols adopted by the Commission, teacher induction programs responding to the new standards under SB 2042 were asked to select from one of six submission windows beginning September 1, 2002. The chart below summarizes the six submission windows, the
numbers of program documents submitted in September 2002 and November 2002, and the number of anticipated submissions for the four remaining windows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Number Received</th>
<th>Number Anticipated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 2002</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2002</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review Process for Program Submissions**

Because the Commission and CDE have joint administration of the BTSA program, the two agencies worked collaboratively to establish a single review process for all programs submitting documentation for initial approval as a professional program of teacher induction under SB 2042.

**Selection Process for Reviewers**

Requests for appointments to participate as a SB 2042 document reviewer were issued to all local education agencies, colleges and universities as well as through BTSA regional cluster consultants and statewide technical assistance meetings. Applications were reviewed and recommendations for appointment were made to the Executive Director of the Commission.

The Executive Director has appointed approximately 110 reviewers who continue to provide assistance to the Commission in the review of the documents submitted for induction program approval.

**Review of Program Submissions**

For both the September and November windows, readers met in Sacramento for the purpose of reviewing program submissions. Each of the readers was assigned to a 3 or 5 person review panel. These assignments were made by staff and took into consideration numerous factors including geographic location and particular areas of expertise, prior experience with assessment, and level of educational focus.

**Ensuring Consistency in the Reading Process**

Ensuring fairness, consistency, confidentiality, and protecting the general integrity of the review process are critical concerns for the Commission and CDE staff. At both of the two review panel meetings that have taken place, a great deal of attention was paid to reader training and calibration prior to review teams beginning their work to review their assigned document. Considerable time was spent reviewing the standards with the readers, discussing what was required of each standard and within each element, and reviewing and discussing sample responses. In several instances, outside experts were also present and shared insight, answered questions regarding the intent of the standards and their elements, and provided general guidance to the review teams.
The review teams were each then assigned one document per window and provided time to work together as a team to discuss the proposed submission. For the duration of the meeting, Commission and CDE staff were present to answer questions and provide further guidance to individual teams as needed.

*Use of Technology*

Also during these meetings, training on the “Sparrow” software, a special web-based software developed by Xerox Corporation’s Palo Alto Research Center, was provided to each team member. This technology has allowed for web-based, group-sharable and group editable documents, and permits instantaneous communication among the members around the state regardless of individual computer systems and set-ups. Beyond the initial meeting, review panels continue their discussions and “post” decisions via Sparrow. Review teams also routinely use Sparrow to communicate with Commission staff. While the face to face meeting is necessary for calibration purposes as well as to allow for the team building that is critical in this process, the Sparrow technology has allowed the review of resubmissions to continue without having to reconvene the group. As a result, the process has been unencumbered by traditional fiscal, geographic, and time constraints.

In order to keep the process moving forward, to better manage workload issues from both the program and reviewer perspectives, and in order to meet the Commission’s adopted timeline of December 31, 2003 as the deadline for approval of induction programs under SB 2042, staff has established deadlines for both program sponsors and reviewers for each step of the process. Staff is responsible for communicating with both the program and reviewers to determine the status of each review and resubmission. Commission staff has established a database to track the progress of each program submission through the duration of the review process.

Consistent with policy guidelines, all standards and all elements of each standard must be met in order for a program to be recommended for approval. This item presents the first three programs of Professional Teacher Induction determined by the appropriate review panel to have met all required standards and elements and, as a result are recommended for approval, according to procedures adopted by the Commission. Each of these three programs submitted documentation for initial program approval during the September 2002 window.

**Summary Information on Professional Teacher Induction Programs Recommended for Approval**

For the following proposed Professional Teacher Induction Programs, the program sponsors have responded fully to the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs*. The review panel has judged that the program has met all applicable standards established by the Commission and recommends the program for approval by the Commission. The three programs of professional teacher induction being recommended for approval at this time are Greenfield Union School District BTSA Program, the Sacramento BTSA Consortium of Profession Teacher Induction Program, and the Santa Cruz/Silicon Valley New Teacher Project. A brief description of each of these programs follows.
Greenfield Union School District

The Greenfield Union School District is in a suburban community located on the southwest side of the city of Bakersfield with a current enrollment of 6,835 students. Greenfield Union School District Professional Teacher Induction Program functions in partnership with California State University, Bakersfield; University of LaVerne; University of Phoenix; Point Loma Nazarene University; National University; Kern County Superintendent of Schools Consortium; Bakersfield City School District; and Kern Union High School District.

Greenfield Union BTSA is one of the state’s newer programs, having been established in 1999-2000 as a result of the major expansion of the BTSA program. The Greenfield Union School District serves approximately 58 eligible teachers each year through its Professional Teacher Induction Program.

Sacramento County Office of Education

Established in 1993, the Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program is a collaboration of 16 local school districts within the Greater Sacramento Area; California State University, Sacramento; and the Sacramento County Office of Education. Participating school districts are located in three counties and include the following:

- **Sacramento County**: Center Unified School District; Del Paso Heights Elementary School District; Folsom-Cordova Unified School District; Galt Joint Union Elementary School District; Galt Joint Union High School District; Grant Joint Union High School District; Natomas Unified School District; North Sacramento Elementary School District; North Sacramento Elementary School District; Rio Linda Union Elementary School District; River Delta Unified School District; and Robla Elementary School District.

- **Placer County**: Eureka Union Elementary School District; Rocklin Unified School District; and Roseville City Elementary School District.

- **Yolo County**: Washington Unified School District and Woodland Joint Unified School District.

The Sacramento BTSA Consortium serves approximately 600 eligible teachers each year in these K-12 school districts. Of particular note, the consortium has recently developed an interactive Internet database to follow the progress of program participants under SB 2042. The program continues to expand and improve this database and plans to make it available to other induction programs.

Santa Cruz/Silicon Valley New Teacher Project

One of the original BTSA programs, the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project was founded in 1988. It has been expanded over the past few years to include school districts within the Silicon Valley to form the Santa Cruz/Silicon Valley New Teacher Project. The Santa Cruz New Teacher Project is a collaborative effort among the University of California, Santa Cruz, Teacher
Education Program; the Santa Cruz County Office of Education; and 27 school districts in the greater Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, North Monterey and San Benito counties. Participating school districts include the following:

- **Monterey County**: North Monterey County Unified School District

- **San Benito County**: Aromas/San Juan Unified School District; and Hollister Elementary School District

- **Santa Clara County**: Berryessa Union Elementary School District; Cabrian Elementary School District; Campbell Union High School District; Cupertino Union School District; Franklin-McKinley Elementary School District; Fremont Union High School District; Gilroy Unified School District; Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary School District; Los Gatos Union Elementary School District; Moreland Elementary School District; Morgan Hill Unified School District; Saratoga Union Elementary School District; Sunnyvale Elementary School District; and Union Elementary School District.

- **Santa Cruz County**: Bonnie Doon Elementary School District; Happy Valley Elementary School District; Live Oak Elementary School District; Mountain Elementary School District; Pacific Elementary School District; Pajaro Valley Unified School District; San Lorenzo Valley Unified School District; Santa Cruz City School District; Scotts Valley Unified School District; Soquel Union Elementary School District.

One of the distinguishing features of this program is that it is a full-time release support provider model. Currently, the program serves 735 beginning teachers.

**Recommendation**

Commission staff recommends that the Commission approve the following programs of Professional Teacher Induction for the Professional Clear Teaching Credential.

2. Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program
3. Santa Cruz/Silicon Valley New Teacher Project