
4C

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Update on Induction Programs

Executive Summary: This agenda item continues the discussion on the availability of high quality Induction programs for teachers holding a Preliminary Credential and presents information and suggestions from a stakeholder meeting held in March 2014.

Policy Question: Does the Commission wish to implement the guidance document presented in the agenda item and/or to move forward with any of the stakeholder suggestions?

Recommended Action: That the Commission provide input and direction concerning implementation of the guidance document and/or any of the stakeholder suggestions for supporting Induction in the current political and fiscal context.

Presenters: Karen Sacramento and Katie Croy, 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.

April 2014

Update on Induction Programs

Introduction

This agenda item continues the discussion regarding the current and future status of the implementation of high quality Induction programs within the context of the Local Control Funding Formula, and suggests some options for the Commission's consideration.

Background

Staff presented information regarding the current status of the implementation of Induction programs and the anticipated potential effects of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) on the future availability of high quality Induction for California preliminary credential holders at the February 2014 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-02/2014-02-6G.pdf>). This information included data staff had gathered during Fall 2013 regarding Induction programs and also identified options for beginning teachers to clear their credential if the employer is not sponsoring or partnering with a Commission-approved Induction program.

A rich discussion ensued with both Commissioners and the public following the presentation of the agenda item. A synopsis of the key points and concerns summarizing the status of Induction in the current context of LCFF that were raised during the February Commission meeting follows:

- Recognition of the value of induction and its substantive contributions to teacher development and retention in California.
- Agreement that California's learning to teach structure, which includes both support and assessment for all new teachers, serves as a foundation for California's licensure system.
- Recognition that there is variability in quality across induction programs in the state, and that one unintended consequence of LCFF has been increased variability in the quality of and access to programs.
- Recognition that one impact of the LCFF is the local requirement in some districts that newly credentialed teachers pay to participate in induction programs, as determined by local program sponsors.
- Recognition that requiring candidates to pay the cost of participating in an Induction program runs counter to the investment in teacher development that has characterized the state's commitment to this program for 20 years, but also recognition that under the LCFF the options for the Commission are limited in this regard.
- Interest from both Commissioners and the public that the Commission examine the extent to which it could potentially influence the employer's responsibility for Induction as a licensure requirement, and whether it might be possible to impose restrictions on programs or restrictions on the Preliminary teaching authorization of the credential itself.

While the LCFF has changed the locus of control over funding decisions, it is within the Commission's purview to consider necessary policy changes that will continue to allow access to high quality induction for all first and second year teachers.

Research Findings on Induction

The effects of the California BTSA Induction program over the last 20 years, combined with research on new teacher induction substantiate the value of providing high quality induction services during the first two years in the teaching profession:

The extent to which teachers are well-prepared and the degree to which newly hired teachers are supported and assessed in their initial years of teaching can determine whether or not they remain in teaching and whether they are able continuously to develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Bolan, 1995). The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future proffers starker numbers, estimating that one-third of all new teachers leave after three years, and 46 percent are gone within five years. Their departure through what researchers call the "revolving door" that's spinning ever faster—the commission estimates teacher attrition has grown by 50 percent over the past 15 years—costs roughly \$7 billion a year, as districts and states recruit, hire, and try to retain new teachers. <http://www.nea.org/home/12630.htm>.

In comparison to national data, the five year retention rate of teachers who completed BTSA Induction in California was found to be over 87% as was reported in a *Statistic of the Month* in December 2008, <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/statistics/2008-12-stat.pdf>.

Research evidence suggests that comprehensive, multi-year induction programs reduce the rate of new teacher attrition, accelerate the professional growth of new teachers, provide a positive return on investment, and improve student learning. A federally funded, randomized controlled trial found that new teachers who received two years of comprehensive induction support produced greater student learning gains in mathematics and reading compared to peers who were provided prevailing and less intensive support. <http://newteachercenter.org/sites/default/files/ntc/main/resources/brf-ntc-policy-state-teacher-induction.pdf>

Research also suggests that comprehensive induction can "reduce the rate of teacher attrition, accelerate the professional growth of new teachers, provide a positive return on investment, and improve student learning" (Glazerman et al., 2010). Specifically, bundling together the components of comprehensive induction shows stronger evidence of positive impact on student learning than any one component alone (Goldrick et al., 2013; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). <http://learningforward.org/docs/default-source/commoncore/the-role-of-comprehensive-induction.pdf>

Feedback from Local Stakeholders regarding the Value of Induction

Though the implications of the LCFE continue to unfold, the voices of local support for the value of California's Induction process continue to rise, as seen through the following samples of local stakeholder feedback.

From BTSA Induction Participating Teachers:

"The induction program has held us accountable to provide services to all our English learners and students with special needs, and such accountability has now ingrained the importance of scaffolding instruction to meet the needs of all the students we serve."

“My support provider has been a joy to work with this year. Her knowledge and experience have been quite beneficial. She has always been willing to listen as well as suggest positive techniques to implement in the classroom. She has been extremely flexible with my schedule and workload throughout this year and I appreciate that. I look forward to having her in my classroom to hear what she has to suggest and/or comment on. My support provider has been a delight to work with and I look forward to working with her in the future!”

“This program has truly expanded on the work of my pre-service program: it has pushed me to be a stronger teacher for the sake of the students I serve.”

“Participation in BTSA has been wonderful. It has really helped me learn and improve my teaching skills. I’ve been lucky to have a terrific SP to help me and feel I am heads and shoulders above where I started two years ago.”

From a Program Graduate:

“Being a part of BTSA made a huge difference in my first two years as it gave me a support network that I could count on. I knew there were people I could go to for assistance: people who would not judge me, but would help to push me to be the best teacher possible. I am grateful for the professional development I was able to attend and even the sub release days I was able to take in order to observe other classrooms. I know that the program helped to make me the teacher that I am today.” Amber Carrow, California State Teacher of the Year 2010

From a Site Administrator:

“Focus on research-based best practices in their professional development with our teachers, and we see that in our classroom observations.”

From Local Education Agency Superintendents:

“In Murrieta, the BTSA induction process has been critical in the support and development of our newest teachers. The program design perfectly blends the legal requirements for clearing credentials, but more importantly, provides genuine and applicable professional development to what they are experiencing in their daily work with students. The program is critical in the development and delivery of professional development that we seek to provide not just to our new teachers but incorporates the best research-based training that we then provide to all teachers. In the transition to the new Common Core standards, building this professional capacity in our teachers will be at the core of its ultimate effectiveness. BTSA induction for our District is not a stand-alone program, but part of the larger vision of what we must do to equip our teaching professionals so that they provide the optimal instruction for students every day in this key transition of educational change.” Pat Kelly, Superintendent Murrieta Valley Unified School District

“The most influential factor in achieving student academic success is, and has always been, the effective classroom teacher. It therefore becomes paramount that persons entering the teaching profession receive the support and training that the BTSA induction program offers. The induction of new instructional staff into the teaching profession is a process that blends strategies with a nurturing program environment framed with ample opportunity for the

inductee to engage in self-reflection, which when combined, enhances personal and professional growth. As a result of this induction process, our education system will continue to evolve in its research about beginning teachers' styles, technology applications and pedagogy. That said, the constant driving influence of the effective classroom teacher will continue to be the most important resource we place before our children as they learn about their ever-changing world. The Antelope Valley Union High School District is a proud program sponsor of BTSA induction and highly values its participating teachers and support providers." David J Vierra, Ph.D. Superintendent Antelope Valley Union High School District

Stakeholder Meeting of March 21, 2014

As a result of the considerable interest on the part of many stakeholders in continuing to work with the Commission on the topic of Induction, staff organized an Induction Forum on March 21 to allow both formal stakeholder groups including Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), California School Boards Association (CSBA), California Teachers Association (CTA), California Federation of Teachers (CFT), and the California County Superintendent Educational Services Association (CCSESA) as well as individual stakeholders to discuss induction issues facing preliminary credential holders. These issues included access to Induction programs, availability of programs, and the cost of participating in Induction.

In preparation for the stakeholder meeting staff conferenced with key stakeholders to develop a meeting agenda that would 1) reflect the Commissioner's direction, 2) provide a forum for stakeholders to discuss the short and long term options identified in the February 2014 agenda item, 3) identify additional options, and 4) maximize the productivity of time by organizing large group participation. From these planning discussions, the general statements reflecting common beliefs about the value of Induction in California and common concerns about Induction in the era of the LCFF as defined below were developed and served as a meeting starting point and resource. In addition, staff developed a document to serve as guidance to the field, entitled "Options to Earn a Clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential," that was also shared and discussed during the Stakeholder Forum (Appendix A). The beliefs and concerns identified by stakeholders in preparation for the meeting are summarized below:

Benefits of Induction

- Teacher support during induction improves student learning (e.g., test scores).
- Induction improves retention of good teachers while providing a venue for counseling out those who show little promise.
- Induction provides an avenue for individualized professional development based in part on self-perceived teacher needs (e.g., CCSS, classroom management) and interests (e.g., technology, CTE).
- Induction provides an avenue for individualized professional development based in part on employer needs (e.g., CCSS) and employer-perceived teacher needs (e.g., classroom management).
- Induction provides an avenue for individualized professional development based in part on state priorities (e.g., CCSS, CTE).
- Loss of induction would adversely impact the quality of instruction to students, the success of new teachers, and the stability of the state teacher workforce.

Concerns About Induction Costs and Sustainability

- New teachers make approximately \$45,000 per year, have already paid thousands of dollars for their preliminary credential preparation programs, and many are beginning to pay back the resulting student loans.
- Two-year Induction program costs range from approximately \$6,000 to \$12,000, based on information from programs that charge candidates a fee. If new teachers are forced to bear the full cost of their induction, they and their representatives are likely to seek legislative relief.
- Support provider pay ranges from approximately \$1,000 to \$3,500 per year per teacher. If new teachers are forced to bear this part of the cost, those lowest on the salary schedule will be redistributing income to those higher on the salary schedule.
- In the long run, improved teacher retention has made up for induction costs to the state by offsetting the cost of training and hiring new teacher candidates and by providing a stable work force to help students improve their academic achievement.
- Improved teacher retention has also benefited districts by offsetting the cost of hiring new employees.

Suggestions for LEA Induction Program Sponsors

Although stakeholders understand that the Commission does not have authority over employers (school districts, county offices of education or charter schools) and how they choose to allocate their funding, stakeholders nonetheless wanted to make some suggestions regarding the funding for Induction. Almost half of California’s new teachers participate in a Commission-approved Induction program sponsored by a county office of education. The other half of California’s new teachers who participate in a Commission-approved Induction program complete a program sponsored by either a single district or a consortia program sponsored a school district. Appendix B provides information on the number of participants for each of the 152 LEA sponsored Induction programs.

	2013-14 Numbers		Percentage of Participants
	Programs	Participants	
Single District Sponsors	59	4,453	24.0%
Consortia-District Sponsors	65	4,957	26.7%
Consortia-County Office of Education Sponsors	28	9,132	49.3%
Total LEA Sponsors	152	18,542	100%

- Districts can allocate funds from LCFF to support individuals holding a Preliminary teaching credential to participate in a district sponsored Induction program.
 - Many single district programs have already made the commitment to fully fund the participation of all teachers in the district who hold a Preliminary General Education teaching credential (and a Preliminary Education Specialist teaching credential for those districts that also offer the Clear Education Specialist Induction program) from the LCFF funds provided by the state. As the table above shows, 59 of the Commission-approved Induction programs are single district programs and these programs serve almost 25% of the state’s new teachers.

- Most consortium programs are still negotiating how the consortium will operate, including funding for the program, in 2014-15 and beyond. As noted in the February Commission agenda item, the LCFE structure has made it challenging and tenuous for county offices to continue to serve all district partners. Twenty-eight Induction programs are sponsored by county offices of education and serve about half of the new teachers in the state. The largest group of induction programs are consortia programs where a school district is the sponsoring entity. One example where a consortium has reached an agreement among all partner districts is the Selma BTSA Induction program. Selma Unified, the program sponsor, and its four partner districts have all agreed to contribute \$2,000 per participating teacher per year. The plan is that the Selma BTSA Induction program will be offered to all eligible teachers at no charge to the participating teacher.
- In California, an individual holding a Preliminary Teaching Credential is required to complete a Commission-approved Induction program to earn a Clear Teaching Credential. Some individuals have suggested that credentialing is a statewide activity and that the state might want to consider if returning to per participating teacher funding would be appropriate for the BTSA Induction program.

Overview of the Discussion at the Stakeholder Meeting

Over 100 individuals participated in the Induction Forum—either in person at the Commission office or through the webcast and technology enabled discussion groups. In attendance at the Commission were representatives from the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), the California Teachers Association (CTA), the California School Superintendents Educational Services Association (CSSESA), and the Induction Cluster Region Directors as well as representatives from local district and county office program leadership and human resources departments and Public Advocates, Inc.

Topics discussed were primarily those that affect candidates directly such as program access, availability, and cost concerns as well as program matters such as challenges in providing adequate mentoring and support to candidates and concerns around the local allocation of adequate resources to meet the Commission's Induction Program Standards. In addition, the draft guidance document (Appendix A) was reviewed and it was suggested that this document be made available not only to Induction program sponsors but also to all Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject candidates. It was further suggested that employers and bargaining organizations could also be enlisted to assure that this information was provided to candidates. The agenda for the Stakeholder Forum is provided in Appendix C

The following issues were discussed at the Stakeholder Forum and the group developed these points for the Commission to consider:

- 1) The Commission's standards should define what a robust, research based Induction program is and should also provide more guidance regarding the critical aspects for programs to consider when they select, orient and train support providers or mentors. The group agreed that based on current research, Induction should be a 2 year program unless the individual teacher has the knowledge and skills defined by the Early Completion Option (EC 44468 (e)(3)).

- a. Induction is about growth over time. A two year Induction program allows sufficient time for growth to take place and for the Preliminary credential holder to demonstrate the application of the knowledge and skills.
 - b. Induction should be for first and second year teachers.
 - c. High quality, well trained mentors must work with the participating teacher
- 2) It is essential that the Preliminary credential holder have information about the requirement to complete a Commission-approved Induction program. The group discussed a number of ways to ensure that this takes place:
 - a. Require Preliminary Teacher Preparation programs to provide the Commission developed Guidance document to program completers.
 - b. When an email is sent from the Commission to the individual who earned the Preliminary teaching credential, information on Induction should be included.
 - c. Staff should continue to work with employers and bargaining organizations to get consensus on the information that each holder of a Preliminary teaching credential needs to receive.
- 3) There was widespread agreement that Induction is an essential component of teacher preparation in California. Employers believe that Induction is a priority for attracting and retaining well prepared teachers.
- 4) An employer who hires an individual holding a Preliminary credential should be required to provide support and mentoring.
- 5) Some participants at the Stakeholder Forum suggested that the authorization that accompanies a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject teaching credential should be restricted in a manner similar to the Intern teaching credential. This topic is closely related to the one directly above.
- 6) The stakeholder group recommended that there should be a closer alignment across the three types of Induction programs (General Education, Education Specialist, and Administrator) for which the Commission has adopted standards.
 - a. The group believes that the requirements for the selection and training of mentors, support providers, or coaches should be more clearly delineated.
 - b. A Transition Document should be prepared by the candidate and the Preliminary Preparation program. The document should be provided to the Induction program to guide the beginning of the individual's induction experience.
 - c. The Administrator and Education Specialist Induction Standards require that the initial IIP be developed within a limited number of days, i.e., 60, of beginning the program.
 - d. The Administrator and Education Specialist Induction Standards require that the IIP be developed in a collaborative manner with the candidate, the support provider/coach, and the employer. The stakeholder group recommends that parallel language be included in the General Education Induction program standards.
- 7) The Stakeholder group acknowledged that a teacher shortage is coming. At this time, there may not be a strong need for new teachers, but a teacher shortage is just around the corner and it will be essential that the teacher preparation programs—Preliminary and Induction—need to be prepared for this shortage.
- 8) The Induction community values the Cluster Region Directors (CRDs) and believes that the Induction programs have developed to be as reflective and high quality largely

because of the knowledge, skills, and efforts of the BTSA Cluster Region Directors. At this time, it is unclear if any of the LEAs that have supported the CRDs will continue to provide this type of support beginning in 2014-15.

Supporting Induction in the Current Policy Context

Stakeholders at the meeting focused their attention on developing suggestions that could be implemented within the current policy context, and that would be practical in terms of supporting Induction for both the short and the long term. The suggestions cluster around the following themes:

- Changes/Modifications to the Commission's Induction Program Standards, including defining the optimal length of an Induction Program and specifying when teachers must complete Induction during the five year term of the validity of the preliminary credential and/or Changes/Modifications to the Commission's Preliminary Teacher Preparation Program Standards
- Communications with candidates about Induction options and costs
- Strategies to ensure that beginning teachers are provided with Induction opportunities

Possible Changes/Modifications to the Induction Program Standards and/or the Preliminary Teacher Preparation Program Standards

In general, the stakeholders at the Induction Forum meeting recommended that there should be a greater alignment across the three types of Induction programs (General Education, Education Specialist, and Administrative Services) for which the Commission has adopted standards. Specific suggestions for standards modification are outlined below. It is important to note that some of these suggestions could have significant cost implications for program sponsors.

1. The Induction Program standards could be modified to define General Education Induction as a two year program. The Commission's standards should also define what a robust, research based induction program is and should also provide more guidance regarding the critical aspects for programs to consider when they select, orient and train support providers or mentors. This approach to define Induction as a two-year program would be consistent with the Commission's new Administrator Induction Standards, which require a two year program. This change would prevent programs from shortening the Induction experience to anything less than two years except for the truly extraordinary candidate who should be completing Induction through the Early Completion Option as defined in Education Code section 44468 (e)(3).
2. The Induction Program standards could be modified to require the development and implementation of the initial Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) within 30, 60 or 120 days of employment. The Induction Standards for both the Administrative Services and Education Specialist Induction program standards include this requirement. This requirement would prevent the Preliminary credential holder from waiting until years 3, 4 or 5 to begin Induction and would also require the Induction Program sponsor to serve all Preliminary credential candidates in their first two years in the profession.
3. The Induction standards could be modified to require the initial IIP to be developed based on information from the Preliminary teacher preparation program – Both the Preliminary

Administrative Services programs and the Preliminary Education Specialist programs are required to develop a Transition Document that the candidate brings to the Commission-approved Induction program. Concomitantly, the Preliminary Teacher Preparation Program Standards could be modified to require that Commission-approved Preliminary teacher preparation programs develop a Transition Document that each candidate will take to the selected Commission-approved Induction program. This would support the Induction program in designing a program that meets the needs of the individual candidate.

4. The Preliminary Teacher Preparation Program Standards could be modified to require that Commission-approved Preliminary teacher preparation programs provide information to candidates about the options to earn a clear teaching credential. As is the case with other Preliminary preparation programs (Education Specialist and Administrative Services) the Preliminary General Education teacher preparation programs could be required to develop a Transition Plan for Preliminary candidates to take to the Induction program.

Communications with Candidates about Induction Options and Costs

As indicated above, a guidance document regarding Induction program options has been provided in Appendix A for Commission discussion and feedback. This document could serve as the primary information vehicle for communicating with candidates about Induction program options.

Although the topic is not within the Commission's purview, stakeholders at the meeting wished to communicate their strong belief that Preliminary credential holders should not be required to pay to participate in an LEA-based Induction program, but rather have choice in determining in which program they will participate if there is a fee to participate in the LEA-based induction program. If a preliminary credential holder enrolls in a college or university Induction program, it is understood that he or she will be required to pay tuition.

Potential Ways to Ensure that Beginning Teachers are Provided with Induction Opportunities

Attendees at the meeting suggested that there should be clearly stated responsibilities that an employer must meet when the employer hires an individual who holds a Preliminary teaching credential. While the Commission does not have authority over employers, some participants suggested that the authorization that accompanies a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject teaching credential should be restricted, such that participation in an approved Induction program would be a condition for serving on the Preliminary credential. The Commission enacted regulations for interns last year that follow this pattern, requiring that interns receive specified levels of mentoring and supervision, provided by the program and the employer, as a condition of working on their Intern credential.

The requirement for holders of the Preliminary teaching credential to complete Induction in order to earn a clear credential is already established in statute. As written, this requirement applies to candidates, not employers. This requirement was placed in statute at a time when funding for Induction was sufficient to provide, free of cost to candidates, two years of induction to every first and second year teacher. In the years since this credentialing requirement was placed in law, the vast majority of new teachers have had access to and completed two years of Induction during their entry into teaching through programs accredited by the Commission.

Research conducted by Koppich and Humphries (2013) found that in some cases, the intended policy of the Commission was not being carried out at the program level, and teachers were not receiving Induction services in their first two years. The Commission has the opportunity now to revisit its program standards, regulatory requirements, and larger policy framework in order to reshape this portion of the credentialing system so that it works effectively for teachers in the current context. The Commission has the statutory authority to establish the scope of a credential authorization, and adopt standards for programs, so making changes in this system would not necessarily require statutory change.

If the Commission believes that placing specific requirements in the authorization of a Preliminary teaching credential, much like the new requirements in the authorization for an Intern credential, is a promising option, staff is prepared to work ACSA, CCSESA, CSBA, CFT, CTA and other interested groups to examine the benefits and challenges of developing such a restriction for the General Education Preliminary teaching credential.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission review and discuss the information presented in the guidance document (Appendix A), as well as the suggestions made by stakeholders concerning potential ways to support Induction in the current fiscal context, and provide direction to staff if the Commission wishes to move forward with the guidance document and/or any of the stakeholder suggestions.

Next Steps

Based on Commission discussion and direction, staff will continue to work with stakeholders on ensuring that all individuals holding a Preliminary teaching credential understand the requirement to complete a Commission-approved Induction program and will also move forward with any additional direction from the Commission concerning support for Induction.

Appendix A



Options for Earning a General Education (MS/SS) Clear Teaching Credential

Individuals holding a Preliminary General Education (Multiple or Single Subject) teaching credential are required by Education Code §44259(c)(2) to complete a Commission-approved Induction program to earn the Clear Teaching Credential. It is the responsibility of the new teacher to earn a clear teaching credential within a five-year period and the method intended by statute for new teachers to earn a clear teaching credential is a Commission-approved Induction program.

An induction program is designed to support and guide the new teacher in his or her teaching assignment, incorporating the local school and district goals, with guidance and assistance of a support provider who has deep knowledge of the local school, district and community as well as new teacher development. Each individual holding a Preliminary teaching credential should be supported and mentored during the first two years of teaching. All Commission-approved General Education Induction programs are listed on the Commission's Approved Programs web page, a drop down list allows for filtering so only those institutions sponsoring Induction programs are listed (http://cig.ctc.ca.gov/cig/CTC_apm/GE_i.php). At this time there are 156 Commission-approved Induction programs (0 CSU, 1 UC, 3 private colleges and universities, and 152 sponsored by local education agencies).

1. Enroll in and complete an Induction program sponsored by, or in partnership with, the employing district or county office of education.

The usual way for an individual to earn a clear teaching credential is by completing a Commission-approved Induction program sponsored by, or in partnership with, the employing school district or county office of education. When the induction program is sponsored by the employing district or the employing district is a partner in the program, it is more likely that the program will incorporate the local school and district goals.

If the individual's employer is not sponsoring or partnering with a Commission-approved Induction program, the following are additional options for earning the general education clear credential.

2. Enroll in and complete an Induction program that is offered by a college or university.

If a teacher is employed in a district that is not sponsoring or partnering to offer Induction to its teachers, the individual may elect to complete an induction program that is offered by a college or university. An induction program sponsored by a college or university needs to incorporate the local school and district goals and most will accomplish this through the work of the support provider with the Preliminary credential holder. This option is limited, however, since at this time there are only four Commission-approved Induction programs sponsored by colleges or universities.

3. Enroll in and complete an Induction program sponsored by a neighboring district or a county office of education if the program accepts participants who are not employed by a partner district.

The teacher would need to contact local school districts and county offices of education to find if there is one that would be willing to work with an individual who is not employed by a partner district. When the program is not sponsored by the employing district, it may be difficult for the program to address local school and district goals. It is likely that the new teacher would have to pay fees to the Induction program as part of a local fee decision. This option may also be limited, as many programs are not prepared to work with teachers from outside of the district and/or partnering agencies.

Note: Online programs are beginning to be offered by both LEA- and IHE-sponsors. Currently the CTC does not have specific information on which Induction programs are offered through an online delivery model. The teacher would need to contact LEA and IHE induction program sponsors to see which institutions offer this option. Although this option seems promising it is a limited choice for candidates since there are few programs currently available at this time.

4. Complete a General Education Clear Credential program

If none of the Induction programs options described above are available to an individual who holds a Preliminary Teaching Credential and the individual is employed as a teacher, completing a Commission-approved Clear Credential program is the alternate route to earn the Clear Teaching Credential.

This is the option available to candidates if a teacher's employer verifies that Induction is not available to that teacher or the teacher must satisfy a NCLB requirement. The employer must complete a form, known as the CL 855 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/cl855.pdf>) to allow the individual to enroll in a Commission-approved Clear Credential program sponsored by a college or university. It would be expected that if an employer does not or cannot make available an Induction program to a beginning teacher during the first two years of employment, the employer would sign this form and provide it to the candidate.

The chart at the following link shows which employers are eligible to complete the CL 855 form and verify that induction is unavailable: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts/2011/PSA-11-15.pdf>

All Commission-approved General Education Clear Credential programs are listed on the Commission's Approved Programs web page, where a drop down list allows filtering so only those institutions sponsoring Clear Credential programs are listed (http://cig.ctc.ca.gov/cig/CTC_apm/GE_c.php). At this time there are 21 Commission approved Clear programs (2 CSU, 3 UC, and 16 private colleges and universities) in operation.

Other Considerations

The Commission does not collect, maintain, or post information on the costs associated with educator preparation programs. It has been the Commission's policy that each individual has the right to select among any of the Commission-approved educator preparation programs that lead to the credential sought. This means that a holder of a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject teaching credential may potentially select among any of the Commission-approved Induction programs, enroll in, and complete the induction program to earn the Clear Teaching credential. However, it should be noted that some employers may require candidates to enroll in the Induction program sponsored by the district as a condition of employment. In this instance, candidates could be required to enroll in the district program rather than choose another enrollment option.

Not all employers (school districts, county offices of education, or charter schools) are sponsoring, or partnering in the sponsorship, of a Commission-approved Induction program. Some employers that are sponsoring, or partnering in the sponsorship, of a Commission-approved Induction program have instituted candidate fees for participating in the program.

It is important that each holder of a General Education (Multiple or Single Subject) Preliminary Teaching credential understand the requirement to complete an induction program to earn the Clear Teaching Credential and understand that the availability and cost of a Commission-approved Induction programs varies across California's local education agencies.

Appendix B

LEA Sponsored Induction Programs Number of Partnering Districts and 2013-14 Participant Totals

LEA Sponsored Induction Programs	Number of Partnering Districts	Number of Participating Teachers 2013-14
Alhambra Unified School District	1	40
Anaheim City School District	1	29
Antelope Valley Union High School District	1	64
Antioch Unified School District	1	75
Arcadia Unified School District	1	18
Azusa Unified School District	1	12
Bakersfield City School District	1	133
Baldwin Park Unified School District	1	3
California School for the Deaf, Fremont	1	13
Central Unified School District	1	49
Chaffey Joint Union High School District	1	31
Chula Vista Elementary School District	1	131
Compton Unified School District	1	15
Conejo Valley Unified School District	1	31
Corona-Norco Unified School District	1	75
Cupertino Union School District	1	25
El Rancho Unified School District	1	3
Elk Grove Unified School District	1	132
Escondido Union School District	1	51
Etiwanda School District	1	35
Evergreen School District	1	33
Fremont Unified School District	1	137
Garden Grove Unified School District	1	98
Grossmont Union High School District	1	41
Hacienda La Puente Unified School District	1	20
Hanford Elementary School District	1	39
La Mesa-Spring Valley School District	1	16
Long Beach Unified School District	1	103
Los Angeles Unified School District	1	1170
Los Banos Unified School District	1	45
Manteca Unified School District	1	48
Milpitas Unified School District	1	31

LEA Sponsored Induction Programs	Number of Partnering Districts	Number of Participating Teachers 2013-14
Montebello Unified School District	1	34
Mt. Diablo Unified School District	1	135
Murrieta Valley Unified School District	1	20
New Haven Unified School District	1	35
Palmdale School District	1	49
Panama-Buena Vista Union School District	1	57
Paramount Unified School District	1	25
Pasadena Unified School District	1	23
Poway Unified School District	1	90
Redwood City School District	1	24
Rialto Unified School District	1	22
Riverside Unified School District	1	93
Rowland Unified School District	1	38
Saddleback Valley Unified School District	1	44
San Bernardino City Unified School District	1	102
San Diego Unified School District	1	174
San Dieguito Union High School District	1	31
San Juan Unified School District	1	91
San Mateo - Foster City School District	1	36
Santa Ana Unified School District	1	112
Santa Clara Unified School District	1	45
Sequoia Union High School District	1	29
Torrance Unified School District	1	42
Tracy Unified School District	1	34
Tustin Unified School District	1	59
Vista Unified School District	1	91
Washington Unified School District	1	49
West Contra Costa Unified School District	1	123
Single District Programs		4,453
Anaheim Union High School District	5	17
Animo Leadership Charter High School (Green Dot Public Schools)	11	32
Aspire Public Schools	13	178
Bay Area School of Enterprise (REACH Institute)	11	149
Bellflower Unified School District	5	39
Brentwood Union School District	5	67
Campbell Union School District	24	65

LEA Sponsored Induction Programs	Number of Partnering Districts	Number of Participating Teachers 2013-14
Capistrano Unified School District	2	72
Castaic Union School District	2	2
Clovis Unified School District	3	111
Culver City Unified School District	2	35
Davis Joint Unified School District	15	222
Encinitas Union School District	6	28
Envision Schools	3	12
Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District	2	101
Fontana Unified School District	4	68
Fresno Unified School District	2	207
Fullerton School District	3	65
Glendale Unified School District	5	47
Hayward Unified School District	3	16
High Tech High	8	119
ICEF Public Schools (Los Angeles Unified School District)	3	91
Irvine Unified School District	4	125
Kern High School District	2	92
King-Chavez Academy of Excellence	44	20
Lancaster School District	3	35
Lawndale Elementary School District	4	87
Madera Unified School District	10	94
Merced Union High School District	2	38
Modesto City Schools	2	38
Newark Unified School District	7	120
Oak Grove School District	4	35
Oakland Unified School District	4	203
Ocean View School District	6	61
Oceanside Unified School District	6	92
Ontario-Montclair School District	2	51
Orange Unified School District	1	87
Palo Alto Unified School District	3	74
Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District	9	99
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District	3	47
Pleasanton Unified School District	8	102
Pomona Unified School District	2	19
Partnerships to Uplift Communities (PUC) Schools	9	38

LEA Sponsored Induction Programs	Number of Partnering Districts	Number of Participating Teachers 2013-14
Sacramento City Unified School District	2	87
San Francisco Unified School District	3	312
San Gabriel Unified School District	5	53
San Jose Unified School District	2	153
San Marcos Unified School District	3	92
San Ramon Valley Unified School District	2	128
Sanger Unified School District	2	53
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District	2	16
Saugus Union School District	5	54
School for Integrated Academics and Technology (SIA Tech)	9	27
Selma Unified School District	5	65
Stockton Unified School District	2	138
Temple City Unified School District	4	18
Tulare City School District	2	33
Vallejo City Unified School District	3	57
Visalia Unified School District	2	103
Walnut Valley Unified School District	14	89
West Covina Unified School District	6	81
Westside Union School District	3	36
Wm. S. Hart Union High School District	3	62
Consortium Programs--District LEA		4,957
Butte County Office of Education	16	129
Contra Costa County Office of Education	13	229
El Dorado County Office of Education	40	135
Fresno County Office of Education	29	231
Imperial County Office of Education	17	101
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	49	279
Kings County Office of Education	13	70
Los Angeles County Office of Education	23	354
Marin County Office of Education	21	683
Merced County Office of Education	20	96
Monterey County Office of Education	33	230
Napa County Office of Education	6	77
Orange County Department of Education	36	244
Placer County Office of Education	21	159
Riverside County Office of Education	78	1556

LEA Sponsored Induction Programs	Number of Partnering Districts	Number of Participating Teachers 2013-14
Sacramento County Office of Education	45	452
San Diego County Office of Education	45	222
San Joaquin County Office of Education	48	149
San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	11	148
San Mateo County Office of Education	26	366
Santa Barbara County Education Office	21	305
Santa Cruz County Office of Education	40	738
Sonoma County Office of Education	117	683
Stanislaus County Office of Education	54	340
Sutter County Superintendent of Schools	24	213
Tehama County Department of Education	111	256
Tulare County Office of Education	48	203
Ventura County Office of Education	29	484
Consortium Programs--County Office LEA		9,132

Appendix C



Induction Stakeholder Forum

Friday, March 21

10:30 am-3:00 pm

10:30 *Welcome and Set the Context for the day*

Objectives of the Stakeholder Forum

Introductions

Recap of the February agenda item and the Commission Discussion

Presentation of short term options

1. Develop a leaflet or other informational document that clearly states the options available for individuals holding a Preliminary Teaching Credentials to earn a Clear Teaching Credential.
2. Require Preliminary Preparation programs to provide information to candidates about the options to earn a clear teaching credential.
3. Provide further guidance to employers regarding Induction and Clear Credential Programs including the CL 855 process and their obligation to candidates when employers verify that Induction is not available.
4. Work with employers and the teachers' associations to provide clear information about the availability of Induction in the district, and if there is a fee for the participating teacher, at the point of hire for teachers holding Preliminary Teaching credentials.
5. The Commission could modify its Induction Program Standards: e.g., to require induction to be a 2 year program, to require the initial IIP to be developed within a specified amount of time as is the case in Clear Education Specialist Induction and Administrator Induction, to require the Preliminary program to develop a Transition Plan that the candidate takes to the Induction program as is the case in the Preliminary Education Specialist program to the Clear Education Specialist Induction program.
6. Other

Discuss feasibility of possible long term options—Discussion Rounds-see next page

Lunch—45 minutes at some time during the meeting

Discussion and Development of Stakeholder Guidance for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

April 10-11, 2014

3:00 *Adjourn*

Each group needs to identify a recorder and a reporter.
30 minute discussion time followed by report out

Discussion Round 1

1. How can the Commission's standards, policies and Credential requirements best assist both candidates and districts so that beginning teachers are well-supported, guided, mentored and assessed, and not left on their own to try to find a way to earn a clear credential? This could be viewed in a manner similar to the Intern Credential. In the past year the Commission has had a number of conversations about the support and guidance each intern must have while holding an intern credential and completed the regulatory process to implement these requirements. Should there be similar support and guidance requirements for employers who hire an individual who holds a Preliminary teaching credential?
2. How can the Commission ensure that candidates have access to a robust, research-supported Induction experience to assist the beginning teachers to advance their practice towards meeting the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*?
3. Should a district have any responsibility for support and mentoring of its new teachers if the district chooses other priorities for its funding?

Discussion Round 2

4. Should the authorization for a Preliminary teaching credential be revised so that the holder is only authorized to serve as the teacher of record if he or she is participating in a Commission-approved Induction program? or if the teacher is receiving support and mentoring?
5. With the advent of a two-year limit on post-baccalaureate teacher preparation programs, how might the Commission adjust its expectations for both preliminary preparation and Induction? How might completion of an in-depth one-year residency, as part of preliminary preparation, address the need to develop each teacher's knowledge and skill in the context of practice? Could such a program satisfy the requirements of Induction?
6. Should the Commission set policy and standards regarding the length of Induction? Given changes in preliminary preparation including all beginning teachers in California passing a performance assessment prior to earning a Preliminary teaching credential, would a high quality one year Induction program be an appropriate option for California teachers?
7. Other