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Executive Summary

This executive summary reports the most salient findings and implications from a State supported study of California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) new teacher induction program and the State’s Alternative Certification (Intern) program. The summary is presented in three parts. First, we summarize what is known about the effectiveness of alternative certification and new teacher induction programs. Here we combine findings from the current study with a broad overview of findings from other research studies. Second, we outline what this study has learned about the overall functioning of BTSA and Intern programs. This second section presents an overall model of success for each program, and describes briefly how individual programs develop unique features in response to the combination of state policies, local conditions and historical circumstances. In the third section of this summary we directly address the eight broad questions provided by the California Department of Education to guide study design and execution. We conclude the executive summary with a summary of issues that should be addressed in evaluating these two programs, but could not be addressed in this study due to a combination of limited study time and difficulty in linking critical data elements together in order to answer important research questions.

The Knowledge Base

The previous research studies reviewed for this evaluation study (described in section III of the report) reveal a fairly broad consensus about the goals and objectives of new teacher induction and alternative certification programs. In both cases, California policies are unique, but they also share, to a considerable degree, the broad purposes being investigated in professional discussions and in scholarly research and analysis.

The California BTSA Induction program, like other new teacher support and induction programs, rests on two broadly supported research findings. First, it is widely believed that the performance level of teachers throughout the public school system is in need of significant improvement. The need for improvement is seen as substantially beyond what can be expected from university-based pre-service training programs. There are diverse explanations for why this substantial improvement is needed. Some observers look upon the schools as a protected publicly supported monopoly which has been a haven for relatively low performance personnel. Others see the need as arising from the globalization of economics and politics which puts us in direct competition with other national education systems – and a number of
studies have indicated that we are substantially behind other, more competitive, national systems. Still other observers see the need for improvement as arising from the dramatic growth and cultural and economic shifts in our school age population. Whatever the reason, these concerns converge to produce substantial pressure to improve school and teacher performance.

A second broadly supported research conclusion that lies behind the creation of BTSA, and other induction programs across the nation, is the proposition that there is an unacceptably high level of teacher turnover at the school level and attrition rate from the occupation. This high turnover and attrition rate, research tells us, can be significantly ameliorated by programs that provide substantial direct personal support to new teachers through experienced teachers who serve as mentors, coaches, consulting teachers, trainers or, as the BTSA program calls them, support providers.

The goals of alternative certification programs are also broadly agreed upon and supported. These programs are intended to attract individuals from usually under-represented social, academic and occupational groups into the teaching workforce. In part, this is to provide access to teaching for individuals who would otherwise not be able to move into this occupational group because they lack the time or resources needed to pursue the standard, university-based teacher pre-service programs. Also, in part, the motivation is to get individuals who have leadership, subject matter or social skills needed by the schools to consider this occupation. And, in part, the motivation is to build a teaching workforce that is far more representative of the diverse students they must teach than is currently the case.

Alternative certification programs are also being created as a means of bringing much needed teaching staff into hard to staff schools and hard to fill teaching specialties. Science and math teachers, special education teachers and, to a lesser extent, English teachers are most needed at the present time, but when California was hard pressed to implement its massive class size reduction program in the 1990s, the need for alternative certification was focused on the multiple subject credential programs that prepare teachers for elementary school classrooms.

Not all analysts agree that either the BTSA Induction or an alternative certification approach are the most effective ways to meet school needs for staff and program improvement. While almost all authors are enthusiastic about the potential of some form of new teacher induction to enhance teacher skills and career commitments, the alternative certification approach to recruiting from different pools of potential teachers and prepare them to solve a significant teacher shortage problem is much more controversial. Analysts with a positive view see the potential for stronger, more practical and more substantial teacher training, but critics see the
potential for abuse and emphasize the ways in which children are put at risk of receiving an inadequate education from inexperienced and potentially ill-trained teachers.

Induction programs also face some significant critics, though they tend to be fewer in number and less strident in their criticisms. Two criticisms of induction programs give some pause for reflection, however. First, the issue of teacher retention may be less serious than previously thought as more recent research finds that, in part because the workforce is predominantly female, teachers tend to take child bearing and family nurture leaves after which they return to teaching and thus are not lost to the occupation in the way early studies had concluded. Second, some questions have been raised about whether new teacher effectiveness is as substantially improved as the early advocates expected. As described in the summary of prior research found in the body of this report, the most critical reviewers insist that there is little really reliable evidence that expected improvements in student achievement are actually forthcoming from new teachers who have undergone induction programs.

The alternative certification programs are succeeding in bringing new populations into the workforce – more minorities and a significant number of career changers. The largest number of individuals pursuing intern programs are recent college graduates, teachers’ aides and substitute teachers moving up in the school systems’ internal labor markets, and first generation college goers who cannot afford to resist the lure of a full-time teacher salary while they are in training. In creating a market-driven response to teacher shortages, however, the alternative certification programs are often tempted to make training less rigorous and to concentrate on “filling classrooms” rather than training teachers. California policy makes it quite clear that the intern programs are expected to produce better teachers by capitalizing on prior experience and building rigorous training components. In the market environment, however, lowering the cost to applicants and facilitating the placement of teachers in hard to fill classroom can easily squeeze program quality.

**BTSA and Intern Program Models of Success and Variation**

Among the most useful findings in this study are those statistically documenting what features of each program play a central role in determining overall program success, and what interpretive findings resulting from intensive case studies account for the most visible variations in program operations. For both the BTSA Induction and the Alternative Certification intern programs statistical analysis of participant survey data produced clear and powerful models of program success. In both cases, matching support providers with novice teachers with regard to location, teaching responsibilities and grade level were deemed a basic building block for success. Proper matching is not enough by itself, however. Unless the matched
support provider and the beginning teachers have build a strong working relationship the
match contributes noting to program success. In both programs, beginning teacher judgments
about the extent and quality the support they receive is the second powerful factor
determining overall program success. In the case of the BTSA programs, quality support has to
be matched by confidence in the program’s formative assessment system before the program
success can be expected. In the case of the intern programs, it is the frequency and duration of
communication between the interns and both their school based support providers and their
university-based supervisors are clear pre-requisites to the development of an appropriate
support system.

With regard to variations among local programs, the field data indicate that there are very
different forces at work in the two types of programs under review. The intern programs are
best understood as creating a regulated and subsidized market for the delivery of teacher
preparation services. Since the local program operators must operate in an environment where
both potential program applicants and local school districts have options for meeting their
respective needs, they must be constantly aware of what it takes to attract quality applicants
and work with the school districts who hire them. This market driven environment means that
any policy that drives away applicants or alienates school district administrators is likely to be
resisted. While the state provides a subsidy for this training, the amount of the subsidy is well
below the cost of the training provided. Thus the state has only limited influence over how
intern programs will operate and program innovations can be predicted from an analysis of
changing market conditions for these program services. The limited influence of state
regulations and fiscal controls is amply evidenced in the obvious variations in program design
found across the state.

In the case of the BTSA Induction program there are no important market forces for program
managers to contend with. These programs operate as state sponsored monopolies, individual
teachers have no choice as to which BTSA program they will participate in, and all new teachers
are required to participate in the program serving their school and district. What does generate
significant variation among BTSA programs, however, is their professional beliefs about the
nature of professional development, educational system improvement and standards based
accountability. Of these the most potent variable is the view of accountability held by the
program leaders. Overall there is significant pressure generated by BTSA program design
structures for program participants to view accountability as a matter of responsibility for good
faith implementation of program requirements. In tension with this view are two more
complex views – one emphasizing the importance of accountability for actual teaching
performances and the other emphasizing the importance of focusing on the development of
teacher capacity and professionalism. While many program leaders feel that these three
different views of accountability can be integrated into a single comprehensive system of accountability, our field data suggest that, in practice, local program staff experiences them as in competition and demanding loyalty to one view over the other two in order to produce a successful program implementation.

Answering the Eight Study Questions

In accordance with the study questions specified in SB 1209 (Scott) on behalf of the Legislature and the Governor, this Scope of Work collected, analyzed and interprets the data needed to answer eight core research questions that were outlined the project Scope of Work. The core questions are:

Question #1. How well are BTSA programs meeting the objectives set forth in the Education Code?

The first study question focused attention on how well the Beginning Support and Assessment programs are meeting legislative expectations. Though much more detail is provided in the body of this report, six observations provide a broad overview of how to answer this question.

1. Senior BTSA staff are competent, enthusiastic professionals who display substantial loyalty to the legislative intent and the standards and guidelines for BTSA.

Morale is high, cooperation with statewide and regional leadership is generally quite fulsome, and turnover among program directors is modest. There are some local programs in which the program directors do not appear to have sufficient administrative authority or status to secure full cooperation from local schools and school district executives, and this issue could well be addressed as a program development priority.

2. Commitment to and implementation of explicit training activities aimed at fulfilling the requirements of the new teacher induction standards (program standards 15 through 20) can be easily recognized in both the case study transcripts and the statewide survey data.

While commitment to this training is obvious, so is the fact that some aspects of the training programs need to be reviewed and improved. To a significant degree, the places where BTSA training is not working well have arisen because university-based pre-service programs have been significantly revised in compliance with the expectations of SB2042 and SB1209. These university programs are now providing training that was not being provided with BTSA began.
With the emphasis in university programs moving toward the same conceptions of high quality teaching as those underlying BTSA training objectives there has emerged a significant level of push back from participating teachers. Resistance to current BTSA training programs is most noticeable in the areas of technology, special populations and support for English language learners. In the case of technology utilization, participating teachers urge significant improvement or abandonment of this as a training component. Participating teachers frequently report that they have already had experience with most of the technologies being addressed in BTSA training programs. In the cases of work with special populations and support for English language learners, we find a lot of interest in the topics, but substantial concern that the training activities are repeating work already covered in the pre-service training programs and not providing the new teachers with the depth of understanding or effective applications needed to turn their fledgling knowledge into professional skill. The challenge for BTSA is to provide more sophisticated training in these areas without substantially increasing the overall participating teacher workload – a workload perceived as creating serious problems of stress and to be intruding on needed time for day-to-day instructional planning.

3. There is strong evidence that retention among mid-career teachers in California has improved every year since about 2000. The interpretation of this improvement is far from straightforward, however.

Although they cover only the last four years or so, the BTSA Induction program tracking system shows high rates of retention among new teachers entering the occupation through this program. And a longer term analysis of average tenure relying on the CBEDS/PAIF data confirms that teachers with 3 to 12 years of teaching experience are staying in teaching longer (raising the average tenure of this group by about six-tenths of a year since 2000).

It is, however, not possible to know with certainty that the improved retention among these younger teachers is the result of the BTSA or intern training and support activities. Broad trends in the CBEDS files are found well before these programs were adopted and implemented. These data indicate that California teachers in the mid-1980s had at least as good a retention rate for the younger professionals in the workforce as those found since 2000. Deeper demographic analysis of workforce trends is needed. The “baby boom” generation was well represented in the teaching workforce by the mid-80s. Many have accumulated 25 or 30 years of experience and are starting to retire in relatively large numbers. During this period, student populations have also fluctuated substantially. And policy changes, like California’s class size reduction initiative, the high stakes high school exit examination, enforcement of the No Child Left Behind “highly qualified teacher” requirements, and above all, the vicissitudes of the state budgeting process have contributed to substantial volatility in the teacher labor
market. Potential teachers appear to get the picture of job opportunities and requirements for entering the occupation quickly and to respond accordingly. The process of scaling up for the mid-90s class size reduction initiative, followed by a retreat from full implementation due to budget crises quickly led to a sharp reduction in the number of candidates seeking multiple subjects credentials, dramatically shifting the composition of intern programs. At the same time, the California State University system experienced a sharp decline in applicants for their pre-service programs.

Thus, while retention is up, it is difficult to attribute this fact to any particular program, policy or demographic trend. BTSA Induction programs have been, and remain, committed to improving teacher retention, and they have documented high levels of retention among their participating teachers. One caveat regarding relying on BTSA tenure tracking data to assess teacher retention needs to be kept in mind. About 40 percent of BTSA participating teachers report that they earned their California teaching credentials a year or more before entering this program (presumably as long term substitutes, on emergency permits, waivers, etc.) . And another modest portion of the BTSA participating teachers were fully credentialed in other states for one or more years before enrolling in BTSA. Researchers studying the retention of regional or national samples of teachers do not take this filtering into account, and can be expected to see substantially higher attrition rates because they are studying a different population of teachers.

4. BTSA programs are structured to provide intensive individualized support for new teachers. While the structure is broadly effective, some important areas for improvement were identified.

Every participating teacher has an assigned support provider. The majority of the support providers are full time teachers who care for from one to four new teachers, typically ones with similar grade level or subject area teaching responsibilities and often located in the same school. A substantial number of BTSA programs rely on full time support providers who carry case loads ranging from a dozen to more than thirty new teachers.

At least three factors influence the working relationship between support providers and their participating teachers. Teacher personalities vary widely, and some are much better suited to the care, nurture and support of new teachers than others. This consideration has become increasingly important as local BTSA programs have encountered difficulty recruiting and retaining the number and quality of support providers that are needed for the more than 20,000 new teachers entering the profession each year. The recruitment of highly motivated and sensitive support providers might be facilitated by adding more money to the stipends or
salaries paid. It is more likely, however, that increased encouragement and support from district and site administrators – particularly in the form of relief from other school level duties – would be more helpful.

A second area of potential improvement for the BTSA personal support system involves the time available for communication, observation, consultation and counseling. The BTSA program is quite busy with structured activities, completion of required documentation, training seminars and formative assessment procedures. Time for responding individually and uniquely to new teacher developmental needs can sometimes be hard to find. One reason that this time is hard to find is that California schools are very busy places. Everyone’s activity schedules are tightly packed. Support providers who are themselves full time teachers typically have to take time from their own teaching if they are going to observe their participating teachers. Some have suggested that giving secondary level support providers the same preparation period as their participating teachers would allow more time for collaboration and conversation. While this would help with opportunities to talk, it would also make cross-observation of each other’s teaching very difficult to schedule.

The third area of concern has to do with support provider training and development. The skills needed to mentor and guide novice teachers are quite different from those required to manage one’s own classroom. It was fairly easy to observe a range of support provider skill and to recognize that the best providers have undergone a rigorous and extensive developmental process of their own. Supporting professional growth requires commitment to the process and ample time, but it also requires complex and subtle skills that can be learned and practiced if the support providers are given the opportunity to do so. Every BTSA program observed in this study has a support provider training program, but more resources and more time devoted to this purpose would probably pay off in better and more successful support for new teachers.

Making heavier investments in support provider training would, in turn, focus attention on the question of how long support providers should remain in this role in order to allow a substantial investment in their training to pay dividends. Some BTSA program leaders see the support providers as a cadre of school program reformers and want this aspect of the BTSA program to involve a broad range of rank and file teachers who will return to regular classroom service and continue to identify with and forward the professionalization agenda that BTSA seeks to support for all teachers. This view leads naturally to the belief that supporting new teachers should be something many experienced teachers learn to do on a part-time basis. Others see the need for intensely training a much smaller cadre of full time support providers who may or may not return to routine classroom instructional duties once their service in this role is ended.
Indeed, some see becoming a support provider as a transition position leading to other school leadership roles.

5. BTSA programs, across the board, display a strong commitment to adoption and utilization of formative assessment systems based, in principle, on the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP). This commitment has been substantially moderated in the last three or four years, however, by the emergence of the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs* (Program Standards) as a potent set of guidelines for BTSA program operations and evaluation. The commitment to the CSTP principles has also been substantially reified in the relatively stable formative assessment system activities and data recording forms used in each local program.

The two BTSA core documents (CSTP and Program Standards) articulate both the target for new teacher development – high performance on the CSTP – and the program operations expected to produce the desired outcomes – the 20 Program Standards. Although many observers see these two documents as mutually supportive of a common framework for facilitating movement along a learning to teach continuum, case study data make it clear that in day-to-day BTSA program operation they play very different roles. The CSTP document provides much of the rhetorical and theoretical grounding for discussions of new teacher progress toward professional competency, but the Program Standards document, combined with key elements in each program’s formative assessment system are, by far, the most potent control elements – pushing the CSTP into a more philosophical and apologetic role.

Formative assessments come in three flavors. The most widely used is the state developed California Formative Support and Assessment System for Teachers (CFASST). A few local programs use, instead, the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project’s Formative Assessment System (SCNTP/FAS), and a handful of other programs use state approve locally developed assessments. Since developing and implementing a comprehensive formative assessment system is a time-consuming and relatively expensive process, once adopted they tend to remain relatively stable in format and substance. The SCNTP/FAS system is relatively expensive for local programs to license and is therefore not likely to become widely used without significant state level investment in making it available to local BTSA programs. The state developed CFASST system has been the object of continuing pressure for modification and simplification as users tend to feel that it is too prescriptive, relies too much on filling out forms, and is not thoroughly integrated with the Program Standards that are driving program evaluation and accountability. Local formative assessment system users have been heard to complain that the tightly structured Program Standards are not synchronized with the approved assessment
systems they have been using and thus they are forced to change the local assessment system for compliance rather than substantive reasons.

As this report is being written, the state is at work revising both the CFASST system and preparing to review and revise the Program Standards, so complaints about these structural elements have not fallen on deaf ears. It is too soon to try to assess whether revisions of either CFASST or the Program Standards will resolve the issues described in various sections of this report.

6. The BTSA Induction program at both the state and local levels is making a continuing effort to generate program improvements. The basic framework for this evaluation and improvement process is appropriately described as a Standards Based Accountability (SBA) model. And the standards that predominate in this model are the Program Standards which specify in substantial detail what evidence needs to be presented by local BTSA programs to show that they are meeting the SBA goal of systematic documentation, review and revision of program activities.

The SBA framework is given substantive meaning through the development of a new program review and evaluation process call an Induction Program Review (IPR). The IPR involves a process of self-study and program narrative preparation by the directors of local BTSA programs. These self-study documents are submitted to a team of four experienced BTSA program leaders who review this self-study document and then come to the local program site to examine documentary evidence and interview program directors and all key stakeholder groups regarding the fulfillment of the 20 Program Standards.

Close observation of the IPR made it clear that this standards based accountability model not only identifies local program strengths and weaknesses, it also has a number of not always anticipated consequences. Details of the observed consequences of the IPR process are described in the body of this report. For this summary, the following are the most important to be reminded of:

- Because the IPR examined fulfillment of most program standards by examining fulfillment of each specific standard element the process required assessment of local program evidence regarding a total of 104 standards and elements. Trying to competently review all of these 104 standards and elements targeted for review tended to fragment the process.
Adoption of an adjudication model for evidence evaluation tended to narrow the focus of assessment to observable data rather than its substantive meaning leaving some participants in the process unclear as to whether they were missing expected performance or only required documentation.

A heavy emphasis on meeting the induction standards has led to a shift in local program emphasis away from the interpersonal work of the support providers, toward courses, seminars and other organized activities conducted by professional development specialists or third-party marketed services.

As implemented, the IPR process tends to elevate the definition of “Standards Based Accountability” to mean meeting implementation guidelines through compliance, rather more than teaching performance or teacher capacity development. That is, the evidentiary emphasis in this model of accountability led the review teams to concentrate on documentation of actions taken rather than evidence of growth in teacher performance or professional capacities.

**Question #2. How well are University and District Intern programs meeting purposes specified in the Education Code?**

On the whole, evidence regarding the recruitment and placement of intern credential teachers is making significant progress toward fulfilling legislative goals for this program. The match with legislative goals regarding recruitment and placement of credential candidates is not perfect, but there is room for some pride of accomplishment. As described in much more detail in the body of this report, intern programs have moved nimbly from a concentration on helping meet the demand for more multiple subject teachers to staff schools undergoing class size reduction to a point where about half of all interns are working toward education specialist credentials to meet a crushing need demand for more special education teachers. Moreover, when the requirements of the No Child Left Behind law calling for “highly qualified” teachers in every California classroom came on line, the intern programs expanded their enrollments substantially to facilitate the acquisition of preliminary and then clear credentials by emergency permit holders and long term substitute teachers. The data even indicate that there was a sharp spike in the number of teachers being prepared for single subject credentials in art when the so-called f-requirement for admission to California universities was added to insist that at least one high school arts course be provided for all university-bound students.

With regard to recruiting candidates from diverse population groups into the intern programs the results are a bit mixed. The largest group of intern credential holders report that they came
into the program right after finishing their college degrees and without substantial prior work experience. Nevertheless, second-career candidates do represent a significant proportion of the intern population and represent individuals who would probably not be seeking careers in education without this program.

Though not spelled out in the legislative intent, there are two other groups of individuals for whom the intern programs represent career opportunities that would probably be denied them without this avenue of access to teaching credentials. The first is the large group of candidates who have become upwardly mobile in the school systems’ internal labor markets – the paraprofessionals and the substitute teachers. These groups come with substantial relevant work experience within the public school system and are using the intern programs to pursue full professional credentialing. By providing advanced training for significant numbers of these committed but underprepared educators the intern programs are providing career opportunities to groups otherwise largely cutoff from advancement. This pool of candidates has the added advantage of containing relatively large numbers of multi-lingual and ethnically diverse individuals. The other substantial group that would probably have a much harder time entering this occupation without the intern program is the first-generation college goers whose families are not prepared to bear the cost of post-baccalaureate training.

It is not possible to tell from the record whether interns moving into education from other careers have substantial or relevant work experience. No doubt, many do, but it is not possible to know whether these applicants are seeking to leave careers where they have failed rather than moving into education from prior successes without undertaking a substantial number of individual case studies. Intern program staff are well aware that not all second career recruits have successful or relevant prior experience, but it was not possible for them to say what proportion of the total second career group this might be.

On the placement side of the equation, evidence of compliance with legislative intent for this program is quite strong, but this success has also become the focus of criticism. A public interest law suit against federal regulations accepting California intern teachers as meeting the criteria for “highly qualified” has been filed in the federal court system. Interns are working in schools with substantially more non-white students, greater poverty, more English language learners, lower average parent education and substantially lower Academic Performance Index scores than other teachers of record. This exactly what the legislature intended, but it is an open question as to whether students being taught by these intern teachers are securing equal access to a quality education. Some site administrators interviewed for this study are convinced that interns are superior teachers, and expressed a preference for hiring them over other new teachers if possible. Systematic data covering multiple years of student achievement
is needed to test the real consequences of staffing classrooms with intern teachers, and that data could not be assembled for this study.

The statutory provision of incentive funding has been incorporated into the intern program under the designation of “enhanced program” funding. As important as it is to know whether these incentive funds aimed at enriching intern preparation are having the desired effect, it is simply too soon to tell. The program is just too recently implemented to know what will happen with the recruitment and training of interns enrolled in these financially and substantively enhanced programs. The current year’s funds for this enhancement came too late for serious program planning and adaptation to requirements to have much effect. Indeed, late authorization meant that funds had to be distributed to programs that had already met the minimal qualifications for enhancement funding without regard to the specific purposes for which the funds would be used. Moreover, current fiscal records for this and most other state program initiatives are too sparse to allow an adequate review of expenditures without an on-site audit level study of cash outlays.

By and large, intern skill levels are being assessed using the same tests and measurements used for pre-service credential candidates – course grades, supervisor evaluations, CBEST passage prior to admission and teaching performance assessment prior to completion. Perhaps a more appropriate assessment of intern competency than any currently available tests or assessments is to examine their retention rates over time. Since school administrators can generally exercise their discretionary authority to terminate intern credential holders without triggering teacher union involvement or creating a basis for legal redress, they are probably more stringent in renewing contracts for these teachers than for most others.

The question of how interns are being trained produced what is probably the most interesting and important set of insights in the study of this program. We found four distinct approaches to training interns distributed across the case study sites examined in this study – approaches that appear to be dictated by the alternative ways in which intern program sponsors orient toward and answer two basic marketplace questions.

The intern programs are local training agencies -- each fiscally managed by a sponsoring public school agency (local district, county office of education). In offering to fund these programs the state has established a nominally competitive market structure for offering teacher training services. When local program sponsors enter the subsidized and regulated market for teacher preparation services, they must answer two fundamental questions: 1) to what extent should the service (teacher preparation) be redefined and restructured, and 2) should marketing alternative certification programs be directed primarily toward the school districts needing staff
or toward the intern candidates seeking entry to the occupation. Data show that program sponsors have answered these questions in very different ways. Some local programs give primary emphasis to redefining pre-service training, others concentrate on new marketing strategies, and some devote substantial attention to doing both. The table below summarizes the alternatives generated by answering these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redefine the nature of pre-service teaching?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, the issue is efficiently producing more teachers to meet pressing needs</td>
<td>Yes, this is an opportunity to change the whole culture of preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on marketing to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>Type B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Oriented Traditional Programs</td>
<td>School Oriented Local Culture Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>Type D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Oriented Traditional Programs</td>
<td>Candidate Oriented Intensified Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally Type A programs are well represented among the CSU campuses. They tend to emphasize using their traditional pre-service courses and supervision system, together with a declaration that they are “market driven” responses to district staffing needs.

Type B: tends to be found in single district and county office of education programs where training is undertaken primarily by experienced teachers and not by university faculty, where emphasis is placed on working with districts and on keeping close to issues of professional practice rather than theoretical concept development.

Type C: tends to be private and entrepreneurial programs that emphasize multiple, convenient locations and direct candidate recruitment efforts.

Type D: is illustrated by one program with restrictive enrollment, limited aim of providing science, math and English single subject preparation and insistence on substantial pre-program preparation.
The important point here is that intern program designs are, in substantial part, structured by managerial decisions regarding the marketplace where these services must be bought and paid for. State funds are incentives for program development but, to become operational, institutional resources must also be tapped and therefore the programs have to be seen as wise investments by intern applicants and school districts as well as the sponsoring agencies. This motivates program operators to cooperate closely with school districts and with candidate training institutions, but it also limits their willingness to see program priorities in terms of state interests.

**Question #3. What policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that district and university interns receive appropriate direct assistance from experienced teachers?**

There are, no doubt, many different ways to tweak the management of the BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification Intern programs that would facilitate the development of more adequate direct support by experienced teachers for the development of their novice colleagues. Most of the good management practices are probably untouched by this evaluation study. There are, however, three domains in which data collected and analyzed for this study do suggest likely ways to improve overall support provider performance.

**Focus on the support providers themselves**

First, focus on the support providers themselves. The provision of support for new teachers can be no better than the recruitment, training and motivations of the support providers selected to work with them. As previously mentioned, a number of BTSA programs are facing a significant shortfall in their efforts to recruit support providers for their new teachers. The problem is even worse for intern programs who often find that the best support providers have been retained by the district’s BTSA program which is offering higher stipends for this sensitive and time consuming work. Resources matter, and none of the support providers who are also serving as full time teachers are being over compensated for the work they are expected to do. In the absence of increased funding, however, management can do some other things that will make the support provider role more attractive. Arranging for better released time to do this work, securing more reliable substitute teacher assistance to make absence from their own classes more palatable, providing more obvious recognition of the important work support providers are doing, maintaining direct contact with the support providers and letting them know their efforts are understood and endorsed, providing support providers with state of the art communication hardware and software so that they can stay in touch with their beginning teachers more easily are but a few of the things that might be done by managers who see
support provision by experienced teachers as a high priority part of their overall professional support and development program.

At least as important as stronger recruitment and incentives for engaging in this vital work is the provision of training in adult learning, counseling, observation and analysis of teaching performances, professional role development and other dimensions of the adult development process that support providers are expected to provide would enable the support providers to enjoy their work more and to do it more efficiently and effectively. This is not a new idea in the BTSA program, but it is relatively foreign to the intern support providers. And, in the BTSA environment, much more could be done to raise the sophistication and effectiveness of the support providers.

Because of the importance of acquiring and using the subtle and complex skills associated with the provision of support for novice professionals, our research team did reach the conclusion that full time support providers have a better chance of realizing the goals of quality support provision than do full time teachers who are carrying support provider responsibilities as an overload. This conclusion is not unequivocal, however, as the benefits of close to the work site of the novice teacher are real, and the positive influence that a large cadre of support providers can have on schools and districts is potentially quite important.

In part, our embrace of the full time model for support providers, despite the fact that this a marginally more expensive approach, lies in thinking about the third dimension of quality support provision – the creation of the time needed by support providers to do their support work. There needs to be enough time and at the right time for support work to have the needed impact. There are too many stories of low frequency contacts between support providers and novice teachers for this issue to go unaddressed. Moreover, as our statistical modeling of intern and participating teacher survey responses evaluating the effectiveness of their program experiences amply demonstrates, providing quality and timely support is probably the most significant factor in determining whether these novice teachers feel that their program experiences have been successful.

Focus on distractions to quality support provision

Once management has secured motivated and trained support providers who have the time needed to assist the new teachers, attention should be given to aspects of the BTSA and intern programs that are tending to distract support providers from attending to this important work. Here the two programs are quite different. BTSA support providers report being distracted by an accountability program that focuses heavily on providing evidence of program
implementation which leads to too much paperwork. The intern program goes too far in the other direction, there is often too little accountability and too little direction for support providers to really understand what is expected of them. Planning support work is just as important to this activity as lesson planning is to classroom support.

**Focus on program management**

There are several management decisions that would help secure high quality support provision in the intern programs. First, prevent late enrollment in the intern program by pre-service teachers who are pressed into service because districts have not accurately estimated staff needs or have not managed their recruitment and hiring processes well enough to get teachers on contract in time to allow them to prepare for this role by completing required foundational pre-service work in a timely way. Second, insist on timely appointment of support providers – perhaps by insisting that the granting of an intern credential is contingent upon providing the CTC with the identity of the person who is accepting responsibility for providing district support, then monitoring the adequacy of that support and preventing support providers who have been that in name only from being used in support of future intern credentials. Third, help school districts overcome the weak planning and late hiring processes that make raiding pre-service programs for intern teachers necessary.

BTSA program management is generally quite streamlined. There are, however, some programs and some school districts within consortium programs where the BTSA program managers do not have the status and respect needed to secure cooperation for the new teachers and their support providers. This is concern is expressed in the Program Standards guidelines and has been reviewed where appropriate in the Induction Program Review process, so it is not entirely clear what more needs to be done, but this issue is important enough to deserve further study.

**Question #4.** What policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that beginning (Induction) and intern teachers are prepared to address the needs of special populations of students – especially English learners and special education students?

Issues associated with addressing the instruction of special needs populations are quite clear in the BTSA program, and were described in this summary in answering question #1. To make the implications of that discussion explicit, we would make the following recommendations.

First, it seems appropriate to simply eliminate the technology standard as a standalone component of the BTSA program standards. We make this recommendation, not because
technology utilization is unimportant, but because it keeps changing faster than formal programs of preparation can cope with and school systems are moving at their own pace to incorporate new technologies and technology support into their routine management processes. Additionally, BTSA participating teachers are reportedly doing more to assist their support providers with new technologies than they are receiving help from them. By weaving appropriate use of technology into the other program standards, BTSA would be acknowledging that technology utilization is not an end in itself, but a vehicle for meeting other standards.

Second, there is a need to review and upgrade curricula and other methods for meeting the special populations and English learner standards. In their present form these standards are being met through training seminars that too often seem, to the participating teachers, to be a repetition of their pre-service training experiences.

Third, there is a need to differentiate training in meeting the needs of special populations and English learners based on the participating teachers actual classroom assignments. Rather than packing the entire training into the first two years, it would make sense to allow BTSA program completers to secure appropriately sophisticated and updated training as their teaching assignments bring them into contact with new language groups, ethnic sub-cultures or special needs students.

In the case of the intern programs, the issue of addressing special needs populations is particularly difficult to tackle. These teachers are getting much of the same training provided to pre-service teachers who do not have full classroom responsibilities, and they have very basic needs that BTSA participating teachers have already addressed. Nevertheless, without adequate preparation interns are often required to face a full range of student needs. For them the important thing is to be able to get help addressing the special needs they are facing on a daily basis, and must performe let larger issues be put off until later. And with half the interns in the state working with special education students, their need for training and support is focused quite tightly. For this group of new teachers one can only recommend that more help be made available to them and that they be empowered to insist on having that help when it is needed most.

**Question #5. What state, regional and/or local administrative structures could improve the support services for Induction and intern teachers?**

Two program structures found in the BTSA program are models of effective program organization and improvement that are to be commended to for use in the intern programs and probably for a number of other state-sponsored program initiatives. The first is the
development of a series of Cluster Regional Directors located within six geographical regions of
the state for the purpose of providing guidance, direction and support to local BTSA programs

The BTSA Induction program’s Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) constitute a program
management and consulting group comprised of a dozen experienced BTSA leaders that are
funded separately from the local BTSA programs and serves as an intermediate governance
structure – separate from the state Task Force which consists of official representatives from
the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of
Education (the state agencies jointly responsible for overseeing BTSA funding, policy and
regulations). Because they are hired by local education agencies, they see themselves as
responsible for supporting local programs, facilitating their improvement, and representing
their interests to local school districts and to the state BTSA Task Force. Moreover, because
they are separately funded, and do not work for the same local district officials that manage the
various local BTSA programs, these Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) are also able to critically
appraise the appropriateness and effectiveness of the local programs with whom they work.

Over time, the CRDs have become the primary working group for monitoring BTSA program
performance, developing new procedures, mechanisms, materials and guidelines for program
improvement, and studying how issues affecting program success should be conceptualized and
dealt with. There are two primary reasons why this governance mechanism looks like a very
promising way of successfully joining state policy priorities with local program designs and
implementation processes. First, and most importantly, by separately commissioning and
funding the CRDs, the state has succeeded in creating a group of professionals who are neither
captured by the aims and interest of local program operators.

The second reason why the CRD structure has become important to BTSA and represents a
promising strategy for state program governance rests in the size of the group and the method
of selecting its leadership. With only twelve individual CRDs, strategically located throughout
the state, with sufficient resources and autonomy to meet together regularly, and with the
knowledge that their influence rests on their capacity for intellectual rather than political
leadership, the CRDs have become an important Professional Learning Community.

The CRD structure for BTSA is underfunded and a significant augmentation to their funding is
highly recommended. Additionally, if adequately funded, a similar structure would serve the
Alternative Certification intern programs very well.
The second BTSA administrative structure which represents a powerful tool for program accountability and improvement is the Induction Program Review (IPR). The IPR process is both intensive and broad ranging. The central ingredient in the process is a 4-day visit by an IPR team consisting of four experienced BTSA participants (typically program local administrators and lead support providers from around the state). The IPR team is supported by one or two facilitators (typically one of the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors) whose job it is to facilitate team deliberations, remind team members of IPR guidelines, and work with the leadership of the program being reviewed to facilitate accumulation of the evidence to be reviewed by the IPR team. The IPR team members have participated in a one-day IPR training session during which they learn about how local program administrators are asked to assemble evidence regarding their program performance, and are briefed on guidelines for the conduct of the 4-day review.

Our evaluation team was quite impressed by the consistency and depth of commitment to the Induction Program Review process by local BTSA directors, the IPR review teams, cluster regional directors, local school officials, state level BTSA Task Force members and the various stakeholder groups involved in BTSA programs. While we had a number of observations about the limitations and diverse understandings of this mechanism that are found in the field (these observations are described in detail in the report section covering the IPR process), we concluded that this mechanism is valuable and should continue to be supported. Moreover, we felt that a similar process should be generated for the Alternative Certification intern programs whose operations are currently facing much too little review or pressure for improvement.

Question #6. What would be a sufficient level of funding for Induction teacher and intern programs, and what criteria should state agencies use to help facilitate legislative passage of appropriate funding levels? How is funding divided between infrastructure operations and direct support to new teachers? Is this division the most effective use of funds?

All conclusions regarding the adequacy of current funding levels for either the BTSA Induction or the Alternative Certification intern program are extremely tentative as fiscal data are not easily accessed and are not organized in ways that make it possible to readily connect expenditure patterns with important program outcomes. That said, for the BTSA programs, resources do seem to matter in relation to the BTSA participant experience – programs that record greater expenditures also tend to report higher participant satisfaction. But recorded budget amounts are so little regulated as to have relatively little meaning and other factors are so important in mitigating the relationship between how much is invested and perceptions as to how much is available. Such factors would seem important to understand from an efficiency
perspective, but are not well captured through current reporting or program monitoring and evaluation processes.

Given these limitations, the qualitative perceptions of local BTSA providers are that program resources are generally sufficient to allow them to implement the program in ways they deem effective. Hence, we have concluded that current data provide no basis for suggesting that current BTSA allocations are fiscally inadequate. With the exception of funding for the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors, available data provide no basis for deciding whether future funding should be substantially different from what is currently being provided.

With regard to using intern program fiscal data to estimate funding sufficiency, we must emphasize that the data currently collected are insufficiently defined and are not measured with enough accuracy to reliably address this question. Some estimates of funding levels and fund usage are developed in the body of this report, but they are quite speculative and the primary focus of our recommendations here is to take steps to improve data uniformity and recording accuracy.

From a practical standpoint, it is very difficult to conduct a reliable fiscal analysis or to interpret historical budget shifts when the only available budget records are found in paper files at the BTSA and intern program offices at the state capital. The lack of budget data with uniform reporting categories, in sufficient detail to track the consequences of alternative expenditure patterns for each local program, and in electronic data file formats that can be economically utilized for analysis will continue to stymie useful fiscal analyses until better financial data systems are developed. Both the intern and BTSA program directors need clearer instructions with regard to identifying and recording in-kind and local financial contributions to these programs. At a minimum, all programs need to accurately report the actual value of matching resources provided by the local program agency. Clearer instructions are needed on what can and cannot be counted as eligible matching contributions. Moreover, program reviews like the IPR need to request and analyze fiscal data in order to insure that it is maintained in understandable formats. Both intern and BTSA directors need clearer direction in the preparation of budgets, particularly in the allocation of program costs to standard accounting categories that will allow comparison of program expenditure patterns that can be linked to program outcome measurements.

**Question #7. What, if any, revisions of the BTSA Induction and/or Intern Program Standards would facilitate increased teacher competency and/or reduce engagement in unproductive activities**
The program standards for both the BTSA Induction and the Alternative Certification intern programs are clearly stated, thoroughly vetted by professional educators and grounded in a fairly widely supported body of research. The issues we found in reviewing the use of these standards had much more to do with how they are incorporated into program reviews and management decisions than with how they are conceptualized and written. There is one important exception to this generalization and that concerns the technology utilization standard in the BTSA Program Standards. After reviewing the text of the standard and the complaints about its use in the field we concluded that this standard should be abandoned as a stand-alone standard and be woven into the operationalization of other standards as appropriate. There are two reasons for this recommendation. First, the BTSA program staff are frequently behind rather than ahead of the technology needs of the participating teachers. Second, the utilization of technology is both being better taught in pre-service training programs and being better supported by local school districts than was the case when this standard was originally developed. The BTSA induction training programs are very tightly packed and the participating teachers are feeling much more need for advanced training in how to work with English language learners and special education certified children than for more technology training as a subject independent of these core instructional issues.

In implementation, there are two problems with the use of program standards that should be addressed through management and training within the BTSA program. First, there is too little attention to accounting in the accountability usage of these standards. That is, standards reviews are generally aimed at securing evidence of program attention to them with too little attention given to whether this attention is securing the desired outcomes. The second problem, seen vividly in the Induction Program Review process, is the tendency for subordinate elements in each of the standards to emerge as needing the same level of attention and evidence of compliance as the overarching standard. When local BTSA programs are asked to submit evidence of meeting more than a hundred discrete elements and standards, the result is an explosive disaggregation of their programs into a search for bits of evidence that have lost coherence as indicators of overall program quality. The BTSA programs should adopt the view that any program service or activity that deserves independent review is, by that fact, to be identified as a program standard. Or to put the point in the other way, that no standard should be judged to have not been met because evidence on one of its elements is not forthcoming.

We think that both of these weaknesses in the use of program standards could be fruitfully addressed if evidence were solicited in a matrix format, rather than on the standards one at a time. That is, if the assessment of evidence for meeting program standards were placed in a framework like the table below, it would invite an accounting of why submitted evidence should be considered appropriate to each standard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Program Activity 1</th>
<th>Program Activity 2</th>
<th>Program Activity 3</th>
<th>. . . et cetera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 1 is met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 1 is met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 2 is met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 3 is met</td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 3 is met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . Standard N</td>
<td>. . .etc.</td>
<td>. . .etc.</td>
<td>. . .etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this format, the evidence of enacting appropriate activities would be presented just once for each activity while the interpretation of how that activity meets diverse program standards would be presented in the appropriate cells of such a matrix of accountability data.

For the Alternative Certification intern programs, the program standards are equally clear, but since the accreditation process was suspended in 2002 there is very little in the way of accountability for meeting those standards built into the intern program management and policy systems. Staff at the CTC report that the accreditation system is being re-established, but there were no instances available for review during this study. A vigorous accountability system is strongly recommended, but in building an accountability system for the intern programs it will be important to remember that these programs are market driven and must maintain a level of service to both intern candidates and school districts that will allow this program to continue to broker intern teacher placement and supervision.

**Question #8. What, if any, changes in laws, regulations and/or policies would help eliminate duplicative requirements, streamline and coordinate support services for beginning teachers and interns?**

Redundancy and duplication of requirements are arising largely within the BTSA Induction program. Intern teachers feel a need for just about all the help they can get and rarely complain about any redundancies prior to encountering BTSA program requirements. The issues of redundancy and duplication are concentrated in two areas: completing training activities associated with meeting the induction standards (Program Standards 15 through 20), and finding activities associated with BTSA formative assessment systems repetitive, particularly repetitive with regard to recording the completion of various required activities.
Several of the problems of duplication and redundancy can be solved through updating the BTSA training curricula, particularly in the domains of work with special education students and English language learners. If the technology standard is maintained as a stand-alone program standard it should be possible for participating teachers to challenge requirements by showing that they can apply technologies appropriately within their classroom responsibilities and be excused from training on matters they have already mastered. Indeed, it would probably be very helpful to have a system of challenge exercises to allow participating teachers to challenge a number of program training activities.

At a more conceptual level, it is important that BTSA program staff come to recognize that the distinction between skill development and skill application that is frequently used to justify requiring participating teachers to engage in activities that they feel they have already mastered is more mystique than reality. Pre-service teacher trainers simply do not believe that they are providing skill development in the absence of skill application, and the BTSA program staff are finding that they must be just as concerned about skill development as about application because incoming participating teachers are often not able to learn applications because they lack needed skills and must learn them as well as apply them. In the final analysis a skill that cannot be applied is not yet learned. It may be important to impress this truth more forcefully in pre-service training programs, but the question of how important that might be is beyond the purview of this evaluation study.

Recommendations for Policy and Program Improvement

Based on the work summarized above, the study team has developed 23 concrete policy and administrative recommendations summarizing our judgments regarding how best to enhance and improve California’s BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification intern programs. The recommendations are organized according to the topics that each addresses.

Recommendation #1: Improve Data Management

Program evaluation and improvement can be only as effective as the comprehensiveness, reliability and accessibility of the data upon which they are based. Data must not only be accessible and reliable it must also be structured in ways that allow both comparisons across program functions and local program sites and across time and levels of analysis. The data required need to include program resources, operational characteristics and attainment of outcomes. For the California BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification intern programs, present data systems are desperately inadequate. Fiscal data are difficult to access, inconsistently categorized and inadequately reported. At the state level, student achievement data are only available in aggregated files that preclude tracing the effects of teacher efforts,
program designs, contextual constraints or longitudinal change. Teacher retention data that could be utilized to address this issue are inaccessible from state data files and must be collected by hand by individual BTSA programs. Program operational data are reasonably well developed but cannot be connected to fiscal inputs, contextual constraints or outcome data measuring student achievement or teacher performance. For all these reasons:

It is recommended that the California Department of Education and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing create a joint task force that includes individuals with substantial program evaluation expertise, support this task force with adequate resources, and commission the task force to develop a comprehensive and systematic data management plan for the BTSA and intern programs. With this plan in hand, staff with data management expertise should be mandated to provide the recommended data elements and linkages.

**Recommendation #2: Improving BTSA and Intern program designs**

There are a number of steps that can be taken to improve the design and operation of these two programs. Hence this recommendation comes in eight parts:

**Recommendation 2A: Strengthen focus on performance and capacity building**

There has been a drift toward defining program quality in terms of compliance with program standards that threatens the intended aim of raising teacher performance and professionalism. This is exacerbated by a not entirely convincing assertion that BTSA training focuses on skill application while pre-service training focuses on theory and abstract skill development. Program standards should urge more documentation of teacher performance and less recording of program implementation practices.

**Recommendation 2B: Support Provider training**

Careful matching of support providers with beginning teachers in both the BTSA and intern programs is an appropriate first consideration. Of equal importance, however, and not always adequately supported in either program, is providing support providers with the skills needed to make their work with new teachers effective. Support providers need significant training in such skills as: observation and analysis of instruction, peer coaching, adult learning theory, trust building, reflective conversations, diagnosis of instructional practices, conflict management, teacher legal rights and obligations, etc. It is recommended that local programs give preference to the employment of well trained full time support providers in order to assure that beginning teachers have access to high quality assistance. It is also recommended
that the cost-effectiveness of this approach be given careful review once data management systems make monitoring impact on student achievement possible.

**Recommendation 2C: Enroll interns in the BTSA early completion option**

Interns who have acquired their preliminary credential enter BTSA with significantly different prior experiences than those of other preliminary credential holders. They should routinely be given access to a BTSA early completion option. Beyond that, because issues of practice are paramount during their training period, interns can easily end participation in this program without some of the theoretical and conceptual foundations that power professional innovation in the classroom. Consideration should be given to providing graduates of intern programs with access to advanced conceptual and theoretical training as part of their BTSA experience.

**Recommendation 2D: Reduce BTSA paperwork and documentation**

Too many BTSA program participants (at all levels, but especially the participating teachers and their support providers) see documentation of program participation as requiring repeated filling out of forms that have little or nothing to do with the quality of the participation experience itself. A concerted effort needs to be made design program participation activities that are self-documenting so that the artifacts of participation, rather than separate documents reporting participation, become the evidence used to evaluate program compliance.

**Recommendation 2E: Evaluate alternative Intern program designs**

Intern programs having evolved in diverse ways now display designs that serve different purposes and provide quite different services to the interns and to the public school system. It is important to recognize these differences and formulate policy guidelines regarding which ones deserve continued funding. This report describes four distinct types of intern programs. While more detailed study would be required to make strong recommendations, the data collected in this study suggest that the program designs aimed at filling classrooms as quickly as possible and those aimed at lowering the effort and financial costs for teacher candidates are probably much less valuable to the state of California than are those that emphasize fitting teacher trainees to the needs of the district where they are being trained and those that see internship as an opportunity to dramatically intensify the amount and quality of teacher pre-service training. Our study team was particularly impressed by an intern program decision to limit interns to substantially less than full-time employment so that their training could be given highest priority. On the basis of the case studies conducted for this report, we would recommend that this option be considered for all interns.
Recommendation 2F: Control Intern enrollment options

Children are put at risk, teacher training is undermined and California is not well served when intern credentials are sought and granted on or after the opening day of school. Except for special cases where intern credentials are given to individuals who have been enrolled for some time in a pre-service program, this practice should be forbidden. If it is not, the arguments of those who are challenging the federal decision to consider intern credential holders to meet the No Child Left Behind requirements of “highly qualified” are likely to become persuasive.

Recommendation 2G: Strengthen support provider commitment to interns

Stronger local school and district commitment to providing interns with trained and capable district-based support providers is needed. It would probably help if the local support provider had to be identified by name and qualifications at the time the intern credential is awarded. Part of the problem is financial, the BTSA program is better funded and can afford to outbid intern programs for the services of quality support providers.

Recommendation 2H: Strengthen intern program accountability

Intern programs have been far less seriously evaluated than the BTSA programs and have hardly been evaluated at all since the CTC had to discontinue accreditation in 2002. In addition to the much anticipated revitalization of the accreditation process, however, it is recommended that the intern program adopt the BTSA model and create a system of regional staff (e.g. Cluster Regional Directors) who can provide ongoing coordination, support and program evaluation.

Recommendation 2I: Assure formal training for intern support providers

Support provider training for local intern support providers is important and typically neglected. Although interns have faculty based supervision from the sponsoring agency, their needs are legion and the local district support provider, if properly trained and motivated, can provide invaluable assistance. Formal training for district support providers should be included along with their explicit identification as part of the sponsoring agency’s responsibilities – adequately funded, of course, or neglect of this duty can be expected.

Recommendation 2J: Complete work already underway to revise formative assessment instruments

It is already clear to BTSA program staff members at all levels that some aspects of the state approved formative assessment systems are cumbersome and focused too much on
documenting activities. Completion of the revised formative assessment system underdevelopment will be much appreciated by staff and participating teachers alike.

**Recommendation #3: Program Standards Modifications**

Although program standards are part of the overall program design, they are important enough to be treated separately here. We make four recommendations related to the content and use of program standards.

**Recommendation 3A: Delete the standalone technology standard**

It is recommended that BTSA do away with the technology standard as a standalone program standard and, instead, incorporate appropriate references to technology utilization into other program standards. As argued above, these technologies change rapidly and new teachers often have leap-frogged past their support providers. This approach recognizes that technology utilization is not an end in itself; it is a means to realizing other program goals.

**Recommendation 3B: Revise and upgrade the content of the English Learner and Special Populations BTSA standards**

Testimony from BTSA participating teachers makes clear the importance of revising and upgrading training associated with these two standards. They are recognized as addressing fundamental classroom needs and new teachers feel the need for more sophisticated training in both areas. Present content too closely parallels pre-service training.

**Recommendation 3C: BTSA needs to re-think the relationship between program standards and the elements that compose them**

It should be recognized that any element aspect of BTSA program operations that needs to be independently evaluated constitutes a program standard and should be characterized as such. Any interpretive element that is intended to convey to program managers the underlying character or the multiple dimensions of a program standard is appropriately characterized as an “element” within the standard it elaborates. Standards should be embedded within the program review and evaluation process in ways that lead them to be reviewed holistically. When this principle is applied, BTSA leadership should quickly recognize that identifying more than a hundred standards for program reviews will undermine program integrity and lead to a “check off” approach to program accountability. Twenty or so standards is about all that can be independently monitored and held in mind as benchmarks for program implementation.
Recommendation 3D: Intern program standards need more careful monitoring

Intern program standards, designed as they are to parallel the standards for all pre-service programs are clear enough, but there are inadequate mechanisms for determining whether they are being met. Intern programs need more routine review and assessment of the adequacy with which standards are being met.

Recommendation #4: Adjusting program recruitment and participation

Several issues regarding participation in both the BTSA and Intern programs should be considered.

Recommendation 4A: Encouraging second career and internal promotion for intern programs

Although there has been notable success in the recruitment of second career candidates into the intern programs, more should be done to bring this opportunity the attention of potential candidates. This can best be done through a statewide public awareness program; local programs have a hard time getting media attention or access to the places where second career decisions are being made.

Intern programs have been particularly successful in providing promotion opportunities for individuals already engaged in public education as paraprofessionals or substitute teachers. Again more could be done to encourage this group to see internship as an opportunity for promotion. And this group is a particularly rich source of individuals from diverse backgrounds. Here districts are the target for recruitment efforts and state level support for reaching out to his group would be productive.

There is one group that is well represented in the intern programs that would probably be better served through scholarships or other forms of assistance to participate in full time teacher preparation programs. That is the group of recent college graduates who are coming from families with limited ability to support them through the teacher preparation process. These students, often from the first generation in their families to graduate from college and typically more ethnically diverse than other pools of teacher candidates are likely entering the intern programs out of financial need rather than preference for this kind of training. It is in the interest of the state and of the children they serve to provide access to teaching in ways that are less stressful for this group.
Recommendation 4B: Providing better support to the interns not in funded programs

One of the surprises in this study was the discovery that more than 25 percent of California intern credential holders are not supported in funded intern programs. While some members of this group are, no doubt, functioning comfortably and at a high level of success, most of the group is nearly invisible to state officials and their effectiveness is uncharted. It is quite likely that many of these interns are in need of support at a level similar to that being provided in the funded programs. The state should commission a careful study of this intern group and develop appropriate mechanisms for insuring that they receive the support they need.

Recommendation 4C: Providing better support to new teachers not eligible for BTSA

Another surprise in the data collected for this study is that a substantial proportion of the teachers entering the BTSA program have already worked for a year or more in California schools before becoming eligible for this program. State policy makers need to take a careful look at this cadre of new teachers and develop mechanisms to provide them with appropriate support as they earn the credentials needed to become BTSA participants.

Recommendation #5: Improving program management and governance

There are several adjustments to program governance and management that could improve overall effectiveness.

Recommendation 5A: Make sure program managers have needed status with district officials

To assure that new teachers get the support they need and are given the opportunity to benefit fully from participation in BTSA or intern programs the managers of these programs need to be seen as important executives in the districts or universities that employ them. In working with sponsoring agencies, it would be helpful if stronger efforts were made to assure that program managers are given the status and authority they need to coordinate support, integrate BTSA and intern program activities into the school systems’ overall professional development efforts and maintain control over budgets and resource allocations. Difficulties with status are not frequent, but when they arise they are important.
Recommendation 5B: Expanding the Regional Coordinator concept to the intern program

As detailed in the body of this report, the Cluster Regional Director structure for BTSA has had important positive benefits for this program. A similar structure should be created for the intern programs.

Recommendation #6: While overall funding levels appear adequate, three important adjustments are needed

In addition to creating a much more useful fiscal record keeping system, there are two relatively simple adjustments in financing that would help improve program operations.

Recommendation 6A: Increase funding for the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors

These key individuals are obviously under resourced to the extent that funding limits their effectiveness. It is not easy to say how much additional funding would be cost effective, but a 50 percent increase in funding for this group is probably justifiable. Although detailed budgets were not studied, it appears that the state BTSA Task Force is also significantly underfunded.

Recommendation 6B: Equalize support for interns and BTSA teachers

One of the negative consequences of lower level per-teacher funding for intern teachers is that it puts this program at a disadvantage in recruiting and compensating support providers. Both programs are reporting significant difficulty in recruiting support providers, but the intern programs seem to be losing out in the competition for needed talent.

Recommendation 6C: Raise compensation for support providers

While money should not be the most important consideration in becoming a support provider for new teachers, it is becoming increasingly clear that the amount of compensation provided is not enough and programs are having a hard time securing talented professionals to do this important work. Increased compensation will be particularly important when steps are taken to substantially improve support provider training.
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I. Introduction

Two of the most important California programs directed toward the preparation and induction of public school teachers are the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) and Intern Alternative Certification (Intern) programs. Under a contract with the California Department of Education, administered by the CDE and the BTSA Task Force, the University of California, Riverside has undertaken a study of the design, operation and impact of these two programs on the teaching workforce. This technical report summarizes the results of that study.

The report is organized into seven sections. This introduction is followed by a section describing the general structure and operational characteristics of the BTSA Induction and intern programs. Section III provides a relatively comprehensive overview of what can be learned about the central findings and design issues reported in previous research studies on new teacher induction and alternative certification programs. Section IV delineates the questions to be addressed in this study as specified in SB1209, the legislation authorizing and funding the study. Section V provides a detailed description of the population wide and intensive case studies used to collect data for this study and indicate how this data can be used to shed light on the research study questions. Section V is the longest section in the report reporting in detail findings from the statistical study of quantitative data covering all local BTSA and intern programs, elaborating conclusions from intensive case studies of ten local BTSA programs and eleven local intern programs. The study report concludes with Section VII which summarizes findings and offers policy and management recommendations aimed at improving the effectiveness and efficiency of these two programs serving California’s newest teachers.
II. The Structure and Operation of the Programs Under Review

This section briefly summarizes the history and structure of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) induction and Alternative Certification (Intern) programs. Though both programs are fundamental elements in the State’s effort to support high quality training and induction for new teachers, they have rather different histories and structures, so each will be reviewed separately.

The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Induction Program

The California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Induction Program is one of three types of state-funded teacher development programs, which also include the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program and Internship Teacher Preparation Programs. The primary objective of BTSA induction programs is to provide support and professional development for first and second year teachers while they are completing the requirements for the Clear Credential. Through formative assessment of teaching practices and individualized support and instruction, induction programs aim to increase teachers’ skill, knowledge and abilities, and to improve student achievement by enabling teachers to provide effective instruction for students of diverse cultural, linguistic and academic backgrounds.

In 2002, after the BTSA program standards underwent a rigorous revision process, The Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction grew from 13 to 20 standards. Standards 15 through 20 clearly define the professional knowledge and application skills a new teacher must demonstrate in order to complete the induction process and to earn the Clear credential. These six new standards, identified as the BTSA Induction standards, include:

- K-12 core academic content and subject specific pedagogy (15)
- use of technology to support student learning (16)
- supporting equity, diversity and access to the core curriculum (17)
- creating a supportive and healthy environment for student learning (18)
- teaching English learners (19)
- teaching special populations (20)

It is also important to note that 2004 was a watershed year for the statewide BTSA programs for two reasons. First, upon a lengthy, rigorous and successful application process to the CTC, BTSA program Directors were granted the authority to recommend new teachers for the Clear credential directly to the CTC, based on candidates’ successful completion of BTSA Induction. This was a major shift in credentialing policy and in BTSA program administration. Prior to this change, recommendations for clear credentials came from approved university pre-service
program staff or BTSA directors would verify to an employing district that the participating teacher had completed BTSA by submitting a signed 41-4 BTSA Verification of Completion form to the participating teacher’s district. Upon receiving the 41-4 document, districts would collect the remaining renewal documentation and file the clear credential application with the CTC. BTSA programs are now the state’s credentialing agents.

Second, along with this new authority have come new responsibilities. BTSA program infrastructures and program delivery services which existed prior to winning credential agent status have had to change, adjust, expand and deepen to meet the support, training and assessment demands of the 2002 induction standards.

The BTSA Funding History

The BTSA program was created by Senate Bill (SB) 1422 (Bergeson) in 1992 and established under Section 44279 of the California Education Code, which details requirements for induction programs and the state’s responsibilities for administering and funding programs. These provisions set an initial amount of $3000 (to be adjusted in subsequent years according to inflation rates) per beginning teacher given to school districts and local education agencies (LEAs) to support teacher induction programs. School districts are also required to provide matching funds of at least $2,000 per beginning teacher and to use these combined funds to develop cost-effective systems for delivering program services.¹

The BTSA program has grown significantly since 1992 and the state funding to programs reflects this trend. In the 1992-1993 school year there were 15 state-funded BTSA programs supporting approximately 1,100 new teachers receiving state funds totaling to $4.9 million dollars. Although legislative changes have slightly modified the allocation formula for grants in the last couple of years, in 2006-2007 the California Department of Education spent more than $93 million supporting BTSA programs. This amount supported 154 LEAs at a rate of $3,893 per first year teacher and, in the first half of the fiscal period (July to December), provided $3,197 per second year teacher participating in induction programs.² In the second half of the fiscal period (January to June) state reversion funds brought the funding levels for year two new teachers to the same level as the first year teachers--$3,893.

Legislative Changes Affecting BTSA Funding

In fiscal year 2005-06, BTSA Induction programs supported the development of 24,000 participating teachers through funds currently provided by the AB 825 Teacher Credentialing Block Grant. AB 825 was implemented in 2005 and allocates 26 categorical grant programs into the following six Block Grants, including one competitive grant:

- Pupil Retention Block Grant
- School Safety Consolidated Competitive Grant
- Teacher Credentialing Block Grant
- Professional Development Block Grant
- Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant
- School and Library Improvement Block Grant

Prior to being included in one of the Block Grants, BTSA and the other 25 programs were all individually governed by their own provisions of law. However, AB 825, repealed almost all of these laws and instead specified that Block Grant funds can be used for "any purpose authorized by the programs" as the statutes governing them read on January 1, 2004, which the legislature argued would provide increased flexibility to LEAs and consolidate funding sources. BTSA is the only program currently funded by the Teacher Credentialing Block Grant (TCBG). Unlike most of the programs in the other Block Grants, AB 825 did not repeal Education Code 44279 governing the BTSA program.

The funding formula for induction programs has undergone several revisions over the last few years. In 2005, the TCBG established that funding was to be apportioned to LEAs in 2005-06 based on the number of eligible participants in the BTSA program. In subsequent years, LEAs would receive their 2005-06 level of funding adjusted for statewide growth in average daily attendance and the cost-of-living adjustment on district base revenue limits." This allocation formula differs from the previous formula, in which funds were allocated based solely on the number of beginning teachers the Commission on Teacher Credentialing identified for each eligible program. However, beginning in 2006-07 this funding formula was revised again by SB 1209 (Chapter 517, Statutes of 2006). New provisions indicate that similar to the original BTSA funding formula, LEAs will now receive “funding based on the number of eligible participants in each approved BTSA program instead of on what they received in TCBG funds in the prior year."  

---

4 http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/ce/ab825guidanceltr04.asp (accessed 30 April 2007)
7 http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r14/tcbg06apptltr1.asp (accessed 2 May 2007)
Basic Structure in the BTSA Design

Local BTSA induction programs are administered by Local Educational Agencies, County Offices of Education and educational consortiums. Sponsoring agencies must follow CTC Induction Submission Guidelines (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/Induction-Program-Subguide.pdf) in order for a proposed program to be reviewed and granted approval. Approved programs serving teachers in the public schools are eligible to receive State funds and recommend candidates for Clear Credentials. Induction programs must be written to and provide evidence that they meet the twenty Standards for Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs [PDF]. The twenty standards are intended to describe how programs are to be planned and managed. They are the standards by which BTSA programs are to be evaluated and improved. Standards 1 through 9, the Foundational Standards for All Multiple Subject and Single Subject Professional Teacher Induction Programs are:

- Standard 1: Sponsorship, Administration, and Leadership
- Standard 2: Resources
- Standard 3: Professional Development Providers
- Standard 4: Evaluation
- Standard 5: Articulation with Professional Teacher Preparation Programs
- Standard 6: Advice and Assistance
- Standard 7: Coordination and Communication
- Standard 8: Support Provider Selection and Assignment
- Standard 9: Support Provider Professional Development

Standards 10 through 20, the Implementation Standards for All Multiple Subject and Single Subject Professional Teacher Induction Programs include standards for program design, teaching California curriculum and all of the State’s academically, linguistically and ethnically diverse students. Those standards are:

A: Program Design
- Standard 10: Program Design
- Standard 11: Roles and Responsibilities of K-12 Schools
- Standard 12: Professional Development Based on an Individual Induction Plan
- Standard 13: Formative Assessment Systems
- Standard 14: Completion of the Professional Teacher Induction Program

B: Teaching Curriculum to All Students in California Schools
- Standard 15: K-12 Core Academic Content and Subject Specific Pedagogy
- Standard 16: Using Technology to Support Student Learning
C: Teaching All Students in California Schools
Standard 17: Supporting Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum
Standard 18: Creating a Supportive and Healthy Environment for Student Learning
Standard 19: Teaching English Learners
Standard 20: Teaching Special Populations
(see, Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing March 2002, p. 13)

Consistent with legislation, the BTSA website states that:

The following purposes and objectives and the Standards for Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs [PDF] guide the design and implementation of support and professional development services for teachers participating in BTSA Induction programs:

- Provide an effective transition into the teaching career for first- and second-year teachers in California
- Improve the educational performance of students through improved training, information, and assistance for participating teachers
- Enable beginning teachers to be effective in teaching students who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse
- Ensure the professional success and retention of new teachers
- Ensure that a support provider provides intensive individualized support and assistance to each participating beginning teacher
- Ensure that an individual induction plan is in place for each participating beginning teacher and is based on an ongoing assessment of the development of the beginning teacher
- Ensure continuous program improvement through ongoing research, development, and evaluation (http://www.btsa.ca.gov/BTSA_basics.html)

Program Governance, Management, Control Structures

Statewide, administration and oversight of BTSA is shared by both the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). BTSA programs are organized into six geographically-based regional clusters lead by Cluster Regional Directors who provide support and assistance to local BTSA programs. There are over 150 individual BTSA programs in the State of California. These local BTSA programs are managed by a program Director, or Coordinator, who is an employee of the LEA or sponsoring agency.
Core Program Activities

BTSA induction is a two year program for new teachers who have earned their Preliminary Single or Multiple Subject Credential. Upon completion of BTSA these candidates may be recommended for a Clear Credential. Vocational education credential candidates and new special education teachers, with Level I, Preliminary Education Specialist credentials may also participate in BTSA Induction. Neither of these groups clears their credential through BTSA, however.

Participating teachers (PT) are each assigned a Support Provider (SP), or mentor teacher to guide them through the induction program, provide support and feedback, assist with the preparation of Individual Induction Plans (IIP) and the completion of a prescribed formative assessment program including documentation of activities. Support providers are more experienced teachers who have been carefully selected and trained as mentors and in the appropriate use of formative assessment in accordance with Induction Standard 8: Support Provider Selection and Assignment and Standard 9: Support Provider Professional Development.

The vast majority of programs use the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST) for formative assessment. As described by BTSA, CFASST is a:

support and formative assessment process ... to assist beginning teachers' professional development. The support and assessment system is both structured and flexible, and consists of a series of events that focus teachers through a "plan, teach, reflect, apply" process, that blends teaching knowledge with performance. Intended for use by first- and second-year teachers with the assistance of an experienced teacher, it is grounded in a developmental view of teaching and integrates the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) [PDF] and the California Student Content Standards (“What is CFASST?” http://www.btsa.ca.gov/faq.html).

Though CFASST is the most widely used formative assessment program, it is not the only program available. In particular, the University of California Santa Cruz provides a highly regarded alternative assessment system used by a number of programs. Programs may use other locally developed systems provided they are aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, provide feedback at multiple points during induction and are used to “determine the scope, focus and content of professional development activities that are the basis of the beginning teacher’s Individual Induction Plan” (Induction Program Standard 8: Formative Assessment of Beginning Teacher Performance).

In addition to formative assessment the:

BTSA Induction Program provides a wide variety of workshops, training and network opportunities targeted for different audiences involved in all levels of the program. Program directors, Site and district administrators, Support Providers and Participating
Teachers engage in local and/or state-level professional development according to their individual and/or group needs. Support, formative assessment and professional development for participating teachers is locally designed and implemented within their local context and according to program standards and credential requirements. Other trainings have been developed by the state agencies, cluster staff and BTSA programs to prepare administrators for their work with participating teachers, Support Providers for their role as coaches for participating teachers, and for local program leaders (BTSA Basics).

Quality Control/Program Improvement Mechanisms and Program Evaluation and Accountability

Quality control and a process of continuous feedback and improvement is built into BTSA programs. Overall program evaluation is accomplished in a variety of manners. Participant evaluation and feedback is sought after most or all staff development workshops and events. Programs conduct annual surveys of Participating Teachers, Support Providers and site administrators as part of a self review process. Programs also engage in a cooperative Peer Program Review (PPR). The PPR begins with a team self study of the program based on all twenty of the program induction standards. This is followed by the partnering team of the program focused on five of the standards. Feedback and results are used by programs to update and create Annual Improvement Plans.

Additionally, beginning this year, selected programs will also cycle through a formal Induction Program Review (IPR) process. The IPR process is similar to but more in depth than the PPR. Programs conduct an detailed self evaluation study, develop a program narrative, descriptions and evidence of how the program is meeting all twenty induction standards. The self study is then evaluated by a visiting team which reviews evidence, conducts interviews and focus groups to determine whether and which standards the program is meeting.

Quality control is also maintained via Support Provider training. Support providers must be trained in the formative assessment system used in their local programs. Depending on the program, they are also provided a great variety of other staff development activities and trainings.

Structural Variations in Program Design

BTSA Induction programs vary in organizational design and include single district programs, consortia of districts as well as large, county office of education-based consortia. Each BTSA Induction program works in collaboration with one or more college or university partner or institutions of higher education or IHE (BTSA Basics, [http://www.btsa.ca.gov/BTSA_basics.html](http://www.btsa.ca.gov/BTSA_basics.html)).
BTSA programs also vary regarding where in the organizational structure they are located. In some districts BTSA is located within staff developments, in others BTSA is included as part of instructional services and in still others within personnel departments.

Programs also vary in the number and type of Support Providers. Some programs rely exclusively on part-time support providers who are still classroom teachers. Other prefer full time Support Provider released from the classrooms. Commonly programs have a mix of both full and part-time providers.

**The California Alternative Certification Intern Program**

Authorized in 1967, California Internship Teacher Preparation programs are intended to serve as alternative routes for teacher credentialing. Internship programs are operated by school districts, county offices of education, colleges, universities, and other public entities designed to offer instructional leadership for beginning teachers. Internship programs allow participants to complete their teacher preparation coursework and credential requirements during their first or second year in a paid teaching position. The program provides instruction to improve teaching practices and a support system for interns through university or district faculty. Candidates who complete internship programs receive the same credential as individuals who participate in a traditional teacher preparation program. The goal of these alternative programs is to help school districts meet the increasing demand for credentialed teachers by supporting the recruitment of second-career professionals and college students into the teaching profession. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) reports that more than 20,000 teachers have received their teaching credentials through participation in internship programs.

In response to California’s teacher shortage and in recognition of the effectiveness of internship programs to attract candidates from diverse professional backgrounds to the teaching profession, the current Internship program was established to sustain existing internship programs and to support the creation of new programs. This incentive funding for alternative certification (intern) programs followed the enactment of Assembly Bill (AB) 1161 (Quackenbush, 1993), which addressed “shortages in the teaching workforce by encouraging public school districts, county offices of education, and colleges and universities to design concentrated programs leading to a credential.”

**Basic Structures in the Intern Program Design**

Internship programs led by institutions of higher education, by school districts and by private agencies in conjunction with districts, offer training programs for prospective teachers,
administrators, counselors, and other school practitioners. To qualify for an internship program, an individual must have passed the CBEST, met the subject matter competence requirement, and obtained character and identification clearance, complete intern required pre-service training and secure a teaching position. An intern teaching candidate, during the one-year to two-year training period, holds an internship credential that is granted by the Commission. Each intern also earns a salary from the employing school district. The enabling legislation, however, permits districts to pay interns a smaller salary to offset training costs.

Internship programs are alternative training programs primarily because interns provide instructional services while they complete requisite courses in educational principles and methods. In the course of their training, interns provide professional services earlier than other credential candidates. For this reason the State requires interns to fulfill higher standards of admission to preparation programs than other candidates. Because each intern earns a salary while completing professional studies, internship programs may be especially attractive to individuals who have previously entered other professions and are interested in becoming educators.

The Commission has encouraged the development and implementation of internship programs for prospective teachers, administrators, counselors, and other educators since 1974. In each professional category, the Commission has required internship programs to satisfy the same standards as non-internship programs in the same category. Additionally, the Commission has adopted expanded standards and preconditions for internship programs which apply to internships in all professional categories. Thus an internship program for prospective teachers must fulfill the Commission's standards for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs, plus the Commission's additional requirements for internship programs.

State laws and Commission policies have emphasized the importance of collaborative development and administration of internship programs. To sponsor internship programs, postsecondary institutions collaborate more extensively with school districts and professional organizations than is the case for non-internship programs. In fact, the Commission's requirements for internship programs have focused almost exclusively on the collaborative governance of these programs, as well as the preparation the interns receive prior to assuming responsibility for their internship assignment.

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) is the agency responsible for administering and overseeing California's Intern programs. Beginning in 1993 the CTC issued Requests for Proposals for intern training program grants. The RFP's were sent to all school districts, county
offices of education and CTC approved institutes of higher education statewide, as well as other
groups requesting the RFP (McKibbin & Hawley, 2000).

Proposed programs were reviewed by a “trained panel of professional educators” including
teachers, administrators, university members and CTC staff. Grants were awarded by the
Executive Director of the CTC to programs “that recruit, prepare and support intern teachers in
California public schools (K-12)” (McKibbin & Hawley, 2000). In their January 2000 report to the
CTC Committee on Preparation standards, McKibbin and Hawley provide the following list of
funding criteria:

- Demonstrated need and rational for the program
- Description of the participants to be served, and recruitment efforts, and selection
  processes
- Geographic distribution of proposals
- Quality of curriculum in the program, including the quality and reading and mathematics
  instruction
- Quality of instructional staff in the program
- Quality of support provided
- Quality of selection and preparation of support providers
- Quality of assessment of each intern’s performance
- Budget for the proposed program
- Cost-effectiveness of the proposed program

Successive rounds of these grants have since been issued in two year funding cycles.

Once approved and implemented, intern programs are administered locally by the sponsoring
district, institute of higher education or agency. Both district internship programs and
university internship programs are required to meet the same standards of quality as
traditional teacher preparation programs. In both programs, interns are public school teachers
of record while they complete their training. However, only in university programs do
participants earn higher education credits, making possible progress to a graduate degree.
In both programs, interns should be provided with a district site support provider.

Until 2002 when it was put in hiatus for budgetary reasons, the CTC conducted periodic
accreditation of all intern programs. CTC staff report that the accreditation reviews are to
resume starting this year, but no accreditation reviews had been held during the study period
covered in this report.
Programs differ from one another in a number of other respects. They vary in both length and intensity ranging from about one to two full years of training. In some programs classes meet for several hours once per week, other meet several times a week and some have training programs on the weekends. In many, but not all, university programs interns are enrolled in the same classes and study the same curricula as traditional pre-service teacher candidates.

During the study period covered in this report internship programs have not been subject to an external review process equivalent in scope, rigor and intensity of the BTSA IPR process. Some mechanisms are place, however, to provide for quality control and on-going program improvement. Chief among them is the annual Program Improvement Plan (PIP) submitted to the CTC upon which continued funding is contingent. The PIP must include, among other information, a narrative with information about the credentials offered, the recruiting process used, methods used to support and assess intern performance, selection and training of support providers.
III. What Previous Research Tells Us about these Programs

This section provides a brief overview of what can be learned about teacher induction and alternative credentialing from previous research on these topics. As the review describes, both topics have generated a fairly robust body of useful research work, and both have produced some points of conflict and controversy.

The Teacher Work Force: Shortages, Retention and Quality

For the past twenty-five or thirty years there have been growing concerns in the United States about ensuring an adequate supply of well-qualified teachers. This was initially fueled by the fact that a significant percentage of America’s teaching workforce was approaching retirement age, the belief that not enough qualified replacements were being produced by teacher education programs, and the needs of a growing and increasingly diverse population of school-aged children. These initial concerns about teacher quantity gave way to concerns about teacher quality. Beginning in the 1980’s, following the publication of A Nation At Risk, policy makers and the American public in general increasingly focused on American competitiveness and the quality and qualifications of the nation’s teachers (The National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983). In 2001, this concern materialized in the “highly qualified” mandate of No Child Left Behind (“No Child Left Behind Act of 2001,” 2001).

Concerns about quality and quantity have driven policy and research to focus on teacher training, recruitment and retention. The teaching profession has a notoriously poor retention history. Researchers have documented a U-shaped retention pattern, with most teachers leaving the profession early in their careers or close to retirement (Guarino, Santibanez, & Daley, 2006). New teachers, those in their first five years of teaching, drop out of the profession at a troubling rate. It is commonly believed that half of all new teachers leave the profession during their first five years of teaching. Research by Ingersoll (2006) supports this belief, finding that 46% leave teaching after 5 years, and 24% after just two years.

Problems with retention are not just issues of quantity but also relate to teacher quality. A variety of research has documented that veteran teachers are more effective teachers, and students learn more from them. Because it takes a few years for novice teachers to become effective, early drop outs often leave the profession just as they becoming effective and are being replaced, once again, by less effective novices.

Providing students with “highly qualified” teachers has also focused attention on teacher training and recruitment of individuals with content knowledge and sought-after skills. Many question whether America’s teachers, prepared in liberal studies, pedagogy and child development, truly have the skills, experience, and educational credentials to adequately teach what America’s children really need to know.
Accordingly, a variety of public policy options have been proposed or adopted to remedy these teacher workforce problems. The focus of this report is on two such policy options adopted by the State of California, Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program and the California Intern Program.

**The California Approach: Ensuring Qualified, Competent Teachers for All Students**

California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA) and Internship Program are both part of the State’s on-going efforts to recruit and retain a qualified, competent teaching work force. BTSA Induction is the State’s new teacher induction program through which teachers earn their Clear Credential. The Intern Program is the State’s alternative certification program which places qualified candidates in classrooms while they earn their Preliminary Teaching Credential. Though both programs are part of the State’s teacher training and recruitment efforts, their primary policy objectives differ in clear and important ways.

**Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment**

**Legislative Intent**

BTSA is principally designed to support new teacher transition from pre-service training into the career by building their knowledge and skills to enable them to more effectively teach California’s diverse student body, and retain them in the profession.

As prescribed by California Education Code 44279.2(b), the intent of BTSA is to:

1. To provide an effective transition into a teaching career for first-year and second-year teachers in California.

2. To improve the educational performance of students through improved training, information and assistance for new teachers.

3. To enable beginning teachers to be effective in teaching students who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse.

4. To ensure the professional success and retention of new teachers.

5. To ensure that a support provider provides intensive individualized support and assistance to each beginning teacher.
(6) To improve the rigor and consistency of individual teacher performance assessments and the usefulness of assessment results to teachers and decision makers.

(7) To establish an effective, coherent system of performance assessments that are based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.

(8) To examine alternative ways in which the general public and the educational profession may be assured that new teachers who remain in teaching have attained acceptable levels of professional competence.

(9) To ensure that an Individual Induction Plan for each beginning teacher is based on an ongoing assessment of the beginning teacher's development.

(10) To ensure continuous program improvement through ongoing research, development and evaluation

The overriding character of BTSA Induction is Standards Based Accountability (SBA). The language and demands of Standards Based Accountability are pervasive throughout BTSA Induction. Programs are to be designed and evaluated according to the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs. Individual teachers are assessed in accordance with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) using an approved assessment system (statewide or locally developed), and are expected to master and teach adopted state content standards.

BTSA began in 1992 as a voluntary program of support and assessment which evolved out of the successes of the California New Teacher Project (1988-1992). Established by SB 1422 (Bergeson), the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) were given shared responsibility for BTSA implementation and administration. Actual administration was carried out by a task force of members from both the CTC and CDE.

Under SB 1422, codified in California Education Code 44279.1-44279.7 the “Marian Bergeson Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment System“ originally sought to:

- Provide an effective transition into the teaching for first-year and second-year teachers in California.

- Improve the educational performance of students through improved training, information, and assistance for new teachers.

- Ensure the professional success and retention of new teachers.

- Identify teaching novices who need additional feedback, assistance and training
● Improve the rigor and consistency of individual teacher performance assessments and the usefulness of assessment results to teachers and decision makers.

● Establish an effective, coherent system of performance assessments.

● Examine alternative ways in which the general public and the educational profession may be assured that new teachers who remain in teaching have attained acceptable levels of professional competence (Olebe, 2001, pp. 73-74).

As initially established by SB 1422, participation in BTSA was voluntary for both educational agencies and individual teachers from 1992 through 1997.

In 1997, both the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for BTSA Programs were adopted by the CTC and the CDE. In the same year, AB 1266 (Mazzoni) expanded BTSA goals to:

● Enable beginning teachers to be effective in teaching pupils who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse.

● Ensure that a support provider provides intensive individualized support and assistance to each participating beginning teacher.

● Establish an effective, coherent system of performance assessments based on the CSTP

● Ensure that an individual induction plan is in place for each participating beginning teacher and is based on an ongoing assessment of the development of the beginning teacher.

● Ensure continuous program improvement through ongoing research, development, and evaluation (Olebe, 2001).

The following year, 1998, SB 2042 (Alpert) established that, contingent on funding, BTSA would become the Statewide induction program. All new teachers in the State of California would earn their Clear Credential by completing two years of BTSA training. SB 2042 also established that in 2003 BTSA would become a Statewide credentialing mechanism responsible for recommending candidates for Clear Credentials upon satisfactory completion. SB 2042 further established BTSA as a standards-based accountability reform by mandating

● Alignment of teacher preparation standards with State adopted academic and content and performance standards for students.
• A new requirement that teachers pass a teaching performance assessment embedded in their preparation program prior to earning a preliminary teaching credential (BTSA Basics, www.btsa.ca.gov).

Most recently, SB 1209 (Scott) effective January 1, 2007 retains BTSA’s place as the State induction program and mechanism for earning a Clear Professional Credential. However, SB 1209 shifts the focus of induction from “study” to the “application of skills and knowledge” previously acquired in a preliminary credential.

**California’s Intern Program**

**Legislative Intent**

The Intern Program is designed to remedy specific problems in the teacher labor market by attracting a new pool of teachers—second career seekers, those with math and science backgrounds and minorities—and placing them in difficult to fill assignments—schools with high poverty, large numbers of minorities and second language learners, and in certain urban and remote rural areas (Chin, Young, & Floyd, 2004).

California Education Code 44380-44386 makes clear that the legislative intent of alternative certification is “to provide a concentrated program leading to a permanent teaching credential” (§ 44381) in order to:

• “recruit talented individuals” including those retiring from the military, industry and other career changers

• alleviate shortages of qualified teachers in the fields of math, science, technology

• address the need for teachers of limited-English-proficient students

• increase the numbers of minority teachers

• address shortages of teachers in certain geographic areas

In short, California’s Intern Programs are intended to be an accelerated path to the classroom for particular types of prospective teachers: candidates with workforce experience, highly sought after skills such as math and science, minorities, or difficult to fill assignments.

According to the CTC, alternative pathways to the classroom, recognize that:

a post-baccalaureate teacher preparation program, is often difficult, if not impossible for many prospective teachers. In particular, non-traditional students such as those with maturity, those making career changes, those with family obligations, or those who
cannot afford to forfeit crucial income while they complete their credential requirements, may find the traditional route to be especially onerous. In many cases, these programs appeal to individuals with a good deal of work experience in other fields and for whom traditional teacher preparation programs (those with coursework followed by student teaching) may be less suited than an integrated, experiential-based program. Without options, otherwise talented individuals, many of whom have specialized skills in selected subject areas, may be dissuaded from pursuing a career in teaching (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2006, p. 54)

In essence, the internship path to the classroom and credential potentially offers both a qualitative and quantitative solution to the State’s chronic teacher shortage problem: quantitatively, by attracting a pool of individuals who otherwise might not enter the teaching profession and offering them an accelerated path to a full credential, and qualitatively, by bringing experienced individuals with backgrounds in math, science or technology into the classroom.

Alternative certification programs are part of a larger wave of quasi-deregulation, market-driven approaches to school improvement (Chin et al., 2004). Because California’s Internship Program is market driven, it is more sensitive to shifting demands in the labor market (Chin et al., 2004; Chin & Young, 2007; McKibbin, 2001). As Chin and Young aptly note:

When the demand for elementary school teachers rapidly increased as a result of California’s class-size reduction legislation, the intern programs responded by admitting and preparing large numbers of elementary candidates. As children progressed through the system and enrollments dropped in elementary schools, there was a concomitant rise in the numbers of secondary candidates prepared through intern programs (Chin and Asera, 2005; McKibbin, 2001). The demand for special education teachers led programs already authorized to prepare special education teachers to increase their numbers and for new programs to emerge and acquire state authorization for these credentials (Chin & Young, 2007, p. 75)

Legislative History

Today’s California Intern Program draws its roots from the Alternative Teacher Certification Act of 1993, AB 1161 (Quackenbush). AB 1161 rolled together two earlier laws and established funding criteria for two separate intern programs. The 1967 Teacher Education Internship Act established university based intern programs and the 1983 Hughes-Hart Education Reform Act authorized districts to establish intern programs. Under AB 1161 (Quackenbush, 1993), both programs received both legislative and fiscal support in the form of matching grants. This was the first time that funding was authorized for intern programs in California. In the same year,
the state budget included an appropriation of $2 million to support teacher internship programs.

This legislation established that internships were to be fully salaried, tenure track positions with interns established as the teacher of record. The duration of the internship was to be one or two years, with a pre-service program to provide foundation skills needed to begin teaching. Each intern would undertake coursework and would be supported by a network of service providers. Performance would be assessed jointly by the teacher preparation program and the employing district.

The Intern Program was enhanced in 1997, with AB 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle) authorizing increased funding for intern programs, and AB 309 (Mazzoni) authorizing increases of the per capita spending per intern to $2500. The State Budget fully appropriated these authorized funds. In 2002, SB 2029 (Alarcon) allowed district intern programs to offer intern certificates in all areas of special education.

In 2006, SB 1209 included additional funding incentives to programs that would enhance their internship programs. Three specific enhancements were required, including: adding hours for English learner pre-service preparation; enhancing on-site support for each intern by a certificated teacher at that school site; and maintaining specified ratios and comparative percentages of new and experienced teachers in high priority schools. If programs agreed to these enhancements, funding could be increased $1,000 per intern.

Evaluating Program Effectiveness

Though both programs are new teacher training and credentialing mechanisms and both are concerned with teacher quality and effectiveness, it is clear that their policy objectives are quite different. This is important to consider when evaluating the “effectiveness” of each. When evaluating either program, it is important to ask not just how effective the program is generally, but also how effective the program is in terms of its policy objectives. That is, how effective is BTSA at providing new teachers with skills to improve student learning? Or, at teaching students who are culturally, linguistically and academically diverse? How effective is BTSA in terms of new teacher retention? How effective is the California Intern Program in attracting second career seekers, those with math and science backgrounds, and individuals of color? How effective is the Intern Program in placing teachers in high shortage geographic areas, and “difficult to fill” assignments?

What follows is a review of the research literature on teacher induction programs and alternative certification. Research from both national studies and studies of California’s
programs are examined in an attempt to answer these and other questions. We begin by looking at new teacher induction and BTSA.

**New Teacher Induction and California’s BTSA Program**

Teacher induction is a relatively new concept in teacher education. Until the 1990’s formal induction programs were virtually unheard of. New teachers were given the keys to their classroom, a copy of the textbook, and were sent to the classroom to teach.

Help, if any, for these new teachers came in the form of isolated instances of advice from the veteran next door or from an informal “buddy” teacher. Guidance often involved procedural information such as how to fill out paperwork or tips for handling unruly students, but rarely about instruction. For the most part, new teachers were on their own, isolated behind the doors of their classrooms. The research literature is full of metaphors describing the first years of teaching as “trial by fire,” “make it or break it,” or “sink or swim.” (Bartell, 2005; Moir & Gless, 2001)

Left to sink or swim, many sank. Others became very skilled swimmers. But, many new teachers neither sank nor learned to be great swimmers and instead learned to tread water—keeping their heads above the surface but not making progress. Indeed, a variety of research has shown that new teachers quickly abandon newly learned “best practices” and adopt survival strategies. Unfortunately, once adopted, these teaching practices tend to be tenacious, frequently setting patterns of practice that continue throughout a career. Induction, among other things, seeks to interrupt this tendency by easing the transition into teaching, supporting effective instruction, focusing on student learning, and instilling habits of reflection on and development of classroom practice.

While “sink or swim” was the method of teacher induction by default for years, induction programs have become increasingly common throughout the country due to both projected teacher shortages and growing public concern about the quality of education. Beginning with the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, and culminating with passage of No Child Left Behind, initial concerns about pending teacher shortages turned to even greater concerns about the quality and skills of our nation’s teachers. A real and perceived crisis about American competitiveness, falling student achievement, and recognition of a growing achievement gap fueled calls for “highly qualified” teachers in every classroom.

Teacher induction programs are today seen as both a qualitative and quantitative response to issues of teacher retention, teacher quality and effectiveness, student achievement, and demands for accountability. Induction is seen by many as the first, and vitally important, stage in a continuum of professional development that should stretch throughout a career (Bartell, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 2001, 2003; Watzke, 2007). Many even hail induction as a “catalyst for change”—meant to reform, or transform, and professionalize the entire teaching profession (Moir & Gless, 2001; Olebe, 2001).
California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program

In California, BTSA, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program fills the role of induction. California has much to be proud of about the BTSA program which is frequently cited in the research as a “model” program to be emulated (Bartell, 2005; Lopez, Lash, Schaffner, Shields, & Wagner, 2004; Mitchell & Boyns, 2002; Scott Hendrick & Childress, 2002; WestEd, 2002).

The BTSA approach to teacher induction is a developmental model, with formative assessment, reflection and mentoring as central components. BTSA offers both individualized assistance and, at the same time, a coherent and structured set of intentionally designed activities to develop and improve new teacher practice.

California’s BSTA is unique. It is not only a statewide, high-profile participation program for most new teachers in California but, more importantly, BTSA is now the State credentialing mechanism for those teachers. New teachers with Single and Multiple Subject Preliminary Credentials in their first or second year of teaching, former Interns that now hold a preliminary credential and teachers with out-of-state credentials must all participate in BTSA in order to secure a clear credential. BTSA programs, run in many cases by the employing school district, recommend that teachers, upon program completion, to be awarded Clear Credentials by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Policy Changes: Unintended Consequences?

While, in many ways, the structure and philosophy of the BTSA program are quite mature, researchers note that policy changes and program evolution may have changed the nature of BTSA in subtle but important ways. First, the addition of credentialing may have changed program emphasis from mentoring and individualized support to compliance. As Olebe (2001) notes:

For the first time BTSA programs will need to meet a higher threshold of legal defensibility . . . Careful records of teacher progress through the system will have to be maintained. . . Extending accountability in an environment where excellence is perceived as the quality of the teacher to teacher experience will ultimately either compromise its viability, turning the program into a compliance effort, or bolster its effectiveness by rewarding teacher efforts through acknowledgment of extended professional accomplishment (p. 81, emphasis added).

Though Olebe was speculating, WestEd’s 2002 Independent Evaluation of BTSA contained a hint that this may be happening, finding that some BTSA programs became “increasingly regimented as they moved beyond serving volunteer teachers to those who are required to
enter the program” (WestEd, 2002). Additionally, shifting the credentialing function to LEAs puts the employers, who frequently are under intense pressure to fill openings, in charge of credentialing.

Second, legislating BTSA as a universal requirement, rather than a voluntary program has greatly increased the number and type of both participants and providers. A number of researchers question whether early findings documenting BTSA successes will still hold, now that the program extends to all new teachers rather than just those who self selected for participation. Just the sheer volume of new teachers needing induction is a challenge for many districts that struggle to find sufficient numbers of qualified Support Providers (WestEd, 2002). Though they sound somewhat trivial, organizational and administrative challenges and inadequacies at local school districts play a role in districts’ hiring ability.

Additionally, Olebe notes that this expansion came without a corresponding increase in staff or infrastructure at the state level. This, according to Olebe, led to the creation of an “external infrastructure” of practitioners with clusters and regional directors.

The third, and related change, was a shift in the “lead players” in BTSA from the universities to the LEAs. BTSA began as a cooperative project between university researchers and local practitioners. However, the role of universities was curtailed after changes in funding allocations under Proposition 98 following settlement of CTA v. Gould (Olebe, p76). The universities’ early role as active, central participants in developing research based BTSA practices has been limited in some cases to little more than “mechanical exchanges of documents and dollars for services” (Olebe, p.76). This change, coupled with the extension of the credentialing function to school districts, has changed the roles of both the universities and the LEAs. What was formerly the traditional domain of professors of education is now the domain of local professional practitioners.

Taken together these changes have created a number of new questions and important issues for researchers to grapple with (Achinstein, Ogawa, & Speiglman, 2004; Grossman & Thompson, 2004; Smith, 2007; Young, 2007). Clearly, the traditional roles of universities and school districts in teacher education have changed. School districts and local educational professionals are now the key decision makers in the arena of new teacher induction, education, and credentialing and BTSA program development.

The following reviews the state of the research on BTSA as well as research on induction in general. Examined are the state of knowledge on the effect on new teacher retention, impact on new teacher effectiveness and student achievement, and what is known about components of effective programs. In addition, much of the existing research on BTSA was research on BTSA as a voluntary program prior to Induction. This confounds self-selection effects with program effects, and thus findings may no longer hold for today’s BTSA Induction programs. While there are speculations about the impact of this policy evolution, the full implications are unclear because the research literature has yet to catch up with changing program structures.
Research on Retention and Effectiveness

Teacher attrition, according to researchers, is caused by myriad factors: low salaries, difficult working conditions, inadequate teacher preparation, lack of administrative support, lack of student discipline, lack of public and parent respect for teachers, excessive paperwork and demands of additional assignments, increasing student diversity in numbers of English Language Learners, poverty, class size, and overcrowding, along with other problems besetting public schools (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005; Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005; Reed, Rueben, & Barbour, 2006; Strong, 2005). New teachers, in particular, struggle with problems of classroom management, curriculum, culture, practice shock, and disillusionment (Achinstein, 2007; Flores, 2006; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Kardos & Johnson, 2007; Kauffman, Johnson, Kardos, Liu, & Peske, 2002; Lortie, 2002; Veenman, 1985). In many cases this leads to abandonment of the profession, before they are fully effective (Bartell, 2005; Brock & Grady, 2007; Gold, 1996; Veenman, 1985).

Accordingly, a variety of public policy options, from lower class size and raising salaries, to building more schools and increasing teacher training requirements have been tried in an effort to remedy teacher retention problems. Induction programs, such as BTSA, assume that providing additional teacher training, with individualized support, mentoring, formative assessment and feedback, will also increase new teacher retention by making teachers better equipped to handle the realities and difficulties of teaching. Given that this is not the only policy option that might effectively address the problem of retention, it is important that we turn to existing research on BTSA and induction to ask: what is the evidence that BTSA (or other induction programs) positively impacts new teacher retention?

Early studies of BTSA and its forerunner, the California New Teacher Project (CNTP), offered promising findings regarding new teacher retention. More recent studies also report that BTSA appears to have some positive impact on retention (Reed et al., 2006; Villar & Strong, 2007; WestEd, 2002).

WestEd (2002) examined the effect of BTSA participation on new teacher retention. They looked for differences in retention rates between rural and urban, high and low poverty districts, and by varying program size and maturity. Though handicapped by missing data and data access problems, WestEd was able to provide some program level estimates of retention. For most of the programs for which they had data, retention was quite high, with 93% of first and second year teachers retained. The exception was two “outlier” programs which reported retention rates of 66.7% and 70.7%.

WestEd found no relationship between rural and urban districts and their corresponding retention rate. They did, however, find a relationship between the level of district poverty and retention. Surprisingly, their data indicated that higher poverty districts exhibited high retention rates. Additionally, they found no relationship between program size or program maturity and retention outcomes. In other words, large programs performed as well as small
ones and new programs as well as more established earlier adopters programs. The authors interpret this as a positive sign that, in spite of the growth and State wide expansion of BTSA, program quality is being maintained.

Reed, Rueben and Barbour (2006) also examined the relationship between BTSA participation and new teacher retention. In order to estimate the impact of BTSA on retention, they utilized data from pre-1996, before BTSA became mandated state wide in 1998. This allowed them to compare retention rates between BTSA and non-BTSA participants. The authors found positive results, reporting that retention was improved by 26% for multiple subject credential holders and 16% for single subject credential holders. For this gain, the State expended approximately $3,370 per year per participant, matched by $2000 in district in-kind support.

Reed, Rueben and Barbour also compared the cost effectiveness of BTSA against another policy option for improving retention—raising salaries. Raising starting salaries by $4,400 during the same time period was associated with retention increases of 17% for multiple subject credential holders and 9% for single subject credential holders. In short, using data from the 1990’s, they concluded that BTSA was both a more effective retention tool and a more cost effective tool.

Though these findings are quite encouraging, it is important to note Reed, Rueben and Barbour’s caveat. While it is advantageous to use data from the early 1990’s in order to have non-BTSA “control” groups for comparison, doing so creates self-selection problems. Since “earlier adopter” BTSA programs involved only organizations and individuals who volunteered to participate, these findings may not extend to the current policy environment which includes all new teachers and programs, willing or not.

Villar and Strong (2007) employed cost-benefit analysis to determine the effectiveness of a “comprehensive mentoring program” for beginning teachers in a single California school district. They asked “What is the rate of return of a comprehensive model of new teacher induction?” (p21). They found that after five years the costs of the program were off-set by positive gains in teacher effectiveness and, to a lesser extent, by cost savings due to improved retention. Assuming that the replacement cost of a new teacher is equal to about 50% of their salary, Strong and Villar estimate that after 5 years, induction saved the district $3,763 per teacher ($807 per year) in terms of reduced attrition alone. Strong and Villar note that, based on research by Fuller (2000) that turnover costs run between 15% and 150% of a teacher’s salary. Villar and Strong concluded that induction as a policy is highly cost effective, with a return of $1.66 per $1.00 spent by a district.

It is important to note that the Villar and Strong study was a case study of a single district, which provided the benefit of in depth analysis but also comes with the usual questions about generalizability. This district differed from BTSA providers in that it was consortium program using an alternative formative assessment other than CFASST (California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers), the State’s developed system.
These three recent studies provided evidence that California’s BTSA Induction programs may increase new teacher retention and may even be a cost effective means of mitigating attrition. They are also in line with other non-California studies of new teacher induction and retention (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Smith, 2007; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Improving teacher retention is, without any doubt, an important policy objective. However, improved retention is only one goal of effective induction programs. No one argues that the goal should be to retain all new teachers regardless of inclination or ability. BTSA and other well designed induction programs also seek to improve performance and ensure that the teacher of record is effective in terms of classroom practices and results. In the next section, we turn to research on teacher effectiveness.

**Teacher Effectiveness**

New teacher induction programs aim much higher than just retaining teachers. Induction programs recognize that new teachers, regardless of how well prepared or how knowledgeable of content and pedagogy, are still beginners, learning to teach and developing as professionals (Bartell, 2005). Research has suggested that new teachers are less effective than their more experienced colleagues for their first few years in the classroom. Induction programs aim to support new teachers’ transition into the profession and to accelerate the learning curve so that new teachers become more effective in a shorter period of time.

Does the research literature support this notion? That is, is there any evidence that induction programs such as BTSA improve new teachers’ effectiveness? Answering this question is not easy. The research literature is replete with studies that attempt to define, assess, measure, describe or observe teacher effectiveness with outcome variables that range from teacher self-assessment to student scores on standardized tests (Wayne & Youngs, 2003; Whisnant, Elliott, & Pynchon, 2005). There is a great debate among educational researchers about appropriate definition and measurement of effectiveness (WestEd, 2002). The debate is compounded by issues of quality and availability of data forcing researchers to rely in some cases on weak proxies for effectiveness.

Early research on the California New Teacher Program (CNTP) found that participants were more effective than non participants. According to a 1992 report *Success for Beginning Teachers: The California New Teacher Project* participants,

more consistently used instructional practices that improve student achievement, more complex and, challenging instructional activities, and a wider range of instructional materials. They were more successful in both motivating and setting high expectations for students from diverse backgrounds (Olebe, 2001, p.72)

Mitchell, Scott-Hendrick and Boyns (1998) examined annual statewide surveys of BTSA participants, their support providers and site administrators from 1996-1998 in 34 school
districts located in Southern California. Analysis revealed that BTSA positively impacted new teacher effectiveness in terms of reported ability, confidence and career satisfaction.

Though this research does provide evidence suggesting that BTSA does impact teacher effectiveness, there are a few drawbacks. First, it is not clear that early implementers typify current BTSA programs statewide. Second, these studies did not measure actual student achievement. Rather, they report on use of instructional practices associated with increase student achievement and self reported impacts. Quite simply, none measure actual student achievement.

One of the reasons for the lack of research measuring the impact of BTSA on actual student achievement is due to data limitations. The necessary California teacher work-force data is fragmented in a variety of databases held by a variety of state agencies. Data on BTSA participants, credentials held, years of experience, districts and teaching assignment is difficult or impossible to link with student performance data.

In the 2002 study of BTSA, the first independent evaluation, WestEd had initially planned to estimate BTSA impact on student achievement. However, because of inherent data problems, they could not do it. Stymied, WestEd recommended that the State undertake the construction of a Statewide database which would make research of this type possible.

A 2004 report by the Educational Testing Service (Thompson, Paek, Goe, & Ponte, 2004) studied the impact of BTSA and CFASST on the practices of a small group of beginning teachers and performance of their students on standardized tests (CAT-6 and CST in English Language Arts and math). They found that teachers who were “more engaged” in CFASST had higher scores in 7 of 10 instructional practices associated with student learning (though the only score that was statistically significant was in instructional planning). In terms of student achievement they found that no statistically significant differences. Puzzlingly, in spite of a lack of statistical significance, the authors report effect sizes with some confidence.

**BTSA and Induction Program Components, Program Effectiveness**

Induction programs vary greatly in terms of scope, intensity, design and structure. However certain common elements-- mentoring, seminars and staff development, reflection on practice-- exist in most programs (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004; Athanases & Achinstein, 2003; Molner Kelley, 2004; Young, 2007; Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008). What are the components of effective induction programs?

According to Moir and Gless (2001) the five “essential components” of quality induction include program vision, institutional commitment and support, quality mentoring, professional standards and classroom based teacher learning. They define program vision as seeing induction as more than just a means to retain more teachers but as means of creating a “new
kind of professionalism.” Induction without this type of vision, according to the authors, risks reinforcing “traditional” norms of “isolation, low expectations, and inefficacy” (p. 111).

Bartell (2005) details twelve “characteristics of effective induction programs” including: clarity of purpose, attention to leadership, collaboration, support and understanding by site administrators, linkages with universities, attention to context, carefully selected and trained mentors, structured time for collaboration, professional development that is developmentally appropriate, individual follow-up and feedback and program evaluation.

Clearly BTSA Induction programs in the State of California contain, in varying degrees, many of the components that these authors deem essential to effective induction programs. However, as of yet there has not been a study that compares the variety of BTSA implementations across the State to discern which programs are more effective and why.
Alternative Certification and California’s Intern Program

Traditional, university-based teacher preparation—with coursework and student teaching prior to securing a credential and becoming a teacher—is not the only path to the teaching profession. All fifty states currently offer some type of alternative certification program as a route to the classroom for eligible individuals.

Alternative credentialing programs are not new to education, though they have seen tremendous growth in the past 10 years. Programs and pathways labeled alternative certification are very diverse both across and within states (E. Feistritzer, 2007; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Humphrey, Wechsler, & Hough, 2008). Alternative certification programs vary in structure, duration, intensity, curriculum, participant characteristics and the targeted market. They are run by universities, school districts, county offices of education and a variety of private entrepreneurial enterprises. The great variety of alternative certification programs, and lack of agreement on definition, has been problematic for research (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001). Although diverse, nearly all offer a rapid path to paid, full-time teaching positions with full or nearly full-time salaries while they are completing preliminary credential requirements.

Alternative Certification in California

The State of California provides a number of pathways to prepare teachers to teach in California’s K-12 public schools. As in most states, individuals can enter teaching through traditional, pre-service teacher preparation programs or through alternative certification routes. However, the majority of California teacher preparation routes are post-baccalaureate programs (a few teachers are being prepared in “blended” programs involving undergraduate study). While traditional teacher preparation programs have long provided the vast majority of the State’s teachers, the past ten years have witnessed a growing percentage of the teaching workforce prepared through alternative routes. Currently, approximately 20% of California’s new teachers are prepared through an internship program. Internship programs are California’s alternative certification route.

Whereas in traditional teacher preparation programs, prospective teachers complete a teacher training program prior to entering the classroom as the teacher of record, California’s interns are placed directly in the classroom, as fully paid teachers of record, while they are enrolled in a teacher intern training program. Interns are teachers—fully paid, fully responsible, public
school teachers of record. They are also students—concurrently completing an approved intern credentialing program. Essentially, internships can be thought of as on the job training. They offer a parallel route of simultaneous training and teaching leading, in theory, to full certification more rapidly than in traditional teacher preparation programs.

Structurally, California has two types of internship programs: university programs and school district programs. Some district programs rely on private entrepreneurial agencies for part of their training. In the university programs, intern teachers take courses in pedagogy after their teaching day ends. The courses usually, but not always, are located on the university campus and are taught by university professors. Frequently, interns attend the same “pre-existing” university classes as traditional, pre-service teacher candidates (Chin et al., 2004, p. 7). The universities also generally provide “supervisors” who occasionally make classroom observations and provide support for the intern.

In district programs, the interns also take classes after school, but the classes are generally taught at the school district by district employees and professional educators often with university faculty participating as part-time adjuncts. The content of district intern programs tends to reflect the district vision and priorities.

In California, intern training programs are typically one to two years in length and are expected to meet the same standards for preparation as traditional pre-service based teacher preparation programs. As in traditional pre-service programs, interns must possess a bachelor’s degree, demonstrate subject matter competency, pass a test of basic skills such as the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) and be finger printed and cleared through a criminal background check by the FBI. Additionally, intern candidates are required to complete between 120 and 160 hours of pre-service observation and training.

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) issues interns a two-year Intern Credential while they are teaching and enrolled in an approved program, and with this Intern Credential, teachers are considered “highly qualified” under provisions of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Once they have completed the program, interns are eligible for a Preliminary Teaching Credential from the CTC. Having received a Preliminary Teaching Credential, former interns typically earn their Clear Credential through participation in the BTSA Program, often in “accelerated” one-year Early Completion Option BTSA Induction Programs as defined by SB 57 (Scott).

Though interns are deemed “highly qualified” for NCLB purposes, many are critical of this designation. In August 2007, a lawsuit was filed against the U.S. Department of Education and Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings for violating the “highly qualified” provisions of NCLB. The suit, Renee v. Spellings, filed in the U.S. District Court of San Francisco, essentially challenges agency regulations that permit interns, or teachers “participating in an alternative certification route,” to be designated “highly qualified.” Though the outcome of this suit will not be known for some time, if the plaintiffs prevail it will certainly have repercussions for
California’s intern programs and alternative certification programs across the nation (Public Advocates, 2007; Rosenhall, 2007; Rubin, 2007).

The heart of the lawsuit is not simply about definition, but about equity-- that alternative certification not only mislabels under or unqualified individuals as “highly qualified,” it also disproportionately places them in schools with high poverty and students of color. The next section of this report discusses the debate about alternative certification, which extends well beyond the courtroom walls.

**Alternative Certification: A Heated Debate**

There is one overarching and often heated debate in the research literature surrounding alternative certification (Chin & Young, 2007; Hawley, 1992; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; McKibbin, 2001). One side sees alternative certification as a superior method of teacher preparation, capable of improving both the size and quality of the teaching workforce. The other side sees alternative certification as an attempt to lower requirements for entry into the teaching profession and water down or eliminate vital training in content and pedagogy.

Proponents of alternative certification believe that alternative certification programs offer a qualitatively better approach to filling the nation’s classrooms by eliminating the barriers that block many qualified individuals from entering the profession (Chin et al., 2004; C. E. Feistritzer, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2004). It opens the classroom door to a pool of talent not coming out of traditional teacher education programs. According to Feistritzer, “[P]eople coming in to teaching through alternative routes tend to be older, people of color, more men, have academic degrees other than education, and have experiences in other occupations” (2001, p. 3). Months of unpaid student teaching is not possible for those who have family and other responsibilities that require that they work. Some argue that content knowledge and verbal ability are the only pre-service requirements needed to begin teaching (Abell Foundation, 2001; C. E. Feistritzer, 2001; Haberman, 2004).

Proponents also offer alternative certification programs as a market driven solution to the teacher shortage problem. Alternative certification unlocks university monopolies over teacher education--monopolies that they contend offer too much theory and too little practical content. The best teacher training, proponents argue, occurs on the job. Teachers learn to teach by teaching, not by attending university classes on pedagogy. Alternative certification programs offer “intense field-based, in the classroom, training and instruction” (Feistritzer, 2001). “The best way to learn to teach is by actually teaching and having access to a mentor, other teachers and online resources” (Haberman, 2004, p.3). In short, not only are alternative certification programs quicker and potentially less expensive, they are believed to be superior to traditional pre-service training.
Advocates of more traditional, university-based pre-service teacher preparation programs see alternative certification as an ill-advised band-aid to the teaching shortage. Opponents of alternative certification believe that the way to improve the quality of the teaching profession is to improve the rigor and requirements of pre-service preparation. In her recent article, “Constructing 21st Century Teacher Education” (2006), Linda Darling-Hammond argues that three critical components are needed for teacher education, including “tight coherence and integration among courses and between course work and clinical work in schools, extensive and intensely supervised clinical work integrated with course work using pedagogies that link theory and practice and closer, proactive relationships with schools that serve diverse learners effectively and develop and model good teaching.” She and others argue that many alternative certification programs represent attempts to “water down preparation” that should be resisted. Some see alternatively certified teachers as less qualified and under-certified, with students suffering as a result. Lasko-Kerr and Berliner (2003), in their article entitled “In Harm’s Way: How Undercertified Teachers Hurt Their Students,” say that alternatives to traditional certification should cause grave concern for both students and for teachers and their ability to be successful. While they specifically consider emergency credentials, their argument is about need for traditional certification to ensure quality.

Proponents and opponents make strong and passionate claims for their positions. However we agree with Humphrey and Wechsler (2007) that the “debate over alternative certification versus traditional certification has done more to obscure the facts than advance the research” (p. 490). In an effort to clarify what is and isn’t known from the research, we lay aside the philosophical debate. In the literature review that follows, we examine: who seeks alternative certification, where they teach, their retention and commitment to the profession, questions of teacher effectiveness and student achievement and components of effective programs. Shortcomings in the literature are raised and examined.

Who seeks alternative certification?

Do alternative certification programs, and particularly California’s Intern Program, attract the intended pool? Are they bringing individuals to teaching who would otherwise not teach?

Who enters teaching through alternative routes? How do they compare, in terms of demographics, work experience and educational background, to their traditionally-trained colleagues? Do alternative certification programs draw a pool of talented and knowledgeable candidates who would not otherwise consider or be unable to become teachers? In short, are the teachers flowing out of the alternative certification pipeline the pool envisioned by policymakers?

As noted in earlier sections of this report, alternative certification is intended to attract an older and more experienced group, second career seekers, retired military, people with sought-after skills and training such as engineering, math and science practitioners, minorities and people of
color, and individuals willing to work in difficult-to-serve, high poverty and urban schools. Does the research show that this is actually happening?

It has long been noted that most teachers who enter traditional pre-service teacher preparation are young, white, middle class, females (Ng, 2003). Although still overwhelmingly white and female, it does appear that alternative certification programs attract more minorities and people of color into teaching than traditional preparation programs (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001).

Zeicher and Schulte (2001) conclude from their examination of peer reviewed research that alternative certification programs attract more Hispanic and African Americans teachers in urban school districts. More recently, Humphrey and Weschler (2007) conducted in depth case studies of seven alternative certification programs across the nation. In these programs, they found that more than 40% of the participants were minorities. However, they note that the ethnic composition of their case studies does not appear to be reflective of the national average which places the figure at a much lower 14%. After further examination, they concluded that national averages are not the same as local labor market averages and the percentage of minorities in alternative certification programs is reflective of local labor markets. In other words, alternative certification programs in areas such as Los Angeles or Milwaukee do attract more minorities, but the numbers are in line with the ethnic composition of the teachers in their districts.

The idea that alternative certification programs attract significant numbers of talented second career professionals with sought-after skills and backgrounds such as retired engineers and scientists is supported by research to only a limited degree (Chin & Young, 2007; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007). Chin’s examination of the alternative certification candidates in California found that second career changers represented only about 14% of the population (2007). Similarly, though not restricted to California, Humphrey and Weschler (2007) report that only about 5% of their sample had backgrounds in science, engineering, mathematics or computer science. In fact the largest group of alternative credential seekers had most recently been full time students (18%). This was followed by people who had held childcare or other educational positions such as Teachers Aides at 15%, and people who were already K-12 teachers at 9%. Of their sample, 59% received a salary increase by becoming a teacher. In short, the notion that alternative certification attracts an altruistic pool of high-powered, high-tech retirees and career changers is certainly not the norm.

Though not strictly speaking career changers, a large percentage of intern candidates have had significant classroom experience. That a significant percent of alternative certification seekers may be people already in the field of education should not be surprising. Many states, including California, have specifically established career ladders involving alternative routes to facilitate teacher aides pursuing careers as teachers.

Some studies point out that the possession of a mathematics degree does not guarantee that people who have been out of school for many years either remember the mathematical
concepts or have used mathematics in their prior employment. Some research finds that both alternative certification and traditionally certified math teachers have an inadequate understanding of underlying mathematical concepts and only know procedures and how to solve problems (Zeichner & Schulte, 2001).

Perhaps not surprisingly, alternative certification holders tend to be somewhat older than their traditional counterparts. In some cases, however, the average age of the two groups differs by only a few years, though alternative certification holders have a more disperse age range. Also, the age of the participants depends greatly on the program and the group it intended to attract (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007).

On the question of gender, findings are inconclusive. While some studies find that alternative programs attract more men than do traditional programs, others find no difference (Zeichner & Schulte, 2001).

Research on California interns has found that internship programs do recruit more ethnic and racial minority groups. For example, McKibbin (2001) notes that nearly half (46%) of California’s interns are racial, ethnic or linguistic minorities, twice the percentage of those in traditional pre-service programs. He also states that in “studies done of the district intern program, more than a third said they would not have entered teaching if the internship option had not been available to them” (p. 140, citing previous work by Wright, McKibbin and Walton (1987)).

Chin and Young’s (2007) research on alternative certification is particularly noteworthy both for its relevance to California, and its methodology and findings. The study used data from interns enrolled in 30 different California internship programs from 2001-2004. Chin and Young critique earlier quantitative studies for using a “variable-oriented approach” (p. 77) which, according to the authors, does not paint sufficiently “complex portraits” of interns (p. 77). To remedy this they employ two stage cluster analysis to group individuals on family and educational background, life situations and variables related to motivation to teach and beliefs about teaching. Their analysis revealed 6 clusters which they labeled: compatible life style (23%), working-class activists (18%), Romantic Idealists (17%), followers in the family tradition (16%) and second career seekers (14%). Second career seekers, the smallest group, are the oldest group ($\bar{x} = 47.5$), more likely to be white men, have an advanced degree and have higher previous salaries than any of the other groups. In comparison, working-class activists were more likely to be Latinos, were the first in the family to graduate from college and pursued internships because of a need to earn an income while they worked on their credentials.

**Where do Interns teach?**

*Do teachers from alternative certification programs, particularly those in the California Intern Program, teach in areas of shortage and difficult to fill assignments?*
The research does support the notion that alternative certification programs place more candidates and especially minority candidates in hard to serve, high poverty, urban districts than do their traditional counterparts. However a debate exists as to whether this is laudatory, or cause for concern (Chin et al., 2004). Some see this as a sign of the positive impact of alternative certification programs on urban schools. Others interpret this as placing the least qualified, or least prepared teachers, with the neediest students (Achinstein et al., 2004; Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002). Even if this is the case, it is clear that placing candidates in difficult to fill positions is in line with policy maker intentions.

Using data from California interns, Chin, et al. (2004) examined how frequently candidates are placed in “hard-to-staff” schools and found that 88% of interns are placed in hard-to-staff schools. They also found that the “main factor” determining whether or not an intern was placed in a difficult assignment was the race or ethnicity of the individual. Whites (16.8%) and Asians (14%) were far more likely to be placed in non-hard-to-staff schools while Latinos (4%) and African-Americans (6%) were far less likely. Chin et al. note there could be a number of reasons for this. For example, they speculate that perhaps more Latino and African Americans live-in and/or chose to teach in districts serving minority or children living in poverty.

**Other Outcomes: Retention and Commitment to the Profession**

While not an explicit or primary goal of alternative certification programs, retention of alternatively certified teachers is, in fact, a goal of most programs. Is there evidence that alternatively certified teachers are more likely, or less likely, to stay in the profession? Like a lot of the research on alternative certification, the evidence is mixed. Research has adopted two approaches to answering this question. One approach asks participants about their commitment to teaching and their long term plans. The other approach attempts to more directly measure attrition. A number of research studies show that when asked about their commitment to teaching, traditionally prepared teachers tend to give more positive responses (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002; Shen, 1998; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001). However, other studies have found that alternately certified teachers are committed to the profession and may be more committed than the traditional group (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Johnson et al., 2005).

Some recent studies looking at actual retention data have found positive evidence for alternative certification. Reed, Ruben and Babour (2006) examined California intern data for the 1990’s and found “promising” results with 85% of university interns and 70% of district interns still teaching and fully credentialed in their fourth year. They concluded that interns are “just as likely and in some cases, more likely, than teachers who started with full credentials to remain teaching in public schools.” However, the authors note that they found more positive retention rates for all teachers in California than other studies suggest. They attribute this to the way that “leaving” is defined. In any case, this does not change their conclusion about intern retention.
Unfortunately, many empirical studies of teacher retention and attrition are hamstrung by the lack of availability of state or national longitudinal data on teacher employment (WestEd, 2003). In many cases, it is difficult (or impossible) to distinguish “leavers” from “movers” (Ingersoll, 2006). Teachers who appear to have left the profession in one district or database may have simply moved to another district, region or state. Reed and Barbour (2006) well document the process and the challenge involved in constructing a statewide database to study teacher retention. A notable exception to this problem is the State of Illinois which has 35 years of teacher employment data on which to view retention. Importantly, these data reveal that about half of the teachers who leave the profession do so only temporarily (for further education, family matters, to try other occupations or just to take time off) and ultimately return (DeAngelis & B. Presley, 2007). Whether or not Illinois’ teacher data mirrors trends in California or other states remains to be seen.

Other Outcomes: Teacher Effectiveness and Student Performance

Researchers have also attempted to discern the effect of alternative forms of training and certification on teacher effectiveness and student academic achievement. Some studies have approached this question through survey research, generally asking teachers about how prepared or how effective they were in the classroom. For example, in a study of new teachers in New York City schools, Darling-Hammond, Chung and Frelow (2002) found that traditionally prepared teachers “felt” better prepared than their alternatively trained colleagues, though this varied by program. The authors also found that sense of preparedness positively correlated with self-efficacy and plans to stay in teaching. Though interesting, the Darling-Hammond, et al study does not attempt to see if feelings of preparedness translate into better practice or increased student learning.

Zeichner and Schulte (2001) reviewed a number of studies conducted between the late 1980’s and the mid 1990’s that attempted to quantify the teaching ability, or quality of classroom instruction, of alternatively certified teachers. These studies employed a variety of classroom observation instruments and, in some cases, included evaluations by site administrators or mentor teachers. Several studies reported finding the performance of alternatively certified teachers satisfactory or better. However, Zeichner and Schulte conclude that the results were of “very limited value” for a number of reasons including their reliance on ratings by observers who “had a stake in the programs being assessed” (p. 276) and other methodological problems such as small sample sizes, and vaguely defined, incomparable or the complete lack of a comparison group.

In another effort to measure the effectiveness of alternative certification, Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin and Heilimnh (2005) linked teacher certification type with standardized test scores (math and reading scores on TAS, SAT9, Aprenda) for a large sample of 4th and 5th grade Houston students. Controlling for teacher experience, educational background, student demographics and prior achievement, they concluded that, on most measures “relative to
teachers with standard certification, uncertified teachers and those in most other non-certification categories generally had negative effects on student achievement” (p. 16). Twenty-two of 36 estimates favored traditionally certified teachers at $\alpha = .10$. They also report that the effects of the certification status were stronger than the effects of teacher experience.

**Alternative Certification Program Characteristics, Program Effectiveness**

As already mentioned, there are a great variety of alternative certification programs. This is true, not just nationwide, but also within the State of California. A central component of most alternative certification programs whether university, district or private enterprise is mentorship. In addition to the mentoring component, many alternative certification programs include curriculum that is both condensed and suited to learning on the job, which means that it is practical, context driven and timely. However, the actual content of programs in the nation and State of California fall on a wide continuum in intensity, duration, and practical, theoretical, pedagogy and subject specific content (E. Feistritzer, 2007; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Humphrey et al., 2008; McKibbin, 2001; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001).

Plaguing research on the effectiveness of alternative certification programs is the problem of definition. Referring to alternative certification programs nationwide McKibbin notes:

> One of the issues that perplexes those immersed in trying to implement high standards and quality preparation to all forms of teacher preparation is that many types of programs are called alternative certification . . . The nature of these programs is quite varied. Some are little more than ways of putting persons in classes using emergency permits, others are states’ addition of a post-baccalaureate preparation program to their existing undergraduate program. Some, such as Teach for America, are largely recruitment programs that include some teacher preparation but certification is not necessarily the goal of the program (McKibbin, 2001, p. 134)

This is true not only across the nation but also within the State of California. Though California alternative certification program are called intern programs the name masks a great assortment of programs. Some programs attempt to truly differentiate themselves in content, structure and delivery from traditional training. Other programs place interns into the same courses taken by traditional teacher candidates (Chin et al., 2004)

In an attempt to discern the characteristics of effective alternative certification programs, Humphrey, Wechsler and Hough (2008) deliberately chose seven very different programs, one of which was in California. They examined the components, participants, school contexts and outcomes of the programs. Not surprisingly, they found that effective programs provide participants with curriculum that is coherent, timely and context sensitive, and with mentor teachers with adequate time and resources to provide meaningful support. However, of all of the variables they examined, they found that the school context exhibited the strongest effect. In other words, the most effective alternative certification programs were those that place
candidates in schools with the best environments—schools with strong and effective leadership, a warm collegial atmosphere and adequate resources. Additionally, they found that the best programs attracted and served (a) the best candidates who attended more competitive undergraduate institutions and (b) those with prior experience in the classroom.

While the Humphrey et al. study is interesting and important it is also somewhat sobering. Their findings suggest that, though program components and content are important, those enrolled in the program and their school site teaching assignments have a greater impact. Research is still needed to fully parse the impact of program effects, from the characteristics of candidates themselves to the schools in which they are placed.

IV. Guiding Questions for the BTSA/Intern Evaluation Study

In accordance with the study questions specified in SB 1209 (Scott) on behalf of the Legislature and the Governor, this Scope of Work collected, analyzed and interprets the data needed to answer eight core research questions that were outlined the project Scope of Work. The core questions are:

1. How well are BTSA programs meeting the objectives set forth in Education Code 44279.1?

That is, has BTSA supported:
   a) Effective transition into teaching careers?
   b) Improved pupil educational performance?
   c) Effective teaching of diverse students (culturally, linguistically, academically)?
   d) Retention of successful teachers?
   e) Intensive individualized support for new teachers?
   f) Improved teacher rigor and consistency?
   g) Coherent assessment based on CSTP?
   h) Retention of professionally competent teachers?
   i) Continued program improvement based on research?

2. How well are University and District Intern programs meeting the purposes specified in Education Code Sections 44382 to 44386?

That is:
a) Are candidates drawn from and/or serving in subject and geographic shortage areas?
b) Do candidates entering the program have substantial and relevant work experience?
c) Which programs are receiving incentive funding and what are these funds used for?
d) What assessment data are available to determine the level of Intern skill?
e) How are intern teachers being trained and how effective is this training?
f) Are programs operated collaboratively? With what collaborating institutions?
g) What geographical, demonstrated need, number of participants, quality of preparation program, and cost-effectiveness criteria are being used to select incentive grant recipients?

3. Program management decisions for direct assistance

What, if any, policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that district and university interns receive appropriate direct assistance from experienced teachers?

4. Program management decisions to support special populations

What, if any, policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that beginning (Induction) and intern teachers are prepared to address the needs of special populations of students – especially English learners and special education students?

5. Administrative Structures

What, if any, state, regional and/or local administrative structures could improve the support services for Induction and intern teachers?

6. Level of funding

What would be a sufficient level of funding for Induction teacher and intern programs, and what criteria should state agencies use to help facilitate legislative passage of appropriate funding levels? How is funding divided between infrastructure operations and direct support to new teachers? Is this division the most effective use of funds?
7. Standards Revision

What, if any, revisions of the BTSA and/or Intern Program Standards would facilitate increased teacher competency and/or reduce engagement in unproductive activities?

8. Eliminating Duplication

What, if any, changes in laws, regulations and/or policies would help eliminate duplicative requirements, streamline and coordinate support services for beginning teachers and interns?

Since the data needed to answer these questions for the BTSA Induction and Intern programs will necessarily come from somewhat different sources and rely on different modes of analysis and interpretation, the study design outlined below is divided into two separate sections, one addressed to BTSA Induction program evaluation and the other to examination of the Intern programs.

V. Design and Methods Used in this Study

This evaluation of the BTSA Intern and Intern programs is based on detailed studies conducted at two distinct levels. For some important questions, statewide data covering all program participants (tracking changes over time, comparing the two programs and examining how each is related to the rest of the California teaching workforce) represent the most important evidence of program success. For these parts of the evaluation, we rely primarily on statistical analysis techniques applied to quantitative file data available from the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). This part of the evaluation study work will be referred to as “Population Studies” throughout this report. For other key questions it was important to secure qualitative data from local BTSA and Intern program sites through interviews, observations and document analyses. Of course, it was not feasible to interview or observe all of the participants in either the BTSA or the Intern programs, or even representatives from all of the programs. Hence, as described below, this part of the study concentrated on learning from the program directors in 27 of the 28 BTSA Induction programs that were undergoing external reviews known as “Induction Program Reviews” during the 2006-07 academic year. A sub-sample of ten of these 27 BTSA programs was targeted for intensive case analysis involving interviews with all key stakeholder groups. To these BTSA programs an additional a sample of eleven University and District Intern programs
were also subjected to in-depth case study. This part of the evaluation study is referred to as the “Comparative Case Study” component of the review. Throughout the studies conducted at both levels, careful attention is given to identifying the perceptions and achievements of first year teachers, their instructors, administrators and support providers. We compared data from these groups with the perceptions of teachers who were near completion or had graduated from a BTSA or intern credential program.

The BTSA Population Studies

Overall population studies of the BTSA Induction program are used to provide broad answers to five core questions. These questions focus on:

a) An analysis of participation in the BTSA and Intern programs with a focus on whether either or both of these programs are bringing new and different types of teachers into the California public school system,

b) Documenting the rate of retention and the skill level of the retained BTSA teachers within the public schools system,

c) Interpreting the judgments of beginning teachers, support providers and school administrators regarding the overall implementation success of BTSA programs,

d) Developing a broad outline of BTSA program budget and finance arrangements, and

e) Documenting the extent to which program participants perceive overlap, redundancies and/or gaps in service as reported in their survey responses.

Unfortunately, it was not possible to document teacher attrition or the effects of BTSA and Intern program participation on student achievement using available state level data. Teacher assignment and student academic performance data collected through the State’s basic education data system (CBEDS) and standardized achievement reporting (STAR) systems cannot be linked together and cannot be used to make longitudinal comparisons for either students and teachers from one year to the next. Strategies for addressing these important questions using small scale data sets provided by local school districts are outlined below.

As noted in the contract supporting this study, the limited ability to utilize statewide data make some of the conclusions outlined later in this report more tentative and suggestive than we would have liked. In the policy recommendations section at the conclusion of this report, we
outline policy steps that could be taken by the state to enable future studies to more reliably provide accurate information about how BTSA and Intern programs are influencing student achievement and teacher retention.

Four BTSA population studies were executed utilizing available state agency and local data sets. These four studies were:

1. The Professional Assignment Information Files (CBEDS/PAIF) and School Information Files (CBEDS/SIF) for the entire history of the CBEDS record (October, 1985 through 2006). Though we had hoped to track BTSA participating teachers through this data set, no records of BTSA participation were preserved in the early years. Fortunately, one large BTSA program has maintained a complete record of participation, matched with CBEDS records over the last ten years and shared that data with us to examine long term retention rates for teachers.

2. The last five years of BTSA Consent form data

3. The last five years of the BTSA statewide evaluation data for Participating Teachers, Support Providers and Site Administrators

4. Local BTSA program budget files for the last two years

5. The student achievement portions of the statewide STAR testing program for the three most recent years (though the original intent was to pursue this on a statewide basis, data access difficulties meant that we could only collect achievement data from only one very large metropolitan district. On the plus side, this district made a full 5 years of achievement data available to the study team).

These data were cleaned and organized and exported to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences© (SPSS) and to the AMOS© structural equation modeling software for data analysis. Utilizing these data, distribution statistics, means comparisons and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) procedures were used to analyze the influences flowing from teacher, staff and program design characteristics through program activities, teacher assessment and induction planning activities to teacher skill, retention and career satisfaction.

Local programs use different designs, rely on different staff members and serve different new teacher groups. Taking these differences into account, the local programs mount a variety of training and support activities aimed at increasing new teacher competence, confidence and
commitment to teaching careers. Relying on the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST), the Santa Cruz New Teacher Formative Center Assessment System (SCNTC/FAS) or other local assessment tools, and monitoring new teacher responses to their training and support activities through surveys, interviews and other feedback mechanisms, the local programs produce measurable increases in new teacher skill and professional commitment. After adjusting for the effects of other variables, these BTSA program effects are expected to result in improved student achievement, higher rates of teacher retention in the California public schools, and greater career satisfaction. Variables assessing each of these BTSA program characteristics and outcomes are available in the data sets listed, and were incorporated into a comprehensive, reliable structural equation model. This model shows how much influence on program outcomes results from the demographic characteristics of the new teachers, their support providers or the students they are teaching, and it is capable of documenting the extent to which various BTSA program activities are most effective in raising skill levels and how much long term outcomes are influenced by the immediately measured program impacts. Of central importance is a determination of what features of the BTSA program are working as designed, what innovative features are being developed “in the field” to facilitate program success when programs are encountering difficulties, and what program features are not controllable by local leaders and need to become the object of state regulation or support.

For the comparative and intensive case study parts of this study, data were collected using standard anthropological field data techniques – interviews, observations and document collection. Data were transcribed and documents were scanned into a qualitative data storage and retrieval system. In addition, the data were subjected to the ordinary procedures used for qualitative data analysis and interpretation – content coding, theme identification, key concept and critical incident identification, followed by team analysis and re-checking raw data regarding the accuracy of the evaluation teams understanding and interpretations. Central issues to be examined and evaluated concern, at least:

a) the extent to which BTSA Induction participants are familiar with and rely upon the California Standards for the Teaching Profession in making judgments regarding teacher skills and abilities

b) how participating teachers and support providers are interpreting and applying the concepts of Individual Induction Planning and the CFASST/FAS or other local formative assessment system

c) how adequately the needs of participating teachers are being met through organized training, individual support, school based administrative or staff support and/or resources flowing from other sources (e.g. universities, parent groups, etc.)
d) whether or not BTSA staff and participants find the program to be adequately resourced and supported by schools, districts and state structures
e) whether or not participating teachers are receiving needed direct assistance to cope with English language learners, special education students and other challenging populations
f) what factors are encouraging or discouraging new teachers from making a career commitment to teaching in California schools
g) other issues that emerge from content analysis of the data gathered.

BTSA Population Study #1: Program Implementation

The first population study uses statewide evaluation surveys of BTSA participating teachers, support providers and school site administrators, combined with information from informed consent forms completed by beginning teachers and support providers to document and evaluate local BTSA program implementation patterns and perceived effectiveness. From these surveys it is possible to develop profiles of the BTSA induction program participants (both beginning teachers and their support providers). It is also possible to infer from responses to questions regarding the activities engaged in and the perceived value of each of those activities which elements of each local program are most fully implemented and which are judged to be of the highest value by the critical stakeholder groups: the new teachers, the experienced support providers, and the responsible school site administrators. A matrix describes the relationship between the annual BTSA survey questions and the 20 Program Standards to which each program is expected to adhere. Data from the latest surveys are examined in relationship to this matrix to assess the extent to which program implementation is meeting standards. Data regarding user assessment of the Individual Induction Plans component of BTSA, gathered from statewide survey data, also sheds important light on the extent to which BTSA is helping teachers reach the level of competency described in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. This study also provides important insights into how the participants in local programs evaluate their program experiences and how they believe program operations can be improved.

BTSA Population Study #2: Program Design, Financing and Staffing Variations

The second population level study analyzes program proposal and expenditure budgets submitted by the local BTSA Induction programs to identify basic variations in program design, budget and expenditure categories and staffing profiles. It does not provide a basis for evaluating the appropriateness or effectiveness of any local program, but it determines
whether there are distinctive local patterns that should be considered when interpreting the comparative case studies described below. The target of this study is the development of a profile of local program designs and documentation of financing and staffing variations associated with this taxonomy. This profile was used to guide data interpretation in the comparative case study phase of this evaluation. As described in the comparative case studies below, the profile of funding patterns serves to focus attention on particularly important fiscal needs and potential ways to improve fiscal efficiency. Budget information was gathered from local program budget documents that are based on the count of informed consent forms completed by the participating teachers in each local program.

BTSA Population Study #3: Teacher Retention

Two aspects of teacher retention are examined by a third population study. First, changes in the rate of teacher retention in the California public school workforce during the years following BTSA program implementation are compared with retention rates in earlier years. These rates are calculated using the employment history records found in the CBEDS/PAIF file. There is a serious limitation on the utilization of CBEDS/PAIF employment records because it is not possible to make year-to-year data linkages to be certain that the same teachers are being tracked when examining the number of teachers in this data file reporting specific years of teaching experience. However, one large local BTSA program that has kept meticulous year-to-year records on all teachers in approximately 50 school districts (linking their annual CBEDS/PAIF records and identifying when they participated BTSA) has provided us with access to these data. This important sample from the larger CBEDS/PAIF record system allows us to validate the estimates of teacher attrition garnered from an analysis of the anonymous statewide data set. By linking PAIF records to school and classroom characteristics (student achievement, poverty rates, numbers of English language learners, special education students, school urbanicity, etc.) it is possible to estimate what working conditions are having the greatest impact on teacher retention.

BTSA Population Study #4: Teacher Performance and Performance Improvement

The fourth study focuses on the question of student academic attainment. Since only a small and unrepresentative group of beginning teachers are not currently participating in BTSA Induction programs, estimating the contribution made by BTSA Induction program participation to new teachers’ skill and effectiveness requires comparing the academic achievement of students taught by BTSA teachers in the year following their completion of BTSA training with the achievement of students taught during the BTSA teachers’ first year of teaching. This, of course, over-estimates the BTSA contribution to teaching improvement because it attributes all
improvement during the BTSA participation years to this program without controlling for ordinary improvements that would occur for unsupported novice teachers. To partially control for this over-estimation, the BTSA Induction teacher improvements are compared with the improvement trajectory of all teachers in the same grade levels during the first 12 years of teaching experience. Once the improvement trajectory over 12 years of teaching has been developed from an analysis of the last three years of the STAR test data, a test is made to document the extent to which BTSA participation produces a significant discontinuity in this improvement curve.

To conduct this study we needed to link the STAR test data (using Normal Curve Equivalent scores) with the CBEDS/PAIF file of teacher characteristics. This linkage can only be meaningfully made for grades two and above since testing does not begin until grade two. Estimates for high school teacher effects are compromised by the fact that high school students typically have five or more teachers in any given year. Additionally, the study had to be restricted to students whose academic records in the spring of the year prior to their experience with BTSA teachers are available so that teachers are properly credited with the academic growth students make during their year with the BTSA teachers. This means that only students currently in grades three and above can serve as an appropriate test population to estimate the contribution of BTSA program experience to the academic improvement of students assigned to them. This approach is far from ideal. It leaves unexamined the contributions of BTSA teachers to academic improvement among younger pupils where much of the long term success of students is determined, but it was the only feasible way to secure standardized test data on student academic ability without mounting an intrusive and prohibitively expensive new testing program.

A variety of important variables are available through the STAR test data file to help limit the biasing effect of differences in student class composition. The most powerful biases arise from differences in the numbers of English language learners and special education certified students in each classroom, and the extent to which classes are composed of children from poverty, ethnic minority households or come from families with low levels of parent education. Also available are indicators for whether students are transient, how large their class sizes are and whether the schools are on year-round calendars or have been identified for school improvement intervention. Statistical controls are used to reduce or eliminate the biasing impact of these variables. In addition to the classroom composition variables that need to be accommodated before achievement is attributed to instructional effectiveness, it was necessary to use statistical procedures to control for the effects of school level factors. The urban nature of the school, the turnover and experience level of other teachers in the school, the proportion of the student body drawn from homes where the first language is not English,
overall levels of school poverty, and other factors were controlled. Note that it is not the intent of this study to evaluate the performance of the teachers, but rather to ascertain the extent to which student achievement is improved through BTSA Induction program participation.

**Intern Program Population Studies**

Sections 44382 to 44386 of the California Education Code, authorizing the creation of District and University Intern Teacher credential programs, clearly articulate the legislative purposes to be served by this alternative approach to credentialing teachers. These programs were designed to bring older, beyond college age candidates, with work experience outside public education into the teaching profession. Particular emphasis is given to the importance of using these programs to recruit individuals who will be able to offset geographic and subject area teacher candidate shortages. Section 44382 states: “Alternative certification programs shall address geographic and subject matter shortage areas, and shall be targeted toward people with work experience and others who already have a bachelor’s degree in the field in which they plan to teach.” Additionally, Section 44384 declares that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, “shall encourage, and may provide funding to, programs that include innovative training, assessment, or support models and strategies that have the potential of improving the quality of the teaching force.” Funding criteria for these programs are delineated in Section 44385 and require that the programs be funded on the basis of: geographic distribution, demonstrated need, the number of participants served, the quality of the curriculum, instruction, support and assessment, and the cost-effectiveness of the programs.

These statutory requirements delineate the target questions for the intern program evaluation studies outlined in this Scope of Work. As with the BTSA evaluation process, intern programs will be evaluated at two levels – a statewide quantitative data-based assessment of the entire population of intern programs, and a set of qualitative data-based comparative case studies. A total of six assessments will be made, three on a statewide basis and three through comparative case analysis.

Five data sets were used for the state level study District and University Intern programs. These include:

a) Budget descriptions for the programs  
b) The CBEDS/PAIF data described above for the BTSA studies  
c) The statewide Intern consent form database  
d) The Intern Program Evaluation Survey database  
e) Interview data provided by senior CTC staff members
Three studies of the statewide performance of the Intern programs were mounted. These studies utilize statewide file data and build an overall picture of Intern program operations and impacts.

**Intern Population Study #1: Describing the Population being Served**

The first question addressed in the statewide data on Intern programs was to ascertain the character of the population being served by these programs. Since state law explicitly sets forth criteria for Intern enrollment, it is important to document the extent to which those criteria are being applied to intern teacher recruitment and selection.

**Intern Population Study #2: Intern Program Implementation Success**

The second important question is the extent to which the programs are being successfully implemented. Assessment of success indicators relies heavily on the Intern teacher evaluation survey data, but additional indicators of success include the geographical location of the programs and subject areas of the intern teachers. As will be seen in the report of study findings later in this document, it was possible to develop a robust Structural Equation Model documenting the key features of successful intern programs, and indicating the impact of local program expenditures on the operation of that program model.

Although it was initially intended for this evaluation study to assess program success by examining how much interns and intern graduates are able to improve student STAR test scores (after controlling for student and school characteristics likely to influence learning rates) in the year immediately following their graduation from the intern program, the lack of identifiable STAR data records linked to individual interns made this aspect of the study impossible. However, at the comparative case study level, additional data were sought to provide a broader indication of the extent to which intern teachers are effective in the classroom.

**Intern Population Study #3: Placement of Intern Program Graduates**

The third statewide evaluation question is whether Intern program graduates are being placed in the geographic regions and the subject matter areas that have been identified as the target areas for training. This question was answered from the CBEDS/PAIF and CBEDS/SIF files to evaluate the school settings within which these teachers are working during their intern training.
Case Studies of Local BTSA and Intern Programs

As noted above, in cooperation with CTC and CDE staff, BTSA and intern programs were identified for intensive case study analysis. The directors serving 27 of the 28 BTSA program undergoing Induction Program Review in 2007 were interviewed and asked for documents regarding their program designs and budgets. Ten of these sites were selected for in-depth case study analysis based on five criteria that assured that the selected sites fully represented the diversity of BTSA programs in the state. These criteria included:

a) Program size measured by the number of Participating Teachers served
   Selected programs ranged from 51 to 959 Participating Teachers in 2006

b) The number of districts involved in a local program
   Seven single district and three multi-district consortia were selected

c) The formative assessment system used by the local BTSA program
   Six case study sites use the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST), two use the Formative Assessment System (FAS) developed by the Santa Cruz New Teacher Center and two utilize locally developed assessments

d) The Support Provider model
   Three of the sites use only Full Time Released support providers with substantial caseloads of Participating Teachers, three use Full Time Classroom Teachers with responsibility of supporting from one to four BTSA Participating Teachers, and four sites were selected where a mixed model of some full time released and some regular classroom teachers are used

e) The urban/rural location of the BTSA program
   Five urban programs were selected, three served suburban areas, one a very rural area and one combined urban and rural service areas.

After an initial selection of sites based on these criteria had been developed by the Evaluation Team, the list was presented to California Department of Education and Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff for review. This review led to replacing one of the original sites because the director at that site was incapacitated and unlikely to be able to assure a successful case study.
For the intern program case studies, eleven programs were selected for case study work based on the following criteria:

a) Program size measured by the number of interns enrolled
   Selected programs ranged in size from 16 to 435 interns in 2006

b) Intern credentials offered
   Six offered multiple subject, single subject and at least one type of education specialist credential, one offered only education specialist training, one offered only single subject training, one offered multiple subject and single subject but not education specialist training and one offered single subject and education specialist but not multiple subject credential training

c) Participating sponsors
   Four sites were sponsored and served primarily by a campus of the California State University system, one by a University of California campus, three by single districts, two by private universities and one by a county office of education

d) Locale
   Three sites were urban in character, five covered both urban and suburban areas, one was suburban, and two covered urban, suburban and rural school sites, all of the State’s six regions were represented by at least one intern program.

Following the selection of an initially representative list of ten case study sites, one additional site was added to provide better geographic balance. One site involved an intern program in the process of closing down operations which provided some unique insights into possible reasons for discontinuing such a program.

For both BTSA and Intern programs site visits of approximately two full days in length (on two or three occasions) were made to these intensive study sites. Additionally, Evaluation Team members attended all of the four days of the Induction Program Review process in each of the BTSA case study sites.

**The BTSA Case Studies**
File data, interviews, observations and document reviews were utilized to develop profiles of BTSA programs. When reviewing both the 27 Induction Program Review sites and the ten intensive case study sites, our emphasis was on comparative case studies aimed at identifying the program strategies that are most effective in meeting the objectives set forth in the BTSA legislation and providing the most cost-effective methods for successfully developing professional skills, preparing teachers for service to diverse populations and encouraging lifelong commitments to the teaching profession. Three focal concerns were utilized to develop and implement the interview protocols presented in Appendix A. These focal concerns were as follows.

**BTSA Case Study Focus #1: Support for Professionalism**

The development of teacher professionalism involves at least four activities: a) becoming a self-directed professional learner through acquisition of needed skills that have been refined through systematic reflection on practice, b) developing sensitivity to diverse student needs, c) maintaining integrity and establishing a trusting relationship with peer colleagues and organizational leaders, and d) taking responsible risks to develop innovative programs and improve school operations. In order for BTSA Induction programs to support the development of these attributes, they need to be clearly conceptualized, aggressively organized and administered, adequately resourced and supported, and faithfully implemented. The comparative case studies proposed here are premised on the knowledge that most BTSA Induction staff are aware of these basic dimensions of their BTSA programs and that interviews, observations and analysis of program artifacts will make it reasonably clear how well individual BTSA Induction programs are succeeding and what, if any, barriers are threatening program success. To collect this information, on-site interviews with: first and second year participating teachers, BTSA program graduates, support providers, school site administrators where the participating teachers work, and BTSA program administrators. At the time of these site visits, our evaluation staff observed the ongoing Induction Program Review process and collected program implementation, internal evaluation, budget and program management, and governance documents. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis by the UCR Evaluation Team.

**BTSA Case Study Focus #2: Analysis of Formative Assessment Systems**

In order for BTSA Induction programs to vouchsafe the professional skills of beginning teachers it is essential that there be a means of reliably assessing skills and complete confidence on the part of the beginning teachers that these assessments are serving to effectively guide their professional development. To document the ways in which BTSA
programs are assessing skills and then utilizing the assessments in teacher development activities, the evaluation team examined how BTSA Induction programs utilize the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST), the Formative Assessment System (FAS) or local program developed teacher assessment systems. Using this understanding of local program assessments, the evaluation team inquired into the character and use of Individual Induction Plans (IIPs) and other BTSA activities to learn which activities are leading to more positive skill assessments. Participating teachers and their support providers were asked to discuss the quality of their experiences with these BTSA Induction components, and their judgments regarding the effectiveness of these two BTSA components in guiding program design and implementation toward the realization of outcome goals related to beginning teachers’ professional competence and career commitment.

**BTSA Case Study Focus #3: Identifying the Real Costs of Program Operations**

Interviewees were asked to evaluate the adequacy of resources available to their local BTSA program. Interview questions probed the extent to which local programs had access to needed space, staff resources, fiscal supports, technological support services, time for providing service to participating teachers and any other resource that might be important. The purpose was to conceptually develop a “full cost budget” for each of the intensive case study BTSA programs. By a “full cost budget” we mean assessing the extent to which unfunded resources are being devoted to BTSA (through volunteer work, in-kind contributions, etc.) and the extent to which BTSA resources are being drawn away from services to the new teachers. These full cost budgets are developed through interviews with local BTSA program and sponsoring agency staff. The purpose is to identify the extent to which BTSA Induction programs are able to leverage additional resources for teachers and/or school sites and to determine whether BTSA Induction expenditures are significantly deflected from budget proposals by special circumstances or needs that arise within the local program sites.

**The Intern Case Studies**

The intensive case studies in the eleven intern programs were aimed at producing rich textured descriptions of local intern program activities and operations. In addition to intern program directors, focus group interviews were held with: a) first and second year interns, b) graduates of the intern programs, c) university supervisors or district employed support providers responsible for guiding and supporting intern development, d) university or district retained faculty for teaching courses or seminars required of the interns, and e) school site administrators in schools where interns worked. Using the interview and document collection protocols shown in Appendix B, these case studies pursued three areas of targeted interest.
Intern Case Study Focus #1: Local Recruitment, Selection and Placement of Candidates

The first question addressed is how intern program operators go about recruiting, selecting and ultimately facilitating placement of the intern teachers.

Intern Case Study Focus #2: Description of Intern Supervision and Training

The second question examined is how the intern teachers are being trained and supervised. The goals of this part of the inquiry include identifying innovative curricula and teacher training techniques, and ascertaining how intern teachers learn such critical skills as how to work with English language learners, children of poverty, and children in need of special education services. These interviews shed important light on what aspects of the programs intern teachers find most valuable, and which, if any, are redundant or unproductive. Both interns and their supervisors were queried regarding the best evidence for assessing the developing skill and ability of the new teachers.

Intern/BTSA Case Study Focus #3: Examining the Relationship between BTSA and Intern Programs

Finally, local program administrators were queried regarding the working relationships between intern programs and BTSA, or other programs aimed at enhancing the training and professional induction of new teachers. In particular, concerns regarding possible duplication and redundancy or gaps in teacher support were examined.

Focus group data from both the BTSA and Intern teachers were particularly helpful in distinguishing between unproductive redundant activities and productive re-teaching of critical skills that the intern or BTSA teachers have not previously mastered.
VI. Evaluation Study Findings

Before undertaking to interpret BTSA and Intern program operations and outcomes, it is helpful to develop an overview of the participants in each of these professional development programs. Since the BTSA program serves virtually all new teachers in the State, close examination of how participation in this program compares with the rest of the California teaching workforce provides clear evidence of the types and extent of change being brought about as new teachers enter the occupation. Additionally, tracking the characteristics of the BTSA program participants over the last five years provides substantial evidence regarding the extent to which changes are accelerating or returning to the traditional norms of entry into this occupation.

Since the Intern program was developed to facilitate career transition for older workers and to help schools fill teaching vacancies in hard to staff schools and hard to fill subject matter specializations, tracking participation in this program facilitates our understanding of the extent to which these legislative purposes are being realized. Moreover, by comparing enrollment in the Intern program with the typical members of the California teaching workforce and with individuals passing through the BTSA induction program, we are able to determine how the extent to which the intern program is changing the composition of the workforce.
Interpreting BTSA Program Operations and Outcomes

Who is Participating in the BTSA Programs?

We begin with a look at the question of who is participating in the BTSA program, and how that participation has been changing over the last five years. Since BTSA has become a virtually universal requirement for becoming a fully credentialed teacher in California, this overview provides a picture of who is entering the teaching workforce. The bar graph in Figure 1 depicts the total enrollment in BTSA from 2002-03 through 2006-07. The line graph near the top of the figure tracks the total teaching workforce in California over the same period. Note that the BTSA participating teacher counts are scaled on the left side axis, while the total teacher count is scaled on the right side axis in the figure. Thus, while the total number of teachers in California schools is substantially more than ten times as large as the number of new teachers being served in the BTSA programs, we are able to align these two numbers to see how they have been changing in recent years.

Figure 1: BTSA Population Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Count BTSA</th>
<th>Total Count CBEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>21458</td>
<td>307623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>20473</td>
<td>303657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>22929</td>
<td>304533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>25810</td>
<td>305147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>28264</td>
<td>316854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Both BTSA and Total Workforce shrank in 2003/04.
Although the teaching workforce of California has tended to grow steadily over the last several years, it is important to notice that the count of teachers shrank by nearly 4,000 in one year – between 2002-03 and 2003-04. A partial recovery from this loss occurred in the 2004-05 year, and there has been continuing growth each year since. By the fall teacher census in October of 2006, there were 4.35% more teachers recorded in the CBEDS data file than were reported in October of 2003. Although further research would be required to be certain, we suspect this shrinkage was substantially related to the convergence of: a) enforcement of the No Child Left Behind insistence that every child should have a “highly qualified” teacher, b) the ending of California’s “Emergency Credential” authorization that was used to place teachers who did not meet NCLB requirements into many classrooms, and c) the establishment of BTSA as an “Induction” program responsible for recommending teacher candidates for their Clear Credentials (which made two years of induction work mandatory for all new teachers).

Importantly, enrollment in the state’s BTSA programs shrank by nearly a thousand teachers (985) during the same year the total CBEDS count was declining by nearly 4,000. Indeed, the number of BTSA participating teachers who reported holding emergency credentials at the time they entered the BTSA program shrank quite dramatically from 1,636 in 2002-03 to only 592 in 2003-04. BTSA participation fully recovered in 2004-05 and has grown steadily since then. In 2006-07 BTSA enrollment was 38.1% larger than in 2003-04.

The four charts on the next page (Figure 3) depict the relationship between four ethnic components of the BTSA participating teacher population and that of the entire California teaching workforce. Several important features of the current and future teaching workforce can be seen in these charts. First, Chart A shows that the overall workforce is substantially more ethnically Caucasian than is the BTSA participating teacher group. This means that changes are coming – a strong majority of new teachers are white, but the larger population is more than 7.5% more likely be ethnically Caucasian in 2006-07. Some strides are being made, but the public school student population is already less than 35% Caucasian. If the workforce should be ethnically representative of the students they serve, California has a long way to go and the current rate of change will never allow the workforce to reach parity. Furthermore, in the last two years the BTSA population has become slightly less ethnically diverse than it was in 2004-05 when only 62% of the BTSA teachers were Caucasian.

Chart B shows that, while five years ago Hispanic representation in BTSA only just mirrored that of the overall workforce, there has been a steady growth in the proportion of Hispanics in this program. Chart C shows that for most of the last five years African American participation in
BTSA has actually been below the proportion of this ethnic group in the overall workforce. The gap has been slowly closing, but a substantial part of that closure has been the result of shrinking participation of African Americans in the total work force which in 2006 accounted for only 4.9% of all teachers. The representation of Asians and others in BTSA and in the larger workforce has remained quite small, but has been growing slightly.
Figure 2: BTSA Ethnicity

Percentage White BTSA Participating Teachers by Year with Percent White Ethnicity in CBEDS/PAIF File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pct Caucasian-BTSA</th>
<th>Pct Caucasian-CBEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Hispanic BTSA Participating Teachers by Year with Percent Hispanic Ethnicity in CBEDS/PAIF File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pct Hispanic-BTSA</th>
<th>Pct Hispanic-CBEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>14.57%</td>
<td>14.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>16.22%</td>
<td>14.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>16.87%</td>
<td>14.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>19.22%</td>
<td>15.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
<td>15.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage African American BTSA Participating Teachers by Year with Percent African American Ethnicity in CBEDS/PAIF File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pct African-BTSA</th>
<th>Pct African-CBEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Asian BTSA Participating Teachers by Year with Percent Asian Ethnicity in CBEDS/PAIF File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pct Asian-BTSA</th>
<th>Pct Asian-CBEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 traces the gender composition of the BTSA participation on the basis of the credentials held by participating teachers. Represented on this graph are three lines tracing the proportion of women working on multiple subject, single subject and educational specialist credentials. While the proportion of women holding any of these credentials is typically at or above 57%, there are two important observations to be made about this graph. First, as can be seen by the total population numbers in the table below the graph line, there have been substantial and statistically significant changes in the overall proportion of BTSA teachers holding multiple subject and single subject credentials. In 2002-03 some 12,761 (about 64%) of the BTSA teachers held multiple subject credentials. By 2006-07, the number of BTSA multiple subject credential holders reached 15,552, but this represents only 55% of the total BTSA enrollment. Meanwhile, the 30% of the 2002-03 group holding single subject credentials grew to fully 40% of total BTSA enrollment by 2006-07. Furthermore, with samples drawn from all five years of BTSA data and holding constant the effects of race and gender, this yearly trend was found to be statistically significant for new teachers holding single subject credentials ($\beta = .067, p=.001$) and multiple subject credentials ($\beta = -.116, p=.001$).
A second and even more dramatic phenomenon has occurred with the gendered split between new teachers seeking multiple and single subject credentials. Holding constant the effects of race and year, for all five years collectively, it was shown that men are more likely to pursue single subject credentials ($\beta=.24, p=.001$) and women are more likely to pursue multiple subject credentials ($\beta=.20, p=.001$).

Figure 3 examines this gendered split between multiple and single subject credentials over the course of these five years. The lines tracking the female proportion of multiple and single subject credential holders diverged sharply between the 2002-03 BTSA cohort and the 2003-04 group. While the number of multiple subject credential holders dropped from 12,761 to 12,227 between these years, the proportion of females with these credentials rose by fully 10% (from 75% to 85% of the multiple subject holders). This increase of 822 female multiple subject credential holders was nearly matched by a drop from 74% to just 60% of the single subject
credentials – a loss of 703 women from this credential group. And there has been a continuing small decline in the number of women single subject credential holders since 2003-04.

Quite clearly, and for reasons that have yet to be fully understood, a significant shift in the way new teachers are entering the workforce took place in 2003-04. As noted above, the total population in BTSA shrunk, the total number of teachers in the state declined, the gender composition of credential holders shifted sharply, and as will be discussed below, there was a substantial increase in the number of teachers enrolling in alternative credential intern programs across the state.

Figure 4 provides a bit more detail regarding the distribution of teaching credentials held by BTSA participants over the last five years. As would be expected based on changes in the law, participants who hold Clear Credentials have steadily declined. In the latest cohort, only 9% of the single and multiple subject BTSA participants reported holding a clear credential, down from 39% of those enrolled in 2002-03. The relatively small number of educational specialists participating has grown only slightly over the last five years. Since the universities responsible for training these credential candidates are, by statute and regulations, responsible for supervising their induction into the profession, this small number reflects the level of cooperation between universities and BTSA programs rather than the number of individuals receiving education specialist certification. As described below, the intern program is a major vehicle for preparing education specialists credential holders.
Figure 5 adds a little detail to the shift in teacher credentialing that took place starting in 2003-04. Between 2002-03 and 2003-04 there were significant declines in the number of BTSA teachers reporting that they were assigned to teach English, mathematics, science and special education. Assignments in these subject areas has been growing steadily since 2003-04, but as noted above, with a significant shift in the gender composition of the single subjects teaching cohorts. Interestingly, 2003-04 was not accompanied by a shift in the number of teachers assigned to the social sciences, reinforcing the idea that it was the stiffening of requirements for obtaining single subject credentials in specific subject areas that induced changes in career seeking among potential teacher candidates.
In sum, 2003-04 was a watershed year for BTSA and for candidates entering teaching in California. A reduction in the size of BTSA was accompanied by significant shifts in the subject areas to which new teachers were assigned, and a significant shift in the gender composition of single and multiple subject certification groups. Throughout the last five years, however, there has been modest – though far from sufficient – progress in recruiting a more ethnically diverse population of teachers.
How BTSA Participants Evaluate their Programs

This section very briefly reviews participating teacher responses to the 2006 and 2007 BTSA Task Force surveys soliciting their views about their BTSA experiences.

Table 1 reports the frequency and length of meetings between BTSA participating teachers and their assigned support providers. There is very little year to year variation in average response to these two questions. Participating teachers report meeting with their support providers more than twice a month, but less than weekly. And their meetings are, on average, substantially more than 30 minutes in length.

Table 1: BTSA Participating Teacher/Support Provider Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often did you meet with your SP:</th>
<th>Mean06 (N=20850)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07 (N=24661)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5A frequency of communication with SP</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long did you meet with your SP:</th>
<th>Mean06 (N=20674)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07 (N=24538)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5B length of meeting with SP</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviations of between .76 and .80 on these 4-point scales mean there is quite a lot of variability in these reports. While most survey respondents reported frequent and lengthy meetings a significant minority reported that they see their support providers rather rarely and/or for brief periods of time.

Table 2 summarizes the participating teachers’ views regarding how well they have been matched with their support providers with regard to how well they share knowledge of the students for which the participating teacher is responsible, whether the support provider is geographically close to the participating teacher and whether they have similar grade level and subject matter backgrounds.
Here again, there is relatively little year to year variation (the differences are statistically significant because of the very large sample size, but they are not substantively important). Overall, matching is reported to be quite good, with participating teachers giving an average rating substantially above 3.0 on all four matching criteria, indicating that BTSA programs were reasonably successful in matching participating teachers with support providers on multiple criteria. The relatively large standard deviations for the grade level and subject matter matching (1.00 and 1.07), combined with their lower mean scores indicate that matching tended to be substantially more of an either/or proposition for these criteria. The elementary level participating teachers were matched more on grade level while matching for secondary teachers, quite appropriately, tended to be based on subject matter specializations.

Table 3 reports the participating teachers’ judgments regarding the adequacy of time allocated to working with support providers. Satisfaction is consistent and generally quite high, though the 0.78 standard deviation indicates some individuals did not believe they were receiving adequate assistance.

In 2007, the survey questions have been revised to lower the survey burden on first year participants who were only required to answer the first seven questions while the second year participants had 20 questions to answer. To accommodate this change in survey design, we have separated the responses of Year 1 and Year 2 participants in 2005-06. Nevertheless, we find that the responses from Year 1 and Year 2 participant across two consecutive years are
quite compatible across all survey items. There are no significant group differences among the three groups.

As shown in Table 4, PTs confirm that the support from their SPs is usually timely (ranging from 3.39 to 3.42 on a 4 point scale), but they report less timeliness in the support from other BTSA teachers/specialists or from BTSA workshops/seminars/courses.

Table 4: Timeliness of Support Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often were BTSA supports timely:</th>
<th>Mean06yr1 (N&gt;=10775)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean06yr2 (N&gt;=8521)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07yr2 (N&gt;=10655)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8A timely support in terms of working with SP</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8B timely support in other teachers/specialist</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8C timely support in workshops/seminars/courses</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

As found in Table 5, PT responses to the frequency of their engagement in formative assessment activities and the value they put on these activities, some noteworthy findings.

Table 5: Frequency and Value of BTSA Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often you engaged in the following activities:</th>
<th>Mean06yr1 (N&gt;=11590)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean06yr2 (N&gt;=9068)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07yr2 (N&gt;=11417)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9F frequency of self-reflection</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9B frequency of evidence collection</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9C frequency of student work analysis</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9E frequency of self in-depth inquiry</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9G frequency of criteria-reference checking</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9A frequency of SP’ observing PT’s teaching</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9D frequency of observing experienced teacher</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

The most frequent activity is self-reflection on teaching. Most participating teachers reflect on their own teaching once a week and they generally put high value on this activity. Participating
teachers report that they have much less frequent opportunities to observe experienced teachers, even though they consistently put the highest value on this way of improving their teaching abilities. Most participating teachers only get to observe experienced teachers once or twice and some never get an opportunity for this valuable experience at all. Participating teachers are usually required to collect evidence of their teaching practice more than once every month, but they view activity as just somewhat valuable or valuable. As to the other four activities – student work analysis, self in-depth inquiry, support provider observation of PT’s teaching, and PT’s examination of their teaching against specific criteria – the frequency of the activities corresponds generally with the value put on the activity.

As shown in Table 6, a majority of participating teachers agree that the connections between the goals and activities associated with Individual Induction Plans (IIPs) and their teaching evidence collection, professional activities, and working with support provider are strong. The link between IIP goals and working with the support providers is significantly stronger than are the links with evidence collection and professional development.

Table 6: Connecting Induction Plans with Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BTSA PT Reports on the Connection between the Goals and IIP Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How strong was the connection between the goals and IIP: Mean06yr1 (N&gt;=11482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12C connection between IIP and working with SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12A link b/w IIP and evidence collection in assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12B link b/w IIP and professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

Most participants agree that the areas of strength and the areas of growth identified by their district’s formal evaluation process are aligned with those identified in the formative assessment (see Table 7).

Table 7: District and Formative Assessment Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BTSA PT Reports on the Alignment between District Evaluation and Formative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the areas of strength and growth aligned: Mean06yr1 (N=11218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 alignment b/w local and formative assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

As shown in Table 8, when considering the clarity of some specific aspects of the BTSA program, participating teachers’ views are varied. The specific aspects examined include requirements and expectations for BTSA participation, how to used formative assessment to improve their
teaching practice, and the individualized plan for professional growth. Participating teachers’ responses on these three aspects have a similar pattern. Around half of them think their BTSA program has made these aspects clear to them, another 20% thinking somewhat clear to them, another 20% thinking very clear, the rest 9-10% thinking their program hasn’t made them clear at all.

Table 8: Are BTSA Expectations, Plans, Assessments Clear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How clear were the following aspects of the BTSA Program:</th>
<th>Mean06yr1 (N=11638)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean06yr2 (N=9073)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07yr2 (N=11403)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14A clarity of requirements and expectation for BTSA</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14C clarity of BTSA plan for professional growth</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14B clarity of using formative assessment in teaching</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

Table 9 and Table 10 present responses to questions about whether BTSA builds on pre-service training and/or supports ongoing professional growth. About 65% of the participating teachers agree that their BTSA induction activities lay a moderate to great foundation for their own plans for ongoing professional growth in the future while the rest 35% think BTSA activities lay no or just a little foundation. As to BTSA activities building upon their previous training through university or intern work, participating teachers’ responses are in the same pattern in their responses to the professional growth foundation question.

Table 9: BTSA as Foundation for Professional Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did BTSA lay a foundation for your professional growth plan:</th>
<th>Mean06yr1 (N=11642)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean06yr2 (N=9058)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07yr2 (N=11281)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15 role of BTSA in your plans for professional growth</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

Table 10: Connection Between BTSA and Pre-Service Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did BTSA build on what you developed through pre-teaching program:</th>
<th>Mean06yr1 (N=11463)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean06yr2 (N=8897)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07yr2 (N=11299)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16 how BTSA build upon PT’s previous training</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

Table 11 summarizes the responses when participating teachers were asked to evaluate the helpfulness of working with their support provider and being engaged in BTSA activities in 15...
specific areas related to their teaching practice, the uniform pattern in their responses is a majority of them think BTSA is somewhat helpful or helpful in those 15 areas. What is worth noticing is that, compared to responses to the other 12 areas, about 10% more (around 25% in total) participating teachers think BTSA is not helpful in their using technology to support student learning, subject matter pedagogy, and communicating with families of students.

Table 11: Helpfulness of BTSA Program to Participating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent did BTSA program help you:</th>
<th>Mean06yr1 (N&gt;=11340)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean06yr2 (N&gt;=8578)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07yr2 (N&gt;=11354)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18H help in creating a supportive environment</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18I help in addressing equity and diversity</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18D help in meeting students’ needs</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18A BTSA’s help in improving student knowledge and skill</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18E help in analyzing student work</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18F help to understand students’ performance levels</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18K help in classroom management</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18B BTSA’s help in using standard-based instruction</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18C help in using standards-based assessment</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18O help in improving student achievement</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18U help in teaching special ed</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18G help in teaching English learners</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18F help in using technology</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18N help in subject matter pedagogy</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18M help in working with students’ families</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

Table 12 and Table 13 examine responses to questions about participating teachers’ satisfaction with their teaching assignment and their commitment to a teaching career. When they respond to their satisfaction to their current teaching status, such as teaching in their current district, teaching at their current school site, and their current teaching assignment, over 80% participating teachers feel either satisfied or very satisfied, which provides a promising prediction about their staying in the teaching profession. Their responses on their commitment in teaching (Table 13) correspond with what they responded in the satisfaction question. Consistently, over 80% participating teachers feel confident or very confident in staying in the teaching profession in 5 years. Interestingly, over 37% participating teachers are either not confident or just somewhat confident in teaching in the same district in five years, and over 43% are either not confident or just somewhat confident in teaching at same school in five years. Therefore, properly tracking the teachers who leave either a specific school or a school district will be more beneficial to increase the accuracy of retention data.
### Table 12: Satisfaction with Current Teaching Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you in terms of the following aspects:</th>
<th>Mean06yr1 (N&gt;=11599)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean06yr2 (N&gt;=9012)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07yr2 (N&gt;=11427)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q19C satisfaction with current teaching assignment</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19B satisfaction with teaching at current school site</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19A satisfaction with teaching in current district</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys

### Table 13: Participating Teacher Confidence in their Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How confident you will be:</th>
<th>Mean06yr1 (N&gt;=11614)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean06yr2 (N&gt;=9039)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean07yr2 (N&gt;=11409)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20A 5 years later confidence in teaching profession</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20B 5 years later confidence in teaching in the same district</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20C 5 years later confidence in teaching at same school</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BTSA Annual Surveys
Modeling BTSA Program Success

We continue next with a look at evidence regarding the critical elements leading to successful operation of typical BTSA programs. The statistical technique that most effectively handles this model building process is called Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Survey data gathered through two years of evaluation surveys completed by both participating teachers and support providers across the entire state provide the data used here.

Structural Equations Modeling BTSA Program Outcomes

Figures 6 through 9 present a composite picture of how successful BTSA programs operate. Figures 6 and 7 present the views of Participating Teachers and Figures 8a and 8b, those of their Support Providers. These two models summarize the “best fit” of the 2004-05 and 2005-06 statewide survey data to models of BTSA program dynamics. These best fit models depict a powerful description of how both participating teachers and support providers perceive the BTSA program and their respective BTSA experiences. The boxes shown on each model represent answers to specific questionnaire items on the Program Evaluation Survey; while the ovals represent conceptual, “latent” constructs that summarize the questionnaire responses targeting related topics. These latent constructs were not directly asked of each respondent but are created through statistical modeling.

The Participating Teacher Model

The eleven boxes on the participating teacher models represent the following questionnaire items:

**Location:** Responses to questionnaire item 6d asking about the extent to which participating teachers believe that they are well matched with their support provider in terms of geographic proximity.

**Subject:** Responses to questionnaire item 6b asking about the extent to which participating teachers believe that they are well matched with their support provider in terms of subject matter or course emphasis.

**Grade:** Responses to questionnaire item 6a asking about the extent to which participating teachers believe that they are well matched with their support provider in terms of the grade level that they teach.

**AdeqSup:** Responses to questionnaire item 7 asking about the extent to which participating teachers feel that the meeting time with their support providers is adequate.
**TimeSupp:** Responses to questionnaire item 8a asking about the extent to which participating teachers feel that the support they receive from their support providers is timely in meeting needs.

**Helpful:** A composite of responses of questionnaire items 18a-o which asks participating teachers about the extent to which they believe that the BTSA induction program’s formative assessment and professional development activities are helpful in improving pedagogical understanding and ability.

**Value:** The average of questionnaire items 9a-g asking about the value various assessment activities have for professional development.

**IIP:** The average of responses to questionnaire items 12a-c which asks participating teachers about the connection between the IIP’s goals and activities and the evidence collected through formative assessment, their professional development activities, and their work with support providers.

**Clarity:** The average of responses to questionnaire items 14a-c which queries participating teachers about the clarity of requirements and expectations for BTSA participation, the use of the programs formative assessment system, and their plan for professional growth (e.g. IIP).

**Sat:** The average of responses to questionnaire items 15a-c asking participating teachers about the extent to which they are satisfied with teaching in their school district, teaching at their current school site, and their current teaching assignment.

**Com:** The average of responses to questionnaire items 20 a-c asking about whether participation in BTSA has increased participating teachers’ commitment to the teaching profession, school district, and school site.

The four ovals in the model represent summary (or “latent factor”) variables and are computed by estimating the intersections of highly correlated and theoretically linked questionnaire items on common concepts:

**SP Match:** A composite measure of the structural match between participating teachers and their support providers in terms of geographic proximity, subject and grade level. It is expected that participating teachers that share common matching characteristics with their support providers are more likely to flourish, receiving greater degrees of support, a more effective use of formative assessment tools, and greater overall perceived satisfaction with and commitment to the teaching profession.

**Supports:** Responses to questions labeled “AdeqSup” and “TimeSupp” are very highly correlated, and together reflect participating teachers’ perception that it is important that BTSA support is both adequate and timely.
Assess: A composite measure of the degree to which participating teachers believe that their use of their formative assessment system is helpful, valuable, well developed and clear. This latent factor is computed by estimating the common effect of the “Helpful”, “Value”, “IIP” and “Clarity” measures from the questionnaire. These measures suggest that clearly developed and implemented assessment systems that are highly valued by and helpful to participating teachers promote a strong overall assessment component to BTSA programs.

Success: Both participating teacher satisfaction and commitment are highly inter-correlated, and combine to promote a composite of overall program success. It is expected that teachers who are simultaneously satisfied with and committed to the teaching profession will not only stay in the teaching profession longer, but will also strive to become more effective teachers. Better prepared and more competent teachers will also be more likely to be more satisfied and committed professionals.

Looking specifically at Figure 6 and Figure 7 (the Participating Teacher “best fit” model), a compelling model is offered describing how local BTSA programs are being experienced by participating teachers. Six key points are supported by these analyses. First, note that data collected from two different cohorts of BTSA participating teachers, separated by a full year between the surveys, produced virtually identical models of BTSA program success. The models are not only robust and highly reliable statistically, they indicate a consistent basis for interpreting BTSA program success. Second, BTSA success, according to this model, begins with the quality of the match between participating teachers and support providers. The SP Match variable plays a significant role in predicting how teachers participating in BTSA experience the BTSA program. That is, where participating teachers are encountering a strong and positive match with their support providers in terms of location and subject matter or grade level they provide more affirmative estimations of the effectiveness of BTSA supports and the overall formative assessment system they use. In the analysis of the 2004-05 data shown in Figure 6, the most powerful link is the .31 on the arrow linking SP Match with the Assess variable, indicating that a positive match between participating teachers and their support providers is most effective in creating a helpful, valuable and clear experience with formative assessment. Next, the .18 relationship between SP Match and Supports also suggests that a positively matched relationship between participating teachers and their support providers is effective in creating the conditions for participating teachers to feel that they are receiving adequate and timely support from their support providers.

Third, it is important to note that the model does not describe a direct link between SP Match and overall program Success. However, this is not to say that a well structured match between participating teachers and their support providers does not influence the satisfaction and commitment of participating teachers; this effect is clearly present but more as an indirect effect of SP Match on both creating strong support from support providers and a clear and helpful formative assessment system.
The fourth point to be considered is that the **Assess** variable has direct and statistically strong linkages to the **Supports** variable (Assess to Supports = .69), and the overall **Success** variable (Assess to Success = .22). These links suggest that a formative assessment system that is carefully developed and implemented serves to facilitate not only a strong and positive relationship between participating teachers and the support providers but, also, impacts the overall satisfaction with and commitment to the teaching profession. Conversely, the model also suggests that participating teachers encountering a BTSA environment in which formative assessment is experienced as cumbersome, confusing and obstructive will be less inclined to find their relationships with support providers rewarding and become less satisfied and committed to their teaching.
Fifth, it is also important to note that this model specifies a strong relationship from Assess to Supports and not the converse. What the direction of this relationship suggests is that a helpful and lucid formative assessment system is crucial in providing timely and adequate support from mentor teachers. While a supportive mentoring relationship surely is a key factor in facilitating the effective use of formative assessment tools, this model suggests that a successful formative assessment system is more likely to be instrumental in constituting the supportive relationship between participating teachers and support providers. This statistical finding was repeatedly illustrated in the case study sites as participating teachers and their support providers assured us that a badly received assessment system seriously disrupted the support provider/participating teacher relationship, while a respected system gave both parties a feeling that their relationship was very helpful to the new teachers’ success.

The sixth and final point to note in interpreting Figure 6 is that BTSA program Success is predicted as an outgrowth of the combined direct effects of both Supports (Supports to Success = .21) and Assess (Assess to Success = .22). These two factors combine to explain 16% (indicated by the .16 to the upper right of the Success oval) of the variance in overall teacher
satisfaction and commitment. While this appears to be a somewhat modest result, the fact that the composite effect of two factors (Supports and Assess) serve to explain nearly one-fifth of the variance of participating teachers’ satisfaction with and commitment to the teaching profession is a particularly notable result.

Comparison of the path coefficients on the arrows connecting the key variables in Figure 7 reveal an essentially identical model of BTSA success in 2005-06.

**The Support Provider Model**

The eight boxes on the support provider model represent the following questionnaire items:

**FreqComm:** Responses to questionnaire items 7a and 7b asking about the frequency of communication between participating teachers and their support providers and the average length of their meetings.

**Clarity:** The average of responses to questionnaire items 14a-d which query support providers the clarity of the goals and design of their BTSA program, their responsibilities as support providers, BTSA completion requirements and how BTSA articulates with professional teacher preparation programs.

**IIP:** The average of responses to questionnaire items 11a-c which ask support providers about the connection between the IIP’s goals and activities and their work with participating teachers, the evidence collected through formative assessment, and their professional development activities.

**Adequate:** Responses to questionnaire item 8 asking about the extent to which support providers feel that the meeting time with their participating teachers is adequate.

**Timely:** Responses to questionnaire item 9 asking about the extent to which support providers feel that the support they allocate to their participating teachers is timely in meeting their participating teachers’ needs.

**RolePrep:** The average of questionnaire items 3a-f which ask support providers to report their opinion on the degree to which their BTSA training serves to help them to become more effective, engaged, reflective, informed and responsive mentors.

**Helpful:** A composite of responses of questionnaire items 17a-o which asks support providers about the extent to which they believe that the BTSA induction program is helpful in improving the pedagogical understanding and ability of participating teachers in a number of distinct areas.
**Assess:** The average of questionnaire items 16a-c asking about the degree to which support providers believe that the BTSA formative assessment system is fair in representing the skills and abilities of participating teachers, is effective in supporting their professional development, and is connected with the IIP from year to year.

Much like the participating teacher model, the two ovals in the support provider model represent summary (or “latent factor”) variables and are computed by estimating the intersections of highly correlated and theoretically linked questionnaire items on common concepts:

**Supports:** Parallel to the participating teacher model, responses to questions labeled “Adequate” and “Timely” are very highly correlated, and together reflect support provider perception that it is important that BTSA support is both adequate and timely.

**Success:** Successful outcomes in the support provider model are computed by examining the degree to which support providers perceive that BTSA helped their participating teachers to become more effective and engaged teachers. Support providers who perceive both that BTSA helps to promote stronger teaching knowledge, skills and practices among beginning teachers, and that BTSA’s formative assessment system is fair and effective are likely to have an overall positive impression of the success of the BTSA program.

**Turning to Figure 8 and Figure 9 (the Support Provider “best fit” models),** a persuasive model is offered describing how local BTSA programs are being experienced by support providers. In some respects this model parallels that which fits the participating teacher data; however, there are important differences. Four key points are revealed by the analysis in Figure B.

First, and in contrast to the participating teacher model, data from the support provider questionnaires are not available to estimate the **SP Match, Assess, and Success** latent factors as they are described in Figure A as much of this data was not collected on the support provider questionnaires. Importantly, successful outcome questions about participating teacher satisfaction and commitment were not asked of support providers. Because of the absence of this data, successful outcomes in the support provider model are illustrated by their perception of the overall effectiveness of both the overall BTSA program and its formative assessment system in providing a supportive and enriching context for professional growth (this is estimated through the combined effects of the **Helpful and Assess** variables).

The second notable feature of this model is that the data from the support provider questionnaire, like that of the participating teacher data, reveal that a positive perception of adequate and timely support is significantly and powerfully a product of the clarity of the BTSA program (Clarity to Supports = .58) and the effectiveness of the IIP (IIP to Supports = .42). (The combined effects of both **Clarity** and **IIP** are used in the participating teacher model to create the **Assess** latent factor but are decomposed here – a result of the non-parallel nature of the questions targeting these concepts between the participating teacher and support provider questionnaires). In addition, and not surprisingly, reports from support providers suggest that
effective **Supports** are also a function of the frequency of their communication with participating teachers. Although the strength of this relationship is modest (FreqComm to Supports = .09), it is notable that it plays an important but much smaller role in facilitating adequate and timely support when compared to the impact of clear and effective program goals and operations. Together, **Clarity**, **IIP** and **FreqComm** serve to explain 72% of the variance in **Supports**, a very powerful explanatory estimation.

**Figure 8**: Support Provider “Best Fit” Model for 2004-2005

The third notable aspect of this model is that **Supports** plays a powerful and direct role in explaining both support provider perceptions of their ability to carry out their various role obligations (Supports to RolePrep = .74) and the overall **Success** of the BTSA program (Supports to Success = .72). These data seem to suggest that support providers understand the effectiveness of both their role in the BTSA program and the program’s overall successful implementation as a product of their ability to provide adequate and timely support. Support providers who can demonstrate effective support for their participating teachers not only perceive that the training for their role was useful, but also that they are competent translators of BTSA knowledge, skills and tools to their participating teachers.
Finally, **Success** in the support provider model is powerfully explained by both adequate and timely **Supports** (Supports to Success = .72) and a perception of helpful support provider role preparation and training (RolePrep to Success = .23). In the model depicted in Figure 9, 79% of the variance in **Success** is explained by the effects of **Supports** and **RolePrep**, an extremely powerful statistical estimation. What these results illustrate is the belief among support providers that both the adequacy of their role preparation matched with their ability to provide adequate and timely support are key factors in the emergence of a BTSA program that embodies a strong assessment system and is helpful overall in facilitating the professional growth of participating teachers.
Accounting for Variations in BTSA Program Operations

The central driving idea that has given form and structure to the BTSA programs is the concept of Standards-Based Accountability (SBA). BTSA’s core documents – the program standards and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, together with the standardized testing system which teacher candidates must master all point to the idea that teaching reform and improvement will come from articulating standards and holding individual teachers and teacher induction programs accountable for realizing these standards.

What the ten BTSA case study programs (and the director interviews from an additional seventeen programs undergoing IPR reviews this year) have revealed quite clearly is that SBA for BTSA programs has evolved into a system in which three competing ideas about how and why standards can be expected to guide and structure the development of high performance public school teachers. For convenience in discussing these three alternative perspectives on SBA, we have labeled the alternatives with labels that point, in a general way, to their different core ideas. First, at many points in our review of local BTSA programs we saw standards described as mandates for the design and operation of local BTSA programs. This perspective is aptly captured in the phrase “Program Delivery Standards.” From the Program Delivery Standards perspective, standards specify what must be done with and for new teachers in order to facilitate their professional growth. The core concept is that years of research and analysis have enabled policy makers and educational leaders to specify, quite clearly, the activities that will lead to competent teaching practice. Standards specify what advanced training needs to be provided, what support services are most effective, and how evidence of participation in these activities and accessing these support services should be documented and reported.

This idea of standards as the specification of activities, events and services stands in significant tension with a second conception of how standards based reform actually works. The second core idea we have called “Performance Standards.” Here, we mean that the standards serve to describe and specify what high performance teachers actually do in the schools to facilitate efficient, equitable and comprehensive student achievement. The core concept is that years of research and analysis have enabled policy makers and educational leaders to specify, quite clearly, the activities that will lead to competent teaching practice. Standards specify what advanced training needs to be provided, what support services are most effective, and how evidence of participation in these activities and accessing these support services should be documented and reported.

Therefore, from this perspective, it is less important that we specify training activities and support services, and more important that we assess actual teaching performances – ones in which teachers demonstrate and document that they are using the craft knowledge of the profession in a suitably flexible and reliable way. That is, the teachers demonstrate and document that they are able to engage students, manage classrooms, cover curriculum, monitor student progress, and attend adequately and equitably to student needs.
There is also a third idea about the meaning of standards based reform that was seen in our BTSA case studies. The third idea, existing in tension with the Program Delivery and Teaching Performance standards, we have called the Professional Capacity Standards framework. From this third perspective, the target of teacher induction is not so much program implementation and/or teaching performance, as the development of teachers who have the willingness and ability to accept and discharge broad responsibility for student outcomes. From this perspective, what needs to be standardized is the flexible, competent and creative capacity of teachers to draw upon a broad repertoire of skills in ways that are guided by a rich and authentic understanding of how children learn and develop, how subject matter concepts and dynamics are best understood and communicated, and what consequences for children’s educations arise from the challenges of factors like poverty, home language, physical or mental limitations, ethnic and political differences.

What we have noted is that the most significant differences in BTSA program design, implementation and documentation arise from the ways in which staff, participating teachers, support providers and district officials wrestle with and align their efforts with one or more of these competing conceptions of what it means to undertake a standards-based reform school teaching.

Table 14 on the next page outlines how we use this notion of the tensions among standards based accountability concepts to analyze variations in how local BTSA programs give unique interpretations to nominally common elements in the BTSA programs in which they participate.
Table 14: How Competing Ideas of Standards Based Accountability Influence BTSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Using the Program Delivery Standards Approach</th>
<th>Using the Classroom Performance Standards Approach</th>
<th>Using the Professional Capacity Standards Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Documents</td>
<td>The Program Standards document is paramount</td>
<td>The specifications of standards in the Formative Assessment instruments are dominant</td>
<td>The idea of professionalism pointed toward by the California Standards for the Teaching Profession dominates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Activities</td>
<td>Emphasize content and required participation</td>
<td>Emphasize application and utilization in classrooms</td>
<td>Emphasize theory and insight development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support services</td>
<td>Guide PTs in executing required activities (IIPs, CFASST events, etc.)</td>
<td>Emphasize observation and modeling of teaching activities</td>
<td>Emphasize trust, team building, engagement in district wide professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Providers</td>
<td>Facilitate activity completion and help manage stress</td>
<td>Model high quality teaching and share techniques</td>
<td>Provide a vision of professional responsibility and capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIP/Growth plans</td>
<td>Outline specific activities and show that they are executed</td>
<td>Define learning tasks emphasizing acquisition of good teaching practices</td>
<td>Identify professional growth needs and aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability review emphasis</td>
<td>Document activities</td>
<td>Document performances</td>
<td>Document evidence of flexibility and innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exploring BTSA Teacher Retention

One important goal in the creation of the BTSA program was to improve the willingness and ability of teachers to remain in the profession and to continue to work in schools serving challenging students. For this reason, the impact of the BTSA program on teacher tenure in the occupation has been a consistent theme in every effort to review and evaluate the program’s success. This review is difficult, however, because California’s Basic Education Data System (CBEDS) still lacks the capacity to provide longitudinal tracking of individual teachers. A new teacher identification and tracking data base is being created to rectify this problem but, at present, it is not possible to definitively evaluate the retention of California teachers through the state’s data systems. As a result, as we turn next to the complex problem of assessing the impact of BTSA programs on teacher retention we are aware that our findings must be viewed as tentative and suggestive rather than definitive.

In the last few years local BTSA projects have been charged with assessing whether the participants in their programs have remained in teaching following the completion of their clear credentials. Monitoring the accuracy of these data is very problematic, however, because the local BTSA programs do not have the resources to more than informally request information about the current whereabouts of individual teachers who may have left positions held during their BTSA participating teacher years. In an attempt to utilize the data available from individual BTSA programs and to place that data in a broader context, we have approached this issue in three steps.

First, we secured and analyzed the teacher retention data reported by the BTSA programs. Second, we solicited and were given access to a ten year data set covering all teachers in the 45 districts participating in one of the state’s largest local BTSA programs. This ten year data set allows us to accurately assess the extent to which CBEDS/PAIF records accurately report teacher longevity in the occupation. Third, we examined the CBEDS/PAIF reports of teacher tenure in education for the entire history of the CBEDS record keeping (i.e., from 1985 through 2006). This section of our report summarizes these three analyses.

Analyzing BTSA Program Reports of Retention

Our review of the data begins with a look at the retention data submitted by the local BTSA programs. These data cover only three cohorts of BTSA participating teachers – those entering BTSA in 2003, 2004 and 2005. There are no school site identifiers available for these teachers, so we can only examine their continuation in the profession, not their continued employment...
in a particular school or district. We can review, however, the local BTSA project reports on how many teachers have left teaching during the first one, two or three years following their BTSA induction experiences. Figure 10 summarizes the data from these reports. The graph in this figure tracks the retention of each of the three cohorts of participating teachers for which data were available. The graph has three lines on it – the middle one reports the average rate of retention across all of local programs. (Note, however, that data were not available for the 2003-04 and the 2004-05 cohorts from nine local programs that were 1,203 participating teachers in 2005-06.) The top line on the graph in Figure 10 shows that the highest rate of retention of new teachers was reported to be 100 percent for all three years. Twelve local BTSA programs, serving a total of 336 participating teachers in 2005-06 reported the remarkable record of not losing a single teacher during the three year tracking period.

Figure 10: Reported Participating Teacher Retention Rates in All BTSA Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Of 37,399 teachers from 2003-04 thru 2005-06; 32,648 are still teaching, 4,751 are not. Of those not known to be teaching, 885 are known to be not teaching, 244 are known to be on leave, 95 are known to have moved to leadership positions, and 3,413 are of unknown status.
The bottom line in Figure 10 reports the lowest level of retention reported by any local program. This rate dropped to just 47%. This was the only program reporting retention of less than 50% of the 2003-4 cohort and the only program reporting below 50% for the 2004-05 cohort as well. Eleven programs, however, reported retention of less than 70% of their 2003-04 cohort three years later. According to the calculation algorithms, the data reported by the local BTSA programs represents the most conservative estimate of teacher retention. All teachers whose status is unknown (ones who may be teaching in another state, or simply in another California school district) and even those teachers who have moved into administrative positions in the schools are counted as lost to retention. To the extent that these data accurately portray what is happening in California, teacher attrition in this state is far below that found in a number of national estimates. To try to corroborate these local program reports, and to examine trends over a longer period of time, we sought data examining teacher persistence in the occupation over a longer time period. Two such data sets were available. The first from careful records maintained by one of the largest state BTSA programs.

**An Eight Year Study of Retention in One BTSA Program**

A large local BTSA program provided our research team with complete CBEDS/PAIF data for the ten year period from 1997 through 2006. The data set is organized so that individual teachers could be anonymously tracked from year to year, making it possible to identify exactly when each teacher entered the BTSA program and when they ceased to be employed in any one of 12 school districts that provided complete annual data (district identities are not reported to protect confidentiality).

Three tests were made of this data. First, teachers who entered the BTSA program each year from 1999 to 2005 were tracked through 2006 to determine whether they were still being employed by any of the participating districts. Next, we examined the employment history of all teachers with less than 3 years of experience (both BTSA and non BTSA) from 1998 through 2006, relying on their tracking identifiers to determine whether they ceased to work in the participating school districts. This helps shed some light on whether participating in the local BTSA program altered the attrition rate relative to teachers working during the same years who did not participate in BTSA.

The third analysis involved monitoring the average years of teaching experience for all teachers with from 3 to 12 years of experience in each of the 23 years for which CBEDS/PAIF data are
available. This analysis uses unidentified teacher records, just as they are found in the CBEDS/PAIF files for all 45 districts that have participated in this BTSA consortium (as above, district identities are not reported to protect confidentiality). To the extent that there is increased retention among teachers in these districts it will appear as an increase in the average number of years of teaching for teachers in this early to mid-career experience range. We test this model in the cooperating local BTSA program school districts, and then expand the test to see if average experience for mid-career teachers has been going up across the state.

Figure 11 graphically presents tracks teacher attrition from the districts served by this BTSA program of teachers in each cohort from 1999 to 2005. The data plots represent the average retention rate in each year following the cohort’s initial entry into the database (that is, the Year 2 data point is the average proportion remaining during the second year for all cohorts). This means that the data points closest to the Year 1 starting point have more estimates averaged and are therefore more reliable than those in the later years.
There are two important points to emphasize in interpreting this graph. First, the attrition rate of all probationary and tenured teachers with less than three years of experience when they are first found in the database (the red line on the graph) have a substantially sharper that for the teachers identified as BTSA program participants (the blue line on the graph). There are two likely interpretations of this difference: a) that BTSA is improving retention, or b) that BTSA does not serve many teachers until after they have acquired some professional teaching experience. To try to determine which of these interpretations is more likely, we examined the reports from the 2005 BTSA consent form for all BTSA participating teachers to compare the year in which they reported receiving their first California teaching credential with the year of their reported enrollment in BTSA. This comparison reveals that 41% of the BTSA teachers report receiving their first California teaching credential at least one full year before entering the BTSA program. No doubt, these earlier teaching experiences are on less than full preliminary credentials, but we do find that a significant portion of teachers have one or more years of experience before entering BTSA. These teachers are, apparently, more likely to leave the teaching workforce during their initial years, and the higher retention of BTSA experienced teachers may be due in some unknown part to the fact that the more at risk of leaving the
workforce first and second year teachers are not getting BTSA support immediately upon entering on their teaching careers.

The second important point to keep in mind about the data on this graph is that we are unable to track any teachers who move out of the districts from whom we received this data. Thus the attrition rate is almost certainly over estimated as teachers moving to other school systems are treated as having left their cohort and are equivalent to having left the profession. This may account for at least some of the elevated rate of attrition in this data when compared to that reported in the BTSA retention tracking system managed by the BTSA Task Force.

A second approach to analyzing the data from this one large BTSA program was to examine what could be learned about changes in teacher attrition by analyzing the entire 45 district teacher workforce without considering whether or not the teachers had participated in the BTSA support and induction process. The purpose of this analysis is to lay the groundwork for examining the entire California teaching workforce – a population for which we could not get any specific indicator documenting whether or not they had participated in a BTSA program during their early teaching career.

Our working hypothesis for this analysis is that, prior to the mid-90s no teacher had the benefit of BTSA support because the program was only created in 1992 and did not become fully operational until 1999. Thus, if BTSA participation is having a positive effect of teacher retention in the workforce, that effect should be seen in an increase in teacher tenure within the occupation since about 2000. The issue is complicated, however, by overall changes in the California public school system – enrollment growth and contraction, budget crises, class size policies, etc. During periods of rapid enrollment growth, we expected to see the average tenure of teachers decline because more new young teachers are being trained and employed to cope with enrollment growth. When budget crises are severe enough to lead to teacher layoffs, the experience level of the average teacher goes up due to the fact that layoffs typically go to the teachers with the least tenure. When class sizes were reduced starting in 1996, there was a dramatic growth in the workforce bringing younger, less experienced teachers into the schools. Finally, in the last few years we have begun to see departures from the workforce of the “Baby Boom” generation teachers who have had ample opportunity to get 30 years of experience and maximize their retirement benefits.

It is possible, however, to generate a reasonably good indicator of BTSA program participation impact on teacher tenure if we compare that experience of those teachers who have most probably been exposed to BTSA with those who have generally not been so exposed. This is done by examining how the average years of teaching experience reported by teachers with
just 3 to 12 years of experience since 1999-2000 with the amount of experience reported by a similar group of teachers in previous years. Most teachers who were given probationary or tenured teaching contracts anytime after about 1999 were BTSA participants during their first two years as fully credentialed teachers. Very often teachers are not fully credentialed during their first year or two as teachers. Indeed, CBEDS data show that about 40% of the teachers reported to be in their first year of experience during 2006-07 school year were employed on contracts without probationary or tenured status.

We ignore the first two years of reported public school employment on probationary or tenured contracts because that is when teachers who are coming directly into the occupation through the traditional pre-service training route will have been receiving their BTSA training and may have been learning that teaching is not really what they had expected, we should see the impact of BTSA on teacher tenure during the next several years as the BTSA prepared teachers stay in the occupation longer than previous generations of teachers did.
Figure 12 compares the experience levels of the entire teaching workforce in the 45 districts served by this one local BTSA program with the experience levels of those teachers in these districts reporting from 3 to 12 years of experience. To make the two lines on the graph comparable, the average experience for each group over the entire 22 year history of CBEDS data is subtracted from the average calculated for each year. Thus, when the graph shows 0.52 years for all teachers in 1985, this reflects the fact that in 1984 the workforce in these districts had an average of 0.52 years of experience more than the 13.08 year average over the 22 year period from 1985 to 2006.
The teachers in the 3 to 12 year group averaged 7.17 years of teaching experience across the entire 22 year period. Thus, the first point on the graph for this group shows 0.48 years because that year the 3 to 12 year group had an average of 7.64 years of experience, 0.48 years more than the historical average.

The blue line, tracing the average number of years of experience above or below the historic average of 13.08 years for the entire workforce does not tell us anything about the impact of the BTSA program, but does provide important information about what has been happening to the workforce in this part of California over the last two decades. Over the period from 1985 to 1990 (when a budget crisis forced cancellation of CBEDS/PAIF data collection for one year) the average tenure of this workforce declined sharply. By 1990 the average teacher in this group of districts had about one and a third fewer years of experience than they did five years previously. This is partly due to dramatic growth in the population of these school districts forcing the hiring of many more young teachers, but as will be seen below, this pattern is
similar to that of the entire state where tenure was declining due to a combination of troublesome teacher attrition, enrollment growth and retirement of an aging teacher workforce. Average tenure for the overall workforce rose again in the early 1990s, declined in the late 1990s, climbed again from 2000 to 2002 and has generally been declining since then.

The red line on the graph in Figure 12 tracks movements in the average experience levels of teachers reporting from 3 to 12 years of experience. And here is where we look for the impact of BTSA. By comparing the red and blue lines on this graph, we can see how shifts in the teachers’ average tenure in this critical period during which lifetime career decisions are being made differs over time, and differs from that of more and less experienced colleagues. In the 1985 to 90 period the 3 to 12 year teacher group declined in experience consistently each year, losing about two-thirds of a year on average. This means that there were more 3, 4, 5 and 6 year teachers and fewer with 7 to 12 years of experience – the expected result of enrollment growth bringing young teachers into the workforce, combined with the widely recognized substantial rate of teacher attrition.

The interesting part of this graph is the way in which the red line does not follow the trend in the blue line during the last five years. While total tenure has been declining, the tenure of the 3 to 12 year cohorts has been growing. The total workforce lost a bit more than one-quarter of a year in average experience while the less experienced group gained four-tenths of a year in experience. Thus, while the overall workforce was losing more experienced teachers (probably due to the retirement of Baby Boomers who have reached 30 years of experience), there has been a steady increase in the overall experience level of probationary and tenured teachers with 3 to 12 years of experience. While it is not possible to show that BTSA has any direct responsibility for this tendency for this younger group to remain longer in the profession, it is certainly suggestive. This is the only period during the last two decades when changes in the experience levels of this group of teachers has run counter to the trend set by the total workforce for more than a year or two at a time.

**Looking for Evidence of BTSA Retention Effects in CBEDS**

Figure 13 presents a graph depicting variations in the average years of teaching experience for all probationary and tenured teachers in California over the 22 year period from 1985 to 2006. The blue line on this graph traces the history of the entire probationary and tenured teaching workforce by plotting the amount by which their average tenure in each year deviates from their 15.14 year average across all years. The red line depicts the history of those teachers reporting 3 to 12 years of experience, plotting the deviation in their average tenure each year from the 7.17 years average tenure across all years.
As the trend in the blue line on this graph clearly shows, California has a substantially less
experienced teaching workforce in the last three years than it has had at any other time since
the CBEDS tracking system was initiated. From its high point in 1985 when the average teacher
had nearly 16 years of experience (0.82 years above the 15.14 overall average) the average
tenure declined to just 14.06 years in 2005. Experience levels among those teachers with just 3
to 12 years of experience shows a very different history. During the 1985 to 1990 period,
average experience for this group declined more sharply than did that of the overall work force
– dropping more than two-thirds of a year on average. This drop was, no doubt, significantly
influenced by rapid growth in school enrollments as well as significant attrition of young
teachers. During the early nineties this group increased in average tenure, indicating a
substantial improvement in their retention rate, probably combined with budget crises that led
school districts to resist hiring more young teachers. With the adoption of the massive class
size reduction initiative in 1995, the experience level of this group dropped quickly as new

Source: California Basic Education Data System Professional Assignment Information Files
teachers were quickly sought to staff the substantial number of new classrooms. From the perspective of potential BTSA program impact on teacher retention, the important point of this graph is seen in the comparison between the blue and red lines beginning in 2000 when virtually all new teachers began to participate in the BTSA program. As the diverging trajectory of the lines on this part of the graph clearly shows, even as overall workforce experience has been declining to historic lows, the average experience of those teachers who have participated in BTSA has steadily climbed. Between 2000 and 2006, this group of teachers gained more than six-tenths of a year in average experience. To produce this sharp increase in average experiences levels for teachers with 3 to 12 years of experience would require one of three things to happen: a) the schools quit hiring young teachers, b) there was a massive influx of new teachers with several years of experience, or c) there was a substantial reduction in the rate of attrition of teachers in these early years of their careers. There have been budget problems leading some districts to abandon class size reduction and thus need fewer new teachers, which may account for part of this trend. The CBEDS records show, however, that the total number of teachers reporting 1 or 2 years of experience has continued to grow during the years since 2000, so overall reductions in hiring cannot be responsible for very much of the tenure growth.

There is an important limitation to this approach that must be recognized. Using the anonymous records in the statewide CBEDS data reports, it is not possible to tell how many exiting teachers might be being replaced by experienced teachers who are entering or re-entering the workforce and thus reporting the same number of years of experience that a teacher leaving the workforce would have reported. Thus, this technique underestimates by some unknown amount the actual retention of teachers – those replaced by experienced returning teachers or ones coming in from out of state.

Another possible compromising factor to keep in mind is that CBEDS data are widely regarded as containing a significant number of recording errors, particularly during the early years of the system’s implementation. Keeping these caveats in mind, we interpret Figure 13 cautiously, but find it realistic enough to deserve reporting.

The important point here is that the CBEDS system appears to suggest that the forces leading to teacher attrition may be embedded in historic shifts in the nature of teacher working conditions, alternative job opportunities, reduction in the kind of civic dedication that has historically attracted young people into teaching, or other unknown factors may be just as important as the quality of teacher training or the quality of induction services. It is quite possible, of course, that teacher retention might have deteriorated disastrously without the BTSA program, significant salary increases, class size reduction and other positive developments.
that have taken place in the last twenty years. Whatever else these data may mean, they strongly suggest that state policy makers and local school district officials should closely examine the factors that are influencing broad trends in teacher retention as well as evaluating the impact of the BTSA program.

The data analysis presented in Figure 13 depicts the average experience levels for teachers after including teachers re-entering the workforce following service interruptions due to relocation, child bearing or other factors. Thus, while we know that a significant number of teachers are returning within a few years after having children or trying other career opportunities, so far as the CBEDS record is concerned, we cannot tell whether it is these teachers that are improving the retention rate for the mid-career teachers depicted in our graph.
Examining the Impact of BTSA on Student Achievement

At the time of this study there were no statewide data systems linking student achievement to individual classrooms and teachers. The only way to approach the question of whether BTSA program participation enhances a teacher’s ability to improve student achievement is to secure data from local school districts. The data need to be fully linked – indicating which students were assigned to various teachers and providing demographic information about both the students and the teachers. In particular, the data need to show which teachers are or have been in BTSA programs and provide both prior and current achievement data for each student. Not only are these data not available from state records, many districts are incapable of linking teacher and student data or are unable to identify BTSA participation in any electronic data files linked to other teacher data. Moreover, files linking teacher characteristics to student achievement are highly sensitive, invariably raising issues of confidentiality and protection of human subjects.

That said, our study team was able to secure a very limited data sample from one large local school district. Linking teacher and student characteristics with achievement data in this sample was limited to elementary level classrooms (middle and high school students have multiple teachers making it impossible in a small sample to know how to assign students to teachers). It is impossible to examine achievement below grade three since state testing does not begin until grade two and it is crucial to have a prior achievement measure for each student in order to assess the impact of teachers who only work with the students for a single academic year. Without controlling for prior achievement, teachers would be credited (or blamed) for the students’ entire academic attainment rather than just that part acquired during their experience in a particular classroom.

The participating school district provided us with a data file containing student reading and mathematics achievement scores on the California Standards Test. These scores were linked to the CBEDS/PAIF teacher assignment information, identifying some but not all of the district’s first year BTSA teachers and including information on student demographics and school program assignments. From this school district’s data we were able to draw a sample of 216 first year BTSA teachers located in 165 different schools and teaching in grades three through five. There were 18,894 students in these three grades in these schools, and there were 987 teachers in these schools who probably did not have BTSA experience because they report having at least 10 years of teaching experience.

With nearly 30,000 BTSA teachers across the state, this data can only be utilized to hint at what might be done to ascertain whether BTSA experience is having a positive impact on student
achievement. Indeed, since we could not identify teachers who had completed their BTSA Induction responsibilities in sufficient numbers to permit even pilot testing, the statistical test presented here is not yet what is really needed. Thus, what is presented here should be seen as only illustrating a useful approach to linking BTSA experiences to student achievement.

The data provided are analyzed to answer two basic questions:

1) Are BTSA teachers more likely to be placed in challenging classrooms than experienced teachers? and
2) Are there any differences in student academic gains between those being taught by novice (BTSA) and those with more experienced teachers?

To address the first question we used logistic regression to determine whether students of various demographic and academic backgrounds are more or less likely to be assigned to BTSA teachers or to more experienced teachers in the same schools. The resulting analysis is shown in the table to the right. Only three of the variables tested showed any relationship between student characteristics and the teachers to whom they were assigned. BTSA teachers were nearly twice as likely to be teaching 4th graders or 5th graders as 3rd graders. (They were 1.9 times more likely to have 4th graders and 1.8 times as likely to have 5th graders). This is almost certainly because the population of younger children is shrinking in this district resulting in fewer new teachers in the lower grades. The BTSA teachers are also significantly less likely to have certified special education children (the odds ratio is 0.7 meaning that special education children are only 70% as likely to be in BTSA as in experienced teacher classrooms. The other significant, but weaker, link is that BTSA teachers are somewhat less likely to have Fluent English (redesignated) students and more likely to have English Only students than their more experienced colleagues. Overall, then, there is no evidence in this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment of Students to BTSA Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts 0405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 0405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic vs White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American vs White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian vs White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American vs White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 vs 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 vs 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female vs Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifree reduce lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL vs EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEP vs EO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data that the more challenging students are being placed with BTSA teachers rather than more experienced teachers in the same schools.

Having discovered that the BTSA teachers have classes that reasonably approximate a random sample of the students in their schools (except for fewer special education and fluent English proficient students), we turn next to asking how the BTSA teachers’ contributions to the achievement of their students compares with that of more experienced teachers who have probably not had any BTSA experience.

Table 16 reports the regression weights for a variety of factors, including whether the students were instructed by BTSA teachers, that could be expected to influence their academic learning in any given year. In this table, the Prior Test Scale Score and the Grade to Grade contrasts are used simply to standardize the scale and keep these factors from distorting the findings.

Table 16. Do BTSA teachers affect student academic gains?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Test Scale Score</td>
<td>37.09</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>49.92</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic vs White</td>
<td>-8.33</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-9.11</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American vs White</td>
<td>-13.00</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-17.92</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian vs White</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American vs White</td>
<td>-4.28</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>-4.57</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 vs 3</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-13.31</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 vs 3</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-18.46</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female vs Male</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free or Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-5.51</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted (GATE)</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>-12.72</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-16.76</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP vs EO</td>
<td>-7.40</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-10.53</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEP vs EO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher BA+30 vs BA</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>-3.48</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher MA vs BA</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher MA+30 vs BA</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher PhD vs BA</td>
<td>-3.82</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>-8.74</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years at the School</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTSA vs teachers over 10 years</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the most part the statistics reported in this table are unremarkable. As expected, high prior achievement predicts higher later achievement; Gifted students gain more than others; special
education students gain less; limited English proficiency is a drag on achievement (measure using an English language test). Asian students do better (especially in mathematics) than whites while other ethnic groups do less well.

The most important entry in the table is the last row which compares the outcomes of a year of experience with a BTSA teacher to spending the year being taught by a teacher with more than ten years of experience. As the p-value column makes clear, there is no statistically significant difference in student learning between classrooms with first year BTSA teachers and those being taught by ten year veterans. If the data from this small pilot study were corroborated across the state it would mean that BTSA teachers are not so distracted by their BTSA responsibilities as to interfere with their teaching effectiveness.

One other interesting finding provided by the data from this district deserves mentioning here. Though we were not initially concerned with whether BTSA teachers were anything more than first time teachers, discovery that more than 40% reported receiving their first California credential at least a year before starting BTSA led us to examine the level of experience of the BTSA teachers in this district sample.

As Table 17 indicates, of the 264 first-year BTSA teachers in this sample for whom their total years of teaching were reported, almost half (49.6%) reported being in at least their second year of teaching. Nearly a third (31.8%) reported being in their third year of teaching when they entered BTSA, and more than 17% reported being in at least their fifth year of teaching.

Such findings pose a significant question: What should the state of California be doing to assure that teachers who are not yet eligible for BTSA participation are adequately supported. Some are, to be sure, being supported by through intern training programs, but the numbers suggest that many California classrooms are being staffed by less than fully credentialed teachers who are almost certainly in need of support at least as robust as that provided to BTSA and intern teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Taught</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent of non-missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BTSA Fiscal Analysis

The fiscal dimensions of the BTSA program received extensive examination by the research staff at the American Institutes of Research. The design, methods and findings of this special research project are presented here.

In the conduct of the study, we understand the primary purpose for developing models of funding adequacy for the BTSA program is to allow better consideration of the fundamental policy question: Is the amount of state funding sufficient, insufficient, or excessive to successfully meet the state policy goals set for this program? Additionally, we examine differences among local programs to see how these differences may be related to program outcomes. Finally, we reflect on how fiscal information can be used to assess attainment of legislative goals.

Addressing questions of this nature requires an understanding of all the resources used to operate each local BTSA program, how local expenditures relate to the state revenues allocated to each program, and the extent to which each local program is meeting specified program goals. To the extent that uniform and complete data can be assembled (and assuming that local programs face relatively equal implementation challenges) the site that most fully realizes program objectives at the lowest level of total expenditures serves to define an appropriate benchmark for funding adequacy.

Three primary questions guide an analysis of funding adequacy:

- **How much is allocated by the state for each of these programs?**
- **How do budget allocations differ across sites?**
- **How effectively and efficiently are fiscal resources being used to reach program goals?**

These three components form the basis of a comprehensive model of program funding adequacy. A description of this model and a list of specific variables used in the analysis of BTSA and Internship programs are provided in more detail below. Of course, the adequacy and completeness of the model depends heavily on the availability and accuracy of data for each of these three components. As detailed below, our analysis of BTSA finances is substantially limited by data inconsistencies and incompleteness.

**BTSA Budget Data Sources**

Once a local induction program is affiliated with BTSA, it must submit annual budget sheets to the BTSA program office of the California Department of Education that itemize proposed
spending on certified teachers, administrative costs, books and supplies and other program components. Each local agency annually provides a projection of anticipated dollars from state and local in-kind sources to the BTSA budget office for the coming year. The first apportionment of BTSA funds is made to programs in October based on the projections outlined in the budget. By December of each year, participating teachers complete and submit an online form to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing that indicates their consent to participate in the program. Based on the revised information received through the consent forms, another apportionment is made to programs from the state BTSA office in February. Program budget sheets are available in hard copy format from the BTSA program office at the California Department of Education for 145 of the 154 funded programs operating during the 2006-07 year and a sample of programs in prior years.8

In addition to the budget sheets that itemize proposed spending at the program level, spreadsheets that list final allocations to each program, including numbers of participating first and second year teachers, are also available from the BTSA program office of the California Department of Education. State allocation data contain the number of first and second year teachers and the amounts allocated to each program from the state BTSA office from the program’s inception to 2006-07. Program budget data and state program allocation data form the basis of our fiscal analysis described in more detail below.

Additionally, excerpts from interviews with program directors from 27 of the 28 programs that underwent the IPR process are available for review. During the interview process, directors were asked about the adequacy of resources and program budget allocations. All 27 interview transcripts were evaluated for budget information and were coded on criteria relevant to the allocation of resources at the site level. Excerpts of the transcripts are included in this report that provide context within which state and local budget data may be more fully investigated.

Finally, there are six regional BTSA clusters in the state of California and each cluster currently receives two grant awards to support Cluster Regional Directors who are charged with providing regional support services. Cluster budgets are available from BTSA regional directors from 2001-02 to 2006-07 listing anticipated dollars from block grants allocated to each cluster as well as budget estimates of the amount of proposed allocation to cluster-level program operation and training in various budget categories. Although the cluster budgets provide

8 In April 2007, requests made to the BTSA program office of the California Department of Education for all budget data on each program for the current year and all prior years were denied. According to DOE program staff, the capacity did not exist at the BTSA program office to provide copies or supervision for the copying of budgets for all programs for all years. As a compromise, staff at the BTSA program office agreed to allow researchers access to budgets for all programs for the current year and a sample of the 28 programs undergoing IPR for prior years. As a result, it was not possible to conduct a full longitudinal fiscal analysis of program data.
additional information about overall program resources, they do not provide information about local BTSA program support. Consequently, we have not included them in the program-level analyses but discuss cluster state allocations in a separate section.

**Funding for BTSA Induction Programs**

The BTSA program was created by State Bill (SB) 1422 in 1992 and established under Section 44279 of the California Education Code, which details requirements for induction programs and the state’s responsibilities for administering and funding programs. These provisions set an initial amount of $3000 (adjusted in subsequent years according to inflation rates) for each first and second year teacher participating in the induction program. School districts are also required to obtain matching funds to support their induction programs of at least $2000 per beginning teacher and to develop a cost-effective system of delivering program services.\(^9\)

The BTSA program has grown significantly since 1992 and the state funding to programs reflects this trend. In the 1992-1993 school year, there were 15 state-funded BTSA programs supporting approximately 1,100 new teachers receiving state funds totaling to $4.9 million dollars, an overall average cost to the state of $4454 per teacher (of course, not all of this amount was allocated to the local programs in per teacher support).

In fiscal year 2005-06, BTSA Induction programs were nominally incorporated into the legislatively enacted (AB 825) Teacher Credentialing Block Grant.\(^10\) AB 825 assigned 26 separate categorical grant programs into six Block Grants:

- Pupil Retention Block Grant
- School Safety Consolidated Competitive Grant
- Teacher Credentialing Block Grant
- Professional Development Block Grant
- Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant
- School and Library Improvement Block Grant

In creating these block grants, AB 825 repealed almost all of the laws governing the consolidated programs and allowed for Block Grant funds to be used for "any purpose authorized by the programs as the statutes governing them read on January 1, 2004."\(^11\) BTSA, however, is the only program funded by the Teacher Credentialing Block Grant (TCBG) and, unlike programs in the other Block Grants, AB 825 did not repeal Section 44279 of the

---


Education Code which governs the BTSA program. Hence, the BTSA program remained essentially unchanged by the provisions of this program consolidation statute.

The funding formula for induction programs has undergone several revisions over the last few years. In 2005, the TCBG established that funding was to be apportioned to LEAs in 2005-06 based on the number of eligible participants in the BTSA program. In subsequent years, LEAs were to receive their 2005-06 level of funding adjusted for statewide growth in average daily attendance and the cost-of-living adjustment on district base revenue limits.”\(^{12}\) This allocation formula differed from the previous formula, in which funds were allocated based solely on the number of beginning teachers the Commission on Teacher Credentialing identified for each eligible program.\(^{13}\) However, beginning in 2006-07 this funding formula was revised again by SB 1209. New provisions indicate that similar to the original BTSA funding formula, LEAs now receive “funding based on the number of eligible participants in each approved BTSA program instead of on what they received in TCBG funds in the prior year.”\(^{14}\)

In 2006-07, the California Department of Education provided a total of $99.6 million dollars in allocations to individual BTSA programs throughout the state. This amount financed the participation of 28,190 beginning teachers (an average of $3541 per teacher). Of the 149 programs for which there were valid state allocation data available, programs ranged in size from as few as 11 participating teachers to over 2300, with a median of 118 teachers per program.\(^{15}\) Although the state provides a set amount per teacher that is defined by state law, actual state allocations ranged from approximately $2000 to $3745 per teacher depending on the program. This difference is due to some extent on different configurations of first, second year and charter school teachers (who are funded at different amounts) and additional funds provided by the state for program reviews. Table 18 summarizes actual program allocations from 2001 to the present.

\(^{15}\) In the sections below, we provide an analysis of total program funding and an examination of differences in funding between programs. Many of the analyses indicate that distributions of budgeted resources, program design characteristics and indicators of program quality are often skewed, with many programs clustered in one end with a number of outliers at the other. When providing descriptive statistics and in cases where distributions are relatively normal, we have provided the program average as a measure of centrality. In cases where distributions are highly skewed, we have used the median to represent the most typical case. The outcomes of descriptive analyses, regressions and ANCOVAs are provided in the sections below. Notes are provided where interpretations of findings should be made with caution if statistical analyses violate assumptions of variance homogeneity or normality.
Table 18: Historical Summary of State Allocations for BTSA Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Participating Teachers</th>
<th>Total State Allocation</th>
<th>Avg. State Allocation per Teacher*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>28,190</td>
<td>$99,620,286</td>
<td>$3,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>25,297</td>
<td>$84,489,845</td>
<td>$3,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>22,668</td>
<td>$77,571,933</td>
<td>$3,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>20,339</td>
<td>$70,150,642</td>
<td>$3,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>$74,368,800</td>
<td>$3,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>22,187</td>
<td>$74,881,125</td>
<td>$3,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State allocations differ for first and second year teachers and charter school teachers

Source: California Department of Education

The difference between $3375 per teacher in 2001-02 and $3541 per teacher in 2006-07 represents a 5% increase during that period. The nationwide rate of inflation for educational products between those years was approximately 10% and the CPI for the western U.S. region was slightly over 14% during that same time period.\(^{16}\) In order to be consistent with 2001 dollars, the amount allocated by the state per teacher would need to have been at least $3738 in 2006-07 based on the educational products index and at least $3851 per teacher based on the CPI for the western U.S. region. Although the $3851 amount is close to the 2006-07 state allocation for first year teachers, programs supported both first and second year teachers (with the latter funded at a lower level) bringing the total average amount per teacher received from the state to a figure that is smaller than what would be expected if the 2001 amount were simply adjusted for inflation. In real dollars, the state is allocating from $197 to $310 less per teacher now than in 2001.

The Cluster Regional Director Budgets

Contacts at the State Department of Education staff verified that state allocations for BTSA cluster regional directors grew from an average of $174,548 per director in 2001-02 to $280,000 in 2006-07, an increase of 60%.\(^{17}\) However, because the number of Cluster Regional Directors was reduced from 18 to 12, these larger allocations actually represent a decrease in cluster level support.

\(^{16}\) [http://www.bls.gov/cpi/#data](http://www.bls.gov/cpi/#data) (data retrieved on 9/2/07)

\(^{17}\) Amounts for both years include grants for training and operations.
Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) submit an annual budget to the state that itemizes proposed spending on operations and training in several budget subcategories: certified and classified salaries, employee benefits, books and supplies, services and operating expenses, capital outlay and other expenses. Although actual state allocation data for each year from 2001-02 to the present were not available, data compiled from the cluster budget sheets provides information about anticipated state allocations for operations and training and the proportion of total budget earmarked for the above-mentioned budget categories from 2001-02 to the present. In 2001-02, 16 different cluster regional directors submitted budgets to the state representing six regional clusters. Combining budgets in 2001-02, clusters anticipated receiving a total of $3,020,212 from the state for operational expenses, an average of $503,369 per cluster. By 2006-07, there were 12 regional directors that submitted cluster budgets to the state, representing the six clusters. In total, during the 2006-07 year, clusters anticipated receiving $2,520,000 from the state, an average of $420,000 per cluster.

Though these budget differences may not reflect actual differences in what the state allocated to clusters, they indicate that clusters are receiving a smaller amount now from the state than they have previously for expenses related to operations.

Cluster budgets nominally list the amount earmarked for cluster level training. Unfortunately, on examination of budget documents, we found that in many cases the sum of the budget subcategories did not match the reported anticipated total amount for training or operations. This problem was widespread enough across years and across clusters to conclude that it was not possible to have confidence in any further analyses of cluster budgets with regard to the amounts devoted to training versus operations or the nature of resource usage over time.

**Analysis of In-kind Budgets**

In addition to allocations provided by the state, each program is required to contribute local in-kind resources. Estimates of anticipated in-kind contributions are listed in the budget sheets that programs submit to the state. By regulation, local BTSA programs are required to allocate $2000 of in-kind support to the program. From an examination of the budget sheets, these in-kind resources can reflect any program expense covered by local funds. Examples include: funding for participating and support provider stipends and salaries, reimbursement for substitutes, training books and materials, copies, travel expenses, office supplies, etc. In 2006-07, projected in-kind contributions were approximately $62.8 million for the 142 programs for which budget data were available. Since the state required matching amount is specified, most local programs list just $2000 as their match. Estimates from individual program budget sheets
are surprisingly varied, however, ranging from $1156 to $8428 per teacher with a median in-kind projected contribution of $2070 for the 142 programs for which data were available.

Based on budget estimates provided to the state from each program, it is possible to calculate in-kind contributions as a percentage of projected total overall funding at the program level. Looking at a sample of programs for which historical budget data are available, projected in-kind contributions have decreased as a proportion of total budget over time. For 2002-03, in-kind contributions were estimated to be, on average, 47% of total program budgets. In 2006-07 projected in-kind contributions were estimated to be 38% percent of total program budgets for the 142 programs with available data.\(^{18}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Programs with available data</th>
<th>Percentage of In-Kind Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although state program allocations have not kept pace with inflation and the amount budgeted per teacher from in-kind sources appears to be decreasing as a percentage of total program budget, local program directors do not consistently report that funds are insufficient to meet program goals. In fact, when asked directly about the adequacy of funding, many program directors mentioned that they have sufficient funds to meet program objectives and/or that funds were more than adequate. Below are excerpts from program director interviews that represent opinions expressed by many in response to the question, “Do you feel that program resources are adequate?”.

Large urban/suburban single-district program\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{18}\) This outcome should be interpreted with caution because we do not have complete fiscal data for all programs for all years.

\(^{19}\) Program size is categorized as follows: Small < 93 participating teachers; Medium between 93 and 199 participating teachers; Large > 200 teachers.
I do not feel like we are hurting for funding.

Small urban/suburban single-district program

Well, I think by and large the resources are good.

Medium urban/rural single-district program

As far as the resources go, I feel like we have the money.

Large rural consortium

Resources - I guess nothing really comes to mind that it’s inadequate in any way.

Medium suburban consortium

The amount of money that I have to do what I need to do is more than adequate. The resources are fabulous....It’s way more than enough.

Large urban single-district program

Our biggest challenge is not that BTSA doesn’t give us enough money, it’s that there’s not enough flexibility in the way that money can be utilized.

Based on these statements, it appears that programs are receiving sufficient funds to meet program objectives. Of course, it is also important to note that we cannot generalize with any statistical confidence to the universe of BTSA programs from these examples. Further exploration of differences between program budgets, program characteristics and relationships to program outcomes, as included below, are necessary to better address these questions.

How do budget allocations differ across sites?

Of the 145 programs for which valid budget data were available, 118 were allocated the same amount per teacher, $3865. The small variations between the remaining programs reflect different configurations of first, second year and charter school teachers. Because the state allocations per teacher and the requested state amounts per teacher were roughly equivalent across sites, it is not possible to differentiate effectively between programs based on this amount alone. Since the amount allocated per teacher is a virtually a constant, analyses using only the state allocation mirror those that simply examine program quality outcomes. Previous sections of this report have addressed these analyses in detail and program differences have
been examined with regard to outcome variables of interest. Because the budget sheets are the best data we have with regard to what programs budget for program components, we used the information provided to examine relationships between data presented in these budget sheets and outcomes in order to explore the question of adequacy.

In theory, variations in the total budgeted amount (state allocation plus local in-kind) per teacher provide information that would allow us to predict program outcomes. This would allow us to discover the extent to which reducing financial support causes programs to miss expected outcome goals, or raising funding enables higher performance. However, because the only real source of variation in program inputs is the reported in-kind match, any analysis of how resources predict program outcomes can be only as accurate as the local program’s reported in-kind amount. As noted above, reported in-kind matches are not likely to be very accurate. Local programs may stop reporting as soon as they reach the required $2000 level, but may still be allocating significant local agency resources that go unreported. Programs may also report rather questionable expenditures as representing their in-kind required match. Only an on-site audit could produce highly reliable estimates.

That said, there was considerable variability in reported in-kind expenditures and we tested whether this variability predicted program outcomes. Some sites show zero in-kind, others report less than the required match of $2000 per teacher. Still others report exceeding the required $2000 by as much as four fold. The program budget guidelines provided by the state enumerate appropriate calculations for direct and indirect costs, support provider training and stipends and other budget line items. However, there appears to be little guidance provided to program directors with regard to requirements for in-kind contributions.

As an overall guidebook for program operations, the Induction Program Manual makes no mention of program budgets. And the following statement appears in the guidelines to Cluster Regional Directors with no elaboration, “All resources that enhance the support to beginning teachers may be included as part of the required $2,000 in-kind contribution. Facility rental charges could be an in-kind contribution.” (p. 2). Given the wide variation in the overall level of reported in-kind per teacher and inconsistencies with respect to what items are included in the in-kind amount, there is little doubt that variations in reported matched resources reflect local budgetary preferences and politics as much as they reflect real differences in program resources.

Since the budget sheets provide the best available information about what programs plan to do and how they anticipate receiving and allocating resources it seems appropriate to at least find out whether the reported differences make a difference.

In analyzing the relationship between program inputs in terms of budgeted resources per teacher and program outcomes, it is important to consider the possibility of mitigating factors. Do program design variables like program size or location, single district or consortium management or other factors, create variations program efficiencies? And, are there important program consequences that arise from making greater or lesser investments in administration or supplies and materials, or giving more to direct professional teacher support? We turn our attention to these issues in the next sections.

**Differences in program size and configuration**

For the 2006-07 academic year, looking across all programs, there is no relationship between program size and the total budgeted amount per teacher. However, size does seem to matter at the extremes. When we look at those programs with the very greatest number of teachers and compare them to those with the very fewest as shown in Table 20, we see a large and statistically significant difference in the budgeted amount per teacher, with very small programs budgeting, on average, approximately $2277 more per teacher than very large programs.
Table 20: Budgeted per Teacher Amounts for 10 Largest and 9 Smallest Programs 2006-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>District/Consortium</th>
<th>Number of Participating Teachers</th>
<th>In-Kind Amount Per Teacher</th>
<th>Total Per Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD – BTSA</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County Office of Education</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$3062</td>
<td>$6,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Office of Ed.</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>$2316</td>
<td>$6,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>$2072</td>
<td>$5,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma COE/North Coast BTSA</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento COE</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles USD – Intern BTSA</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>Dist.</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>$2397</td>
<td>$6,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus COE</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$2355</td>
<td>$6,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$6,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average                             | 918            | 4156                | $6062                           |
| Arcadia USD                         | 435            | Dist.               | 46                               | $2087                     | $5,952            |
| Azusa USD                           | 402            | Dist.               | 46                               | $6267                     | $10,132           |
| Santa Clara USD                     | 225            | Dist.               | 45                               | $3333                     | $10,033           |
| Modesto City Schools               | 313            | Dist.               | 43                               | $8015                     | $11,908           |
| El Rancho USD                       | 430            | Dist.               | 40                               | $2603                     | $6,468            |
| Montebello USD                      | 417            | Dist.               | 40                               | $6986                     | $10,852           |
| Keppel USD                          | 607            | Dist.               | 35                               | $2177                     | $6,040            |
| Escondido UHSD                      | 507            | Dist.               | 35                               | $2000                     | $5,865            |
| Castaic USD                         | 432            | Dist.               | 12                               | $3941                     | $7,806            |

| Average                             | 38             | $4156               | $8339                           |

Source: California Department of Education

Comparing single districts with consortia, there is also a difference in reported amount per teacher, with single district programs budgeting approximately $444 on average more per teacher than programs consisting of multiple districts. These data may indicate efficiencies of scale, where larger programs and programs consisting of multiple entities are able to leverage resources to provide services within state recommended budgeted amounts. The following excerpt from the program director in a medium sized suburban consortium is illustrative:

---

This finding should be interpreted with caution due to large differences in sample sizes (District programs, N=112; Consortia, N=29).
if you scratch below the surface of a BTSA program that’s having money problems here’s what you’ll find: You will find number one that they are not a consortium they are a district. You will find that they do not get cash in-kind contributions, they get in-kind contributions that amount to well, ‘so and so is going to spend 20% of their time here so we’re charging you 20% of their salary’.

But, this director added,

if you’re blessed with having in-kind contributions . . . and have the isolation of a consortium then . . . nobody can get to your money. Then you’ve got plenty of money to run the organization. You’ve got more than enough.

It is interesting to note that the average in-kind contribution per teacher for large programs is comparable to what is required by the state, while for smaller programs this amount is over 50% larger. This may suggest that consortia are better able to meet program objectives with what the state provides; whereas, smaller programs or single district programs may find operating at the same amount a struggle. Or, it may simply indicate different in-kind reporting conventions at larger versus smaller sites. Without clearer guidance as to what can be counted and should be reported in terms of a match, it is hard to know.

**Division of funds between infrastructure operations and support for new teachers**

Some program budgets reflect a higher proportion of resources to support provider salaries and training materials; others show more going for administration or books and supplies. For the BTSA budget forms have the following line items:

- Certified Salaries
- Classified Salaries
- Employee Benefits
- Books and Supplies
- Services and Operating Expenses
- Capital Outlay
- Other
- Total

From these categories it should be possible to calculate the percentage of the total budget that each program allocates to different functions and operations in order to investigate program differences in resource distribution and then to relate these differences to program design
characteristics and outcomes to see if resource allocation patterns enhance program outcomes. If we take the budget categories at face value, for example, we find that during the 2006-07 academic year the percentage of total budget allocated to certified salaries is positively correlated with the proportion of support providers who are full time release. This probably means using full time support providers is more expensive than relying on classroom teachers to provide these services.

But there is a substantial lack of consistency across programs in the way budgets show how resources are divided among these categories. Some programs list support provider stipends and training under services and operating expenses, others divide these expenses between certified salaries, employee benefits and services and operating expenses. Some programs include administrative items under certified salaries and benefits; others include them under certified and classified salaries, services and operating expenses.

Additionally, many budgets do not provide information or list budget categories with sufficient specificity to reveal whether a budget line item is for operations, for support providers or for training participating teachers. When budgets list categories such as “training” and “teacher salaries,” they are sometimes included under certified salaries, other times they are listed under services and operating expenses. In many cases, it is not clear if trainings or teacher salaries are intended for support providers, participating teachers or administrators.

Finally, program budgets vary widely in the specificity of their categories. Many provide detailed information about the number of teachers, support providers, administrators and the amount budgeted for each in stipends and substitute teachers. Other budgets will provide very general information without specific line items. Compare the following two examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program A: Certified Salaries $199,016</th>
<th>Program B: Certified Salaries $387,554</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Support Provider Orientation training ($35/hr X 24 hrs X15)</td>
<td>BTSA Induction certified staff to direct and coordinate all facets of the induction program including: developing training schedules, instruct both PTs and SPs, and assist in development of training materials, coordinate SA training, and meet regularly with district personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Equity Days 1 &amp; 2 for New SPs ($35/hr X 12 hrs X 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Equity Day 3 for New SPs ($35/hr X 6 hrs X 45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update training for SPs ($35/hr X 3hrs X 95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutes for SP/PT Observations ($135/day X 4 days X 95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even when budgets are broken down at the level of detail illustrated by program A, there is little consistency from program to program with regard to individual line items so that cross-
program comparisons at this level of detail are problematic. As a result, the question of division of funds between infrastructure and operations remains unanswerable. Later, we will provide guidelines based on our experience with BTSA and Intern program budgets for how budget information might be collected in ways that support meaningful analysis.

**Differences in support provider types**

In previous evaluations of the BTSA program, researchers have examined characteristics of support providers and the degree to which support provider availability is related to successful program outcomes (Thompson, Goe, Paek and Ponte, 2004; Thompson & Paek, 2001; WestEd, 2002). According to Thompson et al., having an on-site support provider who is readily available, located in the same building and at the same grade level makes a tremendous difference in teachers’ experience of their program. Some BTSA programs provide full time support providers who are released from other teaching or administrative obligations. In contrast, many programs offer new teachers access to support providers who are also classroom teachers with obligations that extend beyond their roles as BTSA support providers. By breaking down programs into dominant provider types, we can explore possible differences between programs with regard to provider type amounts budgeted per teacher and relationships between the percentage of one type of support provider and another and indicators of program quality.

Based on this research, we would predict that having a support provider who is full time and released from other teaching obligations would be associated with participating teachers’ perceptions of increased access and ultimately higher program ratings. From a financial perspective, we would want to know if this approach appears more costly than the alternative, i.e. do we observe a difference in the reported budget amount per teacher between programs that have full-time release support providers and those that offer classroom support providers or a mixture of both? In short, does the type of support provider inform program quality and is it reflected in the budget?

An analysis of program provider type suggests that for the 149 programs for which data were available, nearly half offered support providers who were predominantly classroom teachers (69 or 46%), 20 employed support providers who were predominantly full time release (13%), and the remainder offered a combination of classroom and full time release providers (60 or 40%). Table 21 reports the median percentage of providers across programs that were full time, part time or classroom teacher support providers.
Table 21: Percent Full-Time Release and Part-Time Support Providers 2006-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support Provider</th>
<th>Median Pct of Total Providers Across Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some programs had no full-time support providers; some had no classroom teacher support providers. Some programs relied solely on full-time, some entirely on classroom teachers. No program used part-time support providers for more than three-fourths of their participating teachers.

Though, as noted above, there was a relationship between the amount of money allocated to certified salaries and the use of full-time release support providers, there was no relationship between the percentage of providers who are full time release and the overall per teacher budget totals, and there are no total budget differences between programs with predominantly one kind of support provider (full time release, classroom, mixed).

However, there is some indication that the percentage of providers who are full-time release is related to indicators of program quality. For example, the percent of support providers who are full time release is positively related to ratings of program helpfulness as defined by responses of participants to items on the teacher survey.

**Indicators of program quality**

To determine if programs are receiving sufficient funds, we must first know whether they are being successful and then track expenditures in relationship to the attainment of goals. The primary goals as specified in state legislation authorizing the BTSA program include:

- Provide an effective transition into the teaching career for first- and second-year teachers in California
- Improve the educational performance of students through improved training, information, and assistance for participating teachers
- Enable beginning teachers to be effective in teaching students who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse
• Ensure the professional success and retention of new teachers
• Ensure that a support provider provides intensive individualized support and assistance to each participating beginning teacher
• Ensure that an individual induction plan is in place for each participating beginning teacher and is based on an ongoing assessment of the development of the beginning teacher
• Ensure continuous program improvement through ongoing research, development, and evaluation

Ideally, available indicators of program quality and relevant outcome data would be aligned with these policy goals. Information is less comprehensive than one would hope, but we do have two sets of program quality indicators: summary program evaluations from Induction Program Reviews and annual participating teacher surveys of program content and quality.

**Induction Program Reviews**

In the Fall of 2006, 28 BTSA programs were selected to participate in the Induction Program Review process. In early 2007, external review teams visited each local agency to determine: 1) how well program components were being implemented and 2) how well program elements were aligned with induction standards outlined by the state. Each program was rated on 20 induction program standards, six of which are specifically related to standards of instructional quality (standards 15-20). Induction program review summary outcomes are available for the 28 sites that underwent review. Programs received a median rating of 17.5 out of 20 standards being met; of the 6 standards that specifically relate to instructional quality, the median rating was 5 out of 6 with modest variability between programs.

Statistical analysis found no systematic relationship between per teacher budget totals and the overall IPR rating or with ratings on Standards 15 through 20. The relationships remained non-significant when controlling for program size and the percent of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch. Table 22 shows the Pearson correlation coefficients for total IPR and instructional quality standards as a function of in-kind and total amount per teacher.

---

Table 22: Pearson Correlation between Expenditures and IPR Reported Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-Kind Amount per</td>
<td>Total Amount per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IPR</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards 15-20</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: none of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

According to the CTC guidelines, to fully pass the IPR review a site must meet all 20 Standards. Given this, the overall IPR score may not be as meaningful as the determination that a particular program met all 20 standards of review. Using total IPR rating as a measure of program implementation, we can divide programs into those that met all 20 standards and those that did not.

Additionally, Standards 15-20 pertain specifically to program quality outcomes. Thus, it is also possible to divide programs into those meeting all six instructional quality standards and those programs falling short of that benchmark.

During the 2006-07 year, 7 out of 28 programs met all 20 standards. There was no significant difference in the amount budgeted per teacher or the in-kind budgeted per teacher for programs that met all 20 standards and those that did not. Additionally, there was no significant difference between programs that met all instructional quality standards (Standards 15-20) and those that did not in the total amount budgeted per teacher or the in-kind per teacher.

Although both the input and the output measures used in these analyses are open to serious challenge, at least based on these measures, different funding amounts do not seem to be related to program success. Hence, these data do not shed much light on the primary evaluation question of whether current funding is adequate to meet BTSA program goals.

**Participant surveys**

A second set of measures of program success can be distilled from the annual participating teacher surveys of their program experiences. As part of their participation in the program,

---

beginning teachers complete a survey at the end of the school year that measures experience of and satisfaction with various program components. Responses to this survey are available for all 154 BTSA programs for the current year and prior years. Some survey items ask specific questions about teacher perceptions of the levels, quality, and availability of resources at the program level.

Ten primary constructs of interest in measuring program success were identified – each composed of groups of individual items. To examine whether success in the experience of the participating teachers is related to the only overall measure of program funding available (the per teacher total program budgets) we organized the participating teacher responses into measures of program inputs and outputs. Inputs include:

- Frequency and length of communication with support provider
- Quality of match with support provider
- Adequacy of time with support provider
- Timeliness of support offered
- Frequency of formative assessment activities
- Value of formative assessment activities
- Clarity of BTSA program

For program success outcomes, we utilize the following constructs from survey items:

- Helpfulness of program
- Commitment to teaching
- Job satisfaction

These input and output measures were aggregated to generate program average inputs and outputs which were then combined with the per-teacher budget data to produce the analysis described below.26

Before reviewing the analysis it is important to note that the survey data is self-reported data and may be affected by factors other than BTSA program experiences. For example, it is possible that teachers may rate their experiences with their BTSA program higher because they are working in a district with fewer challenging students or may lower their estimates of BTSA program success outcomes. It is possible that using a two level analysis (teachers within programs) may provide more information about sources of variability. However, these analyses would be necessarily confounded by the fact that some programs are comprised of single districts and others of multiple districts. Because it is not possible to distinguish between variability with regard to program and composition, the interpretation of the output of the two level model becomes problematic. As a result, subsequent analyses examining relationships between variables are aggregated at the program level.

26 It is possible that using a two level analysis (teachers within programs) may provide more information about sources of variability. However, these analyses would be necessarily confounded by the fact that some programs are comprised of single districts and others of multiple districts. Because it is not possible to distinguish between variability with regard to program and composition, the interpretation of the output of the two level model becomes problematic. As a result, subsequent analyses examining relationships between variables are aggregated at the program level.
program success due to social or political turmoil in their schools or districts. In the analyses below, we control for two exogenous factors (student poverty and program size) to gain a clearer picture of relationships between program budgets and indicators of program quality as measured by the teacher surveys. Free and reduced price lunch data, aggregated at the program level are used as a proxy for area SES. The number of BTSA teachers will be used as a measure of overall program size.

As expected, many of the survey constructs are positively correlated with each other across programs. For example, teachers’ estimates of the timeliness of support is positively correlated with their perceptions of the adequacy of that support, the value of formative assessments, program clarity, career commitment, job satisfaction and program helpfulness. Correlation analysis finds strong positive links between the input variables (adequacy and timeliness of support) and the outcome indicators (job satisfaction and career commitment, etc.). Additionally, there are strong relationships between how participants view their assessment program and impressions of the adequacy and timeliness of the support they experienced.

Causal path analyses presented in a later section of this report (see the Structural Equation Models discussed in relation to Figure 6 and Figure 7) suggest a clear directional orientation from support and assessment to program success but not the reverse. For our purposes, this distinction is important. If fiscal resources play a significant role in producing program outcomes by allowing better funded programs to buy more of the most effective inputs, we would expect to see a relationship between budget amounts and participants’ ratings with regard to the BTSA “inputs” described above. Of course, more efficient use of the same level of funding could also have this effect, undercutting any statistical relationship between funding and input assessments. Table 23 provides Pearson correlations coefficients between per-teacher funding and the identified BTSA input and outcome variables.
Table 23: Pearson Correlation between Survey Constructs and BTSA Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Construct</th>
<th>Correlation with In-Kind Amount per Teacher</th>
<th>Correlation with Total Amount per Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of communication with support provider</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of communication with support provider</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of match with support provider</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of time with support provider</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of support offered</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of formative assessment activities</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of formative assessment activities</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of BTSA program</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of program</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to teaching</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

Importantly, across the 142 programs for which we have complete data, there is no statistical relationship between the total or in-kind reported budget amounts per teacher and any of the individual survey constructs mentioned previously with the exception of a weak positive correlation with program average levels of commitment to teaching. Teachers from programs where there was a larger amount of in-kind budgeted per teacher were more likely to report higher ratings on survey items that measured long term commitment to the teaching profession. The non-significant correlations shown in the table remain non-significant when controlling for program size and the percent of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch.

These results indicate that for the 2006-07 academic year, the reported budgeted amount per teacher had little independent relationship to survey assessments of program inputs and outcomes. Resource differentials may affect program results but the differentials reported on program budgets do not have any predictive power when it comes to assessing program operations or outcomes.

**Combining the IPR and Participant surveys**

If program effectiveness includes both the meeting of program standards as assessed during the Induction Program Review process and the teacher satisfaction and commitment measured in the participating teacher surveys, we might find that combining these measures would reveal
the effects of reported budget variations. In order to combine these measures, both need to have common scale – the rank order of the 28 programs that had undergone Induction Program Review. After generating overall survey rating resulted by averaging the outcome constructs (program helpfulness, commitment to teaching, and job satisfaction) the 28 IPR programs were rank ordered by IPR assessments and survey outcomes ratings (higher numbers indicating superior ranking). A combined index of program quality is the average rank for each program combining the IPR and survey responses. Table 24 shows the resulting ranks of the 28 programs that underwent IPRs in 2006-07, together with program size and budget expenditures per teacher.

If the amount budgeted per teacher is influencing real program differences, we would expect to find a relationship between IPR ranking, survey outcomes ranking or the combined ranking and the reported budget differences. However, there is no statistical relationship between these ranking indices and the per teacher budgets. Moreover, no relationship is seen between IPR rankings and survey rankings.

These findings are graphically confirmed in Figure 14 which plots the average program quality rankings against the state allocation and total per teacher budgets for these 28 programs. It is obvious from this graphical representation that expenditure differences are randomly distributed with respect to program output quality rankings. High expenditures are just as likely to be associated with low rankings as with high ones. This is illustrated concretely by the two top programs based on the combined outcome measure shown in Table 24 (#605 and #423). They report very different budgeted amounts per teacher. These programs are roughly the same size in that they serve approximately the same number of beginning teachers. Additionally, they serve roughly the same percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch. Yet, there is a large difference in the amount that they reported in per-teacher budgets. Some programs showing high outcomes (whether based on IPR or teacher perceptions) report high program allocations per teacher, others show comparable results while reporting much lower expenditures. Again, we caution that the data are probably quite unreliable, so this observation should be seen as much as an indicator of the need for better data management as it is an indication of weak links between expenditures and outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>IPR Rank</th>
<th>Survey-based Outcomes Rank</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
<th>In-Kind Amount per Teacher</th>
<th>Total Amount per Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Etiwanda SD</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$8,138</td>
<td>$12,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$1,156</td>
<td>$5,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Capistrano USD</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$2,663</td>
<td>$6,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Clovis USD</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$2,779</td>
<td>$6,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Grossmont UHSD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Elk Grove USD</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>San Bernardino USD</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$2,363</td>
<td>$6,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>La Mesa-Spring Valley SD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$3,017</td>
<td>$6,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Saddleback Valley USD</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$2,202</td>
<td>$6,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$2,072</td>
<td>$5,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Fresno COE</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Long Beach Unified SD</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$2,357</td>
<td>$6,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Castaic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$3,941</td>
<td>$7,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Tustin USD</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,063</td>
<td>$5,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Office of Education</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$2,316</td>
<td>$6,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Tehama County Dept of Education/North State</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Lawndale ESD</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,150</td>
<td>$6,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Stanislaus COE</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$2,356</td>
<td>$6,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Chaffey Joint Union High SD</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Glendale USD</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$3,959</td>
<td>$7,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Monterey COE</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Lodi USD</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Bellflower USD</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,970</td>
<td>$5,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Madera USD</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,014</td>
<td>$5,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>North Coastal Consortium</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,883</td>
<td>$5,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Fairfield-Suisun Unified SD*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Santa Clara USD</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,333</td>
<td>$10,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Antioch USD</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,110</td>
<td>$7,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*We did not receive complete budget data for this program for the 2006-07 year.
What is a sufficient level of funding?

Based on the analyses above, program-level outcome measures show no relationship to differing reported budgeted amounts per teacher. In addition, teacher perceptions of the program inputs available to them show no relationship to the reported program resources. In short, we see no relationship between programs reporting that they are contributing more and teachers reporting that they have more of what they need from the program. This suggests that either: a) resource variations don’t affect program operations, or b) recorded budgets are so little regulated and so irregularly reported as to make discovering the links between resources to program operations impossible.

Given this, and the qualitative perceptions by local BTSA providers that program resources are generally sufficient to allow them to implement the program in ways they deem effective, is no basis in the available data for suggesting that current BTSA allocations are fiscally inadequate. Below we make recommendations as to how the question of funding adequacy might be more fully addressed in the future.
Improving Future BTSA Fiscal Analyses

To provide for more accurate and more useful fiscal analysis of the BTSA programs it is important that both program input measures and program output measures be improved.

Developing Better Program Input Measures

Relying on existing BTSA program budgets to make policy recommendations is problematic for a number of reasons. First, state funds are allocated on a per-teacher basis with the result that there are no important variations in state support for each participating teacher. And while there are large variations in the amount programs report spending on in-kind program supports, most observers believe that these variations have more to do with reporting practices than reliable measures of program resource differences. Guidelines for delineating what constitutes an “in-kind” budget contribution are not very clear, and the state mandated $2000 per participating teacher as the minimum acceptable amount means that many budget developers simply stop counting when they reach the $2000 requirement.

In addition to the lack of uniformity in reporting overall budget amounts, there is no consistency in the way allocations within budget sub-categories are reported. Administrative expenses can be included under certified or classified salaries, services and operating expenses or both. Moreover, field data indicate that the proportion of an administrator’s time charged to a program budget is dictated as much by what is needed to fit the available funds as by a realistic assessment of how the administrator is actually spending time.

As described more fully later in this report, the intern program budgets are in somewhat better shape and we recommend that BTSA budget reporting categories mirror those used for the Intern program. Table 25 shows an example of the type of budget document that would be useful in developing analyzable budget data.

Collecting budget data in this manner would help analysts answer important research questions such as, “Are there differences between programs in the proportion of resources budgeted for administration and are these differences related to program outcomes?” and “Are program outcomes related to differences in the type of resource budgeting for trainers/support providers or overhead/direct instruction at the site level?”. Given the way that budgets are constructed now, these questions cannot be answered in a systematic fashion.
# Table 25: Sample BTSA budget sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Sub Category</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Ave FTE</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration &amp; Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, Phone, Duplication, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Providers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support provider seminar &amp; conference fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support provider release time/stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutes for support provider release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support provider travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Supplies and books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training for Participating Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating teacher seminar &amp; conference fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating teacher release time/stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutes for participating teacher release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating teacher travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Supplies and books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also note that, from a practical standpoint, it is very difficult to conduct budget analyses when program budgets are available only in hard copy in the BTSA program office at the state capital. The lack of budget data in electronic data file formats is a real impediment to fiscal analysis and accountability. It is also important that BTSA get clearer instructions in regard to the required program match. From the record, it appears that programs can, without penalty actually report less than the required amount of in-kind funding, and there is very little consistency regarding what is to be counted as matching resources. Rather than simply specifying the amount of in-kind to be reported, it would be most helpful for future fiscal analysis if the state developed a specific list of cost items that are expected to be borne by local program resources, and asked budget estimates for those costs.

*Developing Better Program Outcome Measures*

To assess funding adequacy it is not enough to know what is being spent and for what program activities and functions. It is also essential that fiscal analysts be able to link expenditures to program outcomes. Funding is adequate, and adequately directed, only if expenditures are allowing programs to reach their central goals. With legislative goals for this program including improved teacher performance, increased teacher retention, greater student achievement and stronger teacher professionalism, we find that the current data collection and accountability systems are not adequate to support analysis of funding adequacy or the appropriateness of local program expenditure priorities. The IPR process which, in its current format, is proving itself to be a significant mechanism assuring program implementation accountability does not to lend itself to framing fiscal efficiency and accountability analyses. It may be more difficult to persuade legislators to provide continuing (or enhanced) program support based on compliance (no one is breaking the rules) than on outcomes (i.e. much of what was hoped for out of this program is being realized). To show that outcomes are being realized, stronger and more reliable outcome measures are needed.

At present, it is not possible for program evaluators to link overall BTSA program operations to student achievement data on anything but small scale volunteer bases, much less link that data to variations BTSA program budgets and expenditures. And it is equally difficult to longitudinally link teacher involvement in BTSA programs with their continued commitment to the profession. These problems are being addressed by the development of longitudinal data systems for students and teachers, but we are several years away from being able to use these new data systems for effective program assessment.
Summarizing BTSA Fiscal Analysis

The consideration of program adequacy requires a comparison of inputs to outcomes at the program level. An adequate resource level is the minimum amount needed to fully meet program objectives. For this evaluation, the best consistent quantitative measure of inputs available across all programs is the reported budget allocation per teacher. In addition, we have qualitative measures of perceived resources at the program level from teacher participant surveys. Our best outcome measures are the IPR ratings and qualitative measures of satisfaction with the program and perspectives regard to teaching into the future from the teacher survey.

Important questions are associated with the true meaning of varying reported resource amounts per teacher. For example, there is little guidance as to what may count as in kind contribution or what is to be reported. This may explain the total lack of observed relationship between this measure of program inputs and the outcome measures described above. These reported budget amounts per teacher also do not relate to teacher perceptions of the resources available to them at the local level, so it is hard to know what meaning to attribute to them in their current form.

Current outcome measures are also problematic. From a fiscal perspective, the IPR process appears labor intensive and costly and does not seem to produce results that are linked to indicators that programs are meeting the purposes set out for them in their authorizing legislation. Instead, this process seems much more implementation and compliance oriented. The extent to which site-level compliance correlates with local program-level success is unclear. This study found no statistical relationship between IPR ratings and participant perceptions of success.

Given these data limitations, the best indication of success at the site level seems to be combining IPR ratings and teacher perceptions. Sites who do well on both measures are arguably the best performers system-wide given current measures. The fact that these highest performing sites report very different budget allocations per teacher, make it virtually impossible to infer that current allocations per teacher are either adequate or inadequate. It appears that some sites are operating more efficiently than others and that it would be prudent to better understand the implications of these efficiencies for future program implementation.

Based on current input and output measures for the program, definitive conclusions of this type are not really possible. Improved input and outcome measures at the program level would allow the following types of questions to be addressed:
What levels of resources are needed to fully meet program objectives
What relationships are observed between inputs and outputs across programs?
Do some sites show much greater efficiencies than others, e.g. more program outputs for constant dollars?
What might be learned in regard to program efficiencies that might be shared with others sites as a result of these analyses?
Do some variables beyond the control of local sites affect the observed relationships between inputs and outputs such that funding differentials for these types of sites should be considered, e.g. high percentages of students in poverty or necessary smallness of program size due to remoteness of location?

With better data and answers to the questions above in hand, questions of program adequacy of funding and future program efficiencies could be much better addressed. Until that time, as there is no real evidence solely from a fiscal perspective to suggest the direction of any needed change, if the program is to be continued overall, we recommend continued funding at the current level as well as the development of substantially improved input and output measures for the future.
The Cluster Regional Directors

One unique feature in the organizational structure of the California BTSA Induction program is a program management and consulting group known as Cluster Regional Directors. This group of a dozen experienced BTSA leaders is funded separately from the local BTSA Induction programs and serves as an intermediate governance structure – separate from the state Task Force which consists of official representatives from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education (the state agencies jointly responsible for overseeing BTSA funding, policy and regulations). Because they are hired by local education agencies, they see themselves as responsible for supporting local programs, facilitating their improvement, and representing their interests to local school districts and to the state BTSA Task Force. Moreover, because they are separately funded, and do not work for the same local district officials that manage the various local BTSA programs, these Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) are also able to critically appraise the appropriateness and effectiveness of the local programs with whom they work.

The CRDs have several important roles that help assure uniformity, continuity and quality in the statewide BTSA program. Meeting regularly among themselves they are able to pool insights into the successes and challenges of the 154 local BTSA programs across the state. Armed with these insights, they are ideally positioned to communicate issues and opportunities for policy change or program improvement to the state BTSA Task Force. At the same time, the CRDs are seen, and see themselves, as responsible for assuring that a unified state teacher support and induction system is maintained. Hence they have become the primary agents for interpreting the overall state level goals, regulations, guidelines and philosophy of the BTSA program to the local program directors and staff. Toward this end, they engage in a number of critical program support and development activities.

The CRDs convene and coordinate information dissemination and professional development meetings across the six regional clusters of local BTSA programs. During these meetings they disseminate state level requirements, recommendations and insights and gather feedback from local program directors. A CRD served as a facilitator during each of the BTSA Induction Program Reviews (IPRs) that serve to provide accountability and program improvement for local programs. In their roles as facilitators, they are called upon to constantly interpret the guidelines for the conduct of these reviews, discourage IPR review teams from relying on personal experience rather than formal evidence assessment in making judgments about local program success, and provide clarification needed to develop elaborated and consistent meanings for the BTSA program standards that serve as criteria for judging local program success. The CRDs routinely serve as the first line of support for local programs, answering
questions about requirements and regulations, encouraging program improvements, following up with local directors as they seek to accommodate the findings that encourage change in response to an external program review, etc. Similarly, the CRDs are the primary vehicle for dissemination of state level information regarding anticipated or adopted program changes, guidance regarding compliance with guidelines and expectations, etc. The CRDs also play a crucial role in facilitating transitions when there are key staff changes in local BTSA programs or when the relationships between local program operations and the local districts, county offices or consortia that sponsor them need to be reviewed and adjusted.

Over time, the CRDs have become the primary working group for monitoring BTSA program performance, developing new procedures, mechanisms, materials and guidelines for program improvement, and studying how issues affecting program success should be conceptualized and dealt with. It would appear from their history, and their quite modest budgets, that the CRDs were originally expected to serve almost exclusively as facilitators and supporters for the local BTSA programs. In the early years of BTSA, leadership and program development was concentrated in the hands of the state BTSA Task Force composed of representatives from the two sponsoring agencies (CTC and CDE). With tight budgets and strong emphasis on other state priorities – particularly those associated with meeting the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind law – the state BTSA Task Force has suffered loss in both resources and status within the state agencies and program leadership has shifted perceptibly toward the CRDs. At this point in time, the CRD group has developed a series of standing committees, has taken the lead in proposing revisions for the California Formative Support and Assessment System for Teachers (CFASST), assisting the CTC in reviewing and modifying BTSA program standards, examining and considering revisions of the Induction Program Review process, developing and implementing training for program reviewers, and generally concerning themselves with the overall character and quality of the BTSA program.

While their budgets and staff support are inadequate for the work required in undertaking these broad responsibilities, there is good reason to believe that this evolving governance mechanism should be seriously considered as a model for state support of public school improvement policies more generally. There are two primary reasons why this governance mechanism looks like a very promising way of successfully joining state policy priorities with local program designs and implementation processes. First, and most importantly, by separately commissioning and funding the CRDs, the state has succeeded in creating a group of professionals who are neither caught up in the complexities of state level politics nor captured by the aims and interest of local program operators. Thus they are able to act with some independence from issues of immediate interest to either state or local policy makers and can concentrate on the technical and professional dimensions of the BTSA program itself.
They easily recognize that if they get too close to merely representing local interests, the state system can easily ignore them. And they recognize that if they serve simply as agents of state interest they will have little influence on local program implementation. Thus, they have learned that their power and prestige rests in their professional competence and single-minded attention to the theoretical and practical issues of BTSA program design and implementation. Quite simply, the CRDs have influence and control in the BTSA system because they understand BTSA better than anyone else and can confidently predict what will and what will not work when proposals for change are forthcoming. The Task Force members understand the state policy context within BTSA programs operate and, therefore, need to guide and authorize the work of the CRDs.

The second reason why the CRD structure has become important to BTSA and represents a promising strategy for state program governance rests in the size of the group and the method of selecting its leadership. With only twelve individual CRDs, strategically located throughout the state, with sufficient resources and autonomy to meet together regularly, and with the knowledge that their influence rests on their capacity for intellectual rather than political leadership, the CRDs have become an important Professional Learning Community. They routinely see themselves as caring for and nurturing a specific program which has an important but tenuous relationship to both state agencies and local school systems. They, therefore, routinely engage in thoughtful discussions of how best to position the program and secure its future. In short, they see that their own influence and future rests almost entirely on the quality and success of the program for which they are responsible.
Induction Program Reviews

The primary accountability and improvement mechanism for local BTSA programs is an extensive, on-site, review process called an Induction Program Review (universally referred to by both state and local staff as an IPR). The IPR process was designed in 2006 and first activated in 2007. This process replaces a review process called the Peer Program Review (PPR) which had been used for several years prior to 2007. The review plan calls for approximately one-fifth of the local BTSA programs to be reviewed each year (28 were identified for review in 2007). Thus, all local BTSA programs would undergo an IPR approximately once every five years. Policies provide for specially scheduled IPRs to take place if there are reported concerns about the functioning of a particular local BTSA program. One such review was undertaken during the period covered by this evaluation study.

The IPR process is both intensive and broad ranging. The central ingredient in the process is a 4-day visit by an IPR team consisting of four experienced BTSA participants (typically program local administrators and lead support providers from around the state). The IPR team is supported by one or two facilitators (typically one of the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors) whose job it is to facilitate team deliberations, remind team members of IPR guidelines, and work with the leadership of the program being reviewed to facilitate accumulation of the evidence to be reviewed by the IPR team. The IPR team members have participated in a one-day IPR training session during which they learn about how local program administrators are asked to assemble evidence regarding their program performance, and are briefed on guidelines for the conduct of the 4-day review.

The IPR visitation is preceded by extensive preparation on the part of each local program undergoing review. A Self-Study and Program Narrative document, a few hundred pages in length, is prepared by each program being reviewed. This document, typically prepared in the form of a loose leaf notebook, presents in a standardized format the local program’s representation of evidence indicating how they have met each of the BTSA program’s twenty program standards. For twelve of these twenty standards, local programs are assessed on the basis of from two to eleven specific elements embodied within these standards (and four of the elements (Standards 9b, 11c & d, 13f), present a total of 23 sub-elements that were typically seen as in need of independent evaluation. Thus, there are a total of 104 specific assessment criteria to be applied by the IPR teams in evaluating program performance. A copy of the complete standards document is attached as an appendix to this report. In summary form, the standards and elements utilized by the IPR teams in their local program evaluations can be paraphrased as:
Foundational Standards

Standard 1: Committed Sponsorship, Administration and Leadership
Standard 2: Sufficient Resource Allocation
Standard 3: Selection of Skilled Professional Development Providers
Standard 4: Comprehensive Formative Program Evaluation and Development
Standard 5: Articulation with Teacher Preparation Programs
Standard 6: Advise and Assist Participating Teachers with Credential Requirements

This standard required evaluation of each of six elements, including:
  a. Inform participating teachers within six weeks
  b. Inform teachers of eligibility for BTSA
  c. Process for verifying teacher eligibility
  d. Opportunities for teachers to extend beyond 2 years if needed
  e. Inform participating teachers of need for evidence accumulation
  f. Inform new hires of responsibility to start BTSA within 120 days

Standard 7: Coordinate and Communicate with other agencies to develop effective program

Standard 8: Select Support Providers Using Explicit Criteria
Standard 9: Provide Professional Development for Support Providers

This standard required evaluation of each of five elements (one with eight sub-elements) including:
  a. Initial and continuing development for support providers
  b. Development of the following support provider skills:
     i. Responding to diverse participating teacher needs
     ii. Engaging in reflective conversations
     iii. Understanding participating teachers local contexts
     iv. Formative assessment of participating teachers based on California Standards for the Teaching Profession and academic content standards
     v. Fair and equitable use of assessment evidence
     vi. Using assessments to develop Individual Induction Plans
     vii. Discussing requirements for program completion
     viii. Establishing clear guidelines with administrators and participating teachers for use of assessment information
  c. Training in the use of formative assessments with emphasis on fairness
  d. Support providers have sufficient supported time to meet with each other
  e. Appropriate evaluation of support provider work quality
Program Implementation Standards: Category A – Program Design

Standard 10: Logically Structured Professional Development Program

Standard 11: Administrator and Board Roles Defined

This standard required evaluation of each of four elements, including:

a. Leaders communicate program goals and rationale
b. The K-12 system provides appropriate services
c. Training for site administrators that includes:
   i. The learning to teach continuum
   ii. Beginning teacher development
   iii. Working conditions promoting beginning teacher success
   iv. Effective steps to overcome challenging work environments
   v. Understanding the role of support providers
   vi. Respecting confidentiality
d. Work with site administrators to establish a culture of support
   i. Informing participating teachers of resources, personnel, policies
   ii. Introducing participating teachers to staff and school community
   iii. Helping learning community meet standards for curriculum and staff
   iv. Ensuring site-level professional development activities
   v. Participating in program evaluation

Standard 12: Professional Development Based on Individual Induction Plans

This standard required evaluation of each of six elements, including:

a. Professional development supporting: English learners, healthy environments, equity, diversity, access to core curriculum, teaching special populations and using technology
b. Assist in developing Individual Induction Plans for participating teachers
c. Having IIPs that include growth goals, specific strategies, documentation and monitoring
d. Regular meetings between support providers and participating teachers
e. Time allocated for support providers and participating teachers to work together
f. Clear guidelines for ratio of support provided to participating teachers
Standard 13: Formative Assessment Systems for Participating Teachers
This standard required evaluation of each of eight elements, including:
   a. Multiple opportunities for participating teachers to demonstrate applications of The California Standards for the Teaching Profession
   b. Monthly assessments of participating classroom teacher classroom performance
   c. Using multiple measures appropriate to the standards
   d. Criteria to identify multiple levels of teaching performance
   e. Developing and implementing IIPs based on formative assessments
   f. A formative assessment system characterized by:
      i. Valid instruments
      ii. CSTP element specific criteria
      iii. Evidence includes both teacher and student work
      iv. A reflective process in collaboration with support providers
   g. Evidence presented for professional credential completion
   h. Formal evaluation of the formative assessment system

Standard 14: Completion of the Professional Teacher Induction Program
This standard required evaluation of each of two elements, including:
   a. Program completion requirements that include:
      i. Documentation of teaching performance
      ii. Annual IIPs documenting professional growth
      iii. Demonstrated application of the CSTP and state-adopted frameworks
      iv. Evidence of participation in professional development
         a) Attendance at planned events
         b) Consistent communication with support providers
      v. Demonstrated knowledge of the following:
         a) Using technology
         b) Equity, diversity and access to core curriculum
         c) Creation of healthy environment
         d) Teaching English learners
         e) Teaching special populations
   b. Program has a process for verifying completion and recommending for credentials those participating teachers that complete
Program Implementation Standards: Category B – Teaching Curriculum

Standard 15: Core Academic Content and Subject Specific Pedagogy
This standard required evaluation of each of eight elements, including:
   a. Formative assessment documents teacher ability
   b. Throughout the program participating teachers apply content standards and performance levels for students
   c. Participating teachers develop at least one content area of focus
   d. Participating teachers establish classroom routines that are fair and respectful
   e. Participating teachers meet diverse student learning needs
   f. Participating teacher interpret student assessment data and use multiple measures to monitor student progress
   g. Participating teachers communicate with families and communities
   h. Participating teachers take part in professional conversations focused on core academic standards-based instruction

Standard 16: Using Technology to Support Student Learning
This standard required evaluation of each of seven elements, including:
   a. Using a variety of electronic media
   b. Electronically communicating with other professionals
   c. Uses technology in classroom/library/center to create lessons
   d. Adapt lessons to address problem solving skills
   e. Use technology to support student information gathering, problem solving
   f. Use computer applications to analyze data, assess learning
   g. Evaluates authenticity and reliability of data gathered

Program Implementation Standards: Category C – Teaching All Students

Standard 17: Supporting Equity, Diversity and Access to Core Curriculum
This standard required evaluation of each of seven elements, including:
   a. Develops knowledge of student backgrounds, experiences, characteristics
   b. Examines personal beliefs and expectations
   c. Assesses students specific learning needs
   d. Include in instruction history and traditions of major cultural groups
   e. Examines personal beliefs regarding gender and sexual orientation
   f. Recognizes and seeks to eliminate bias in the classroom
g. Recognizes and seeks to eliminate bias in larger educational system

Standard 18: Creating a Supportive and Healthy Environment

This standard required evaluation of each of seven elements, including:

a. Identifies factors influencing student well-being
b. Implements accident prevention strategies
c. Uses strengths-based approach to foster student well-being
d. Can implement school’s crisis response plan
e. Understands health and safety factors and accesses support services
f. Uses adopted health curriculum
g. Reports child abuse and neglect appropriately

Standard 19: Teaching English Learners

This standard required evaluation of each of eleven elements, including:

a. Knows adopted instructional program for English learners
b. Uses English language development methods and strategies
c. Uses materials based on students’ assessed proficiency
d. Uses a variety of well planned teaching strategies
e. Understands assessments of English learners and plans accordingly
f. Uses assessment information to develop lessons meeting content standards
g. Draws on resources to enhance English learner comprehension
h. Applies understanding of cultural, experiential, cognitive, pedagogical factors
i. Develops learning experiences drawing on students’ prior knowledge and experience
j. Provides equitable learning environment, encourages variety of meaning expression
k. Teaches students from diverse backgrounds and communicates with parents and families

Standard 20: Teaching Special Populations

This standard required evaluation of each of six elements, including:

a. Identifies and refers students for special education services, respecting ethical and legal obligations
b. Knows students’ growth and development and supports positive behavior
c. Insures students with disabilities and talents are integrated into social fabric
d. Uses resources to assess and educate students with individual needs
e. Collaborates with other care givers and special education teachers
f. Assesses and recognizes the strengths of students with disabilities and who are gifted and talented

It is easy to recognize that this highly condensed list of standards, elements and sub-elements presented the review teams with an extraordinary task. Team members did not always agree about what evidence would be necessary to demonstrate meeting each standard and element. Indeed, on several occasions we observed IPR team members discussing with some uncertainty what each standard or element is actually expected to mean in the day to day practice of a local BTSA program. Nevertheless, they uniformly demonstrated a conviction that the standards and elements were appropriate and that they should seek specific evidence referencing each of these 104 evaluation criteria.

Typically, the Program Narrative and Self-Study notebook prepared for the IPR team was arranged with a tabbed section devoted to each of the 20 standards. Evidence in the tabbed sections for the 12 standards to be evaluated at the element level typically arranged the evidence in accordance with the element sequence specified in the standard. For each standard and element specified for the review the notebooks sought to incorporate samples of relevant participating teacher work, documents showing the nature and content of various training sessions, information from the annual statewide evaluation survey, and narrative interpretation of how the local program leadership has assessed the significance of this evidence. This notebook is made available to the members of the IPR team approximately two weeks prior to the IPR. The review team typically divides responsibility for close study of this self-study document with each team member accepting responsibility for assessing the quality of the evidence for specific program standards.

In addition to preparing this extensive document, each local program undergoing review is asked to create an “evidence room” in which are placed samples of training seminar materials, support provider and participating teacher activities and assessment results, along with program administrative records. Typically, a substantial part of the evidence is organized by placing materials relevant to each of the twenty BTSA program standards into a corresponding folder, notebook or box. In addition to the collection of evidence associated with individual program standards, the evidence rooms generally have a number of tables of materials related to seminar programs, participating teacher assessments, program administrative documents, etc., and a set of working tables at which the IPR team members can spread out and review the evidence presented.

The on-site IPR process typically begins with a relatively informal evening meeting among the IPR team members and the facilitator(s) at a local hotel. This meeting allows for team members
to become better acquainted (typically some team members are acquainted with others, but it is also generally the case that one or more team members have not met prior to this gathering). The review process formally begins the next morning when the team members meet alone to review the process and go over their individual assignments. This is followed by an introductory meeting with the local BTSA program director who is often accompanied by additional program staff and local district administrators. At this meeting, the IPR team is given an overview of the program under review and oriented to the evidence room, the physical facilities available for meetings and other activities and a reprise of scheduled review activities.

This introductory meeting is followed by a formal review of the physical evidence available to the IPR team. This review includes both a review of the materials submitted to the team in the Program Review and Self-Study binder and examination of the various physical evidence elements found in the evidence room. Typically, newsprint wall posters or other devices are used to track IPR team judgments regarding whether the available evidence supports a conclusion that specific standards (and elements within the standards) have been met. Team members often use “post-it” notes to record observations and questions regarding the evidence. Where physical evidence was expected but could not be found, the IPR team solicits additional physical evidence from the BTSA program director. Such solicitations occur quite frequently, and may require that the BTSA director secure records from the school system or county office files or materials from participating teachers, support providers and/or leaders of various BTSA seminars or other structured activities.

Following several hours of evidence review, the IPR team conferences to pool their judgments regarding the adequacy of the physical evidence and to determine what questions remain to be answered. Then they work to determine whether additional physical evidence would be helpful and to construct interview questions to be used in collecting oral testimony from focus group interviews with participating teachers, support providers, school or district administrators and BTSA program leaders. Focus group interviews are arranged by the local BTSA director, and conducted, confidentially, by IPR team members. Typically, one team member conducts the focus group interview while one or more other team members take notes.

Once interviews with key stakeholders have been completed, the IPR team caucuses again to review and interpret evidence. They explicitly seek to establish whether there is a “preponderance” of evidence regarding meeting each standard and element, and seek to “triangulate” various data sources in order to determine when, in combination, they support strong inferences regarding issues where evidence is more indirect. At this point, a team consensus is reached on whether each standard and element has been “Met” or “Not Met.”
And an explanation for the team decision is developed in order to report back to the local BTSA program director and senior staff.

During a confidential exit conversation with the local program director (and senior staff if invited by the director), the IPR team leader, with the facilitator present, reviews the team’s evaluation of each standard and element and explains their rationale for judging whether the standards were or were not met. Additionally, the exit conversation may cover other important observations made by the IPR team, including commendations for high performance and recommendations for program improvement.

The IPR review team prepares a brief report for the statewide BTSA Taskforce recording whether the reviewed program has met each of the twenty program standards.

**Observations about the Induction Program Review Process and Outcomes**

A review of interview notes, direct observations and documents collected during the observation of IPR team actions in ten different local BTSA Induction programs led to nine broad conclusions about the IPR process and its contributions to local BTSA program operations and the induction of new teachers into this profession. In no particular order, these observations are as follows.

**Observation #1: Commitment to the IPR Process.** Our evaluation team was quite impressed by the consistency and depth of commitment to the Induction Program Review process by local BTSA directors, the IPR review teams, cluster regional directors, local school officials, state level BTSA Task Force members and the various stakeholder groups involved in BTSA programs. Even though budgets did not adequately support their work, IPR teams came early and worked late to complete the process. Local BTSA program staff worked long hours to prepare documents and organize them for the IPR team to review. Participating teachers, support providers and local school administrators gave generously of their time to participate in the process. And during the review itself, local BTSA program staff often worked late into the evening or early in the morning to secure additional information and present it for review.

**Observation #2: Preparation time and effort sometimes seemed quite excessive.** Local BTSA staff reported that preparation for and participation in the IPR process required many hundreds of hours by a large number of local program staff and participants. While this was the first implementation of a new type of program evaluation process, possibly making the IPRs conducted this year much less efficient than they will become in the future, the level of effort required does raise some question as to whether the substantial benefits from this process might be produced in a less taxing way.
Observation #3: Trying to competently review all of the 104 standards and elements targeted for review tended to fragment the process. The number and diversity of the evaluation standards and elements were such that IPR teams were typically unable to see them as an integrated, coherent whole describing the character of a comprehensive and unified program for the induction of new teachers into the profession. This disaggregation of the local program into discrete component parts was evidenced in a number of ways. The IPR teams found themselves frequently referring to the list of review elements to remind themselves of what they were seeking evidence about. Various pieces of evidence being presented by the local programs were often repeatedly presented as documenting compliance with more than one standard or element. The IPR teams often found themselves concentrating on specific elements or standards and unable to easily decide whether evidence of meeting a specific element or standard component should be interpreted as reflecting the intent of the standard as well as its narrowly constructed requirements.

Observation #4: Adoption of an adjudication model for evidence evaluation tended to narrow the focus of assessment to observable data rather than its substantive meaning. The frequently used phrase “preponderance of evidence” used to describe what the IPR teams were looking for as they sought to determine whether local programs had met the 104 standards, elements and sub-elements identified for review was indicative of reliance on an adjudication model of program assessment. That is, the IPR teams confronted the evidence before them as if they were jurists responsible for weighing the evidence for and against meeting a specific program requirement. Like a trial defendant seeking to be found “not guilty” of breaking some rule of law, the local BTSA programs tended to cast themselves (and to be cast by IPR teams) in the role of one accused of not fulfilling some requirement and in need of proving their “innocence.” This model led IPR teams to often remind themselves that they were only looking for evidence regarding meeting or not meeting the specified standards, and thus were not interested in other evidence that might indicate whether local programs were more (or less) effective in other areas of practice. Moreover, when holding their focus groups with participating teachers and other stakeholders, the IPR teams carefully constructed their focal questions to elicit information only about the specified standards. They inquired primarily about evidence regarding the program’s realization of elements or standards they did not find in the self-study or the materials assembled in the evidence room. They typically did not inquire about other aspects of program operations and/or effectiveness.

Observation #5: The need to produce evidence of meeting standards and elements has led many local program staff to believe that inflexible, check-off oriented, program implementation has been mandated. An important corollary of Observation #4 is that this
process invites local BTSA program implementers to believe that they should emphasize evidence collection and approach defending their ability to meet the various program standards by showing “check-off” lists of activities that can be reasonably argued would imply meeting of the program standards. This is a major element in the development of the “paperwork” and “busy work” interpretation of program activities which were frequently the targets of serious complaints about time wasting and lack of program substance voiced by participating teachers.

**Observation #6:** Since evidence was selected and organized by local program leaders, and since interviewed participating teachers, support providers and other stakeholders were also selected by local program staff, the evidence reviewed by the IPR teams may show more of what local BTSA programs can do than what they routinely do do. One aspect of the evidence collection and presentation process that struck our evaluation team was selectivity in the presentation of evidence on virtually every aspect of the BTSA programs under review. Programs with dozens or hundreds of participating teachers presented only a small sample of their work for review. When focus interviews were held, the local program staff typically identified the participants in these interview groups, and when seminar materials were collected for presentation they were typically illustrative rather than exhaustive representations of the seminars. Not only were logs and other reports of participating teacher/support provider interactions selective, but they typically did not contain indicators that would allow IPR team members to know what the quality and outcomes of these interactions might be.

**Observation #7:** The heavy emphasis on meeting the induction standards has led to a shift in local program emphasis away from the interpersonal work of the support providers, toward courses, seminars and other organized activities conducted by professional development specialists or third-party marketed services. It was less clear in the IPR process, but our evaluation team came to the broad conclusion that the focus on induction and meeting induction standards that has emerged since local BTSA programs were authorized to recommend new teachers for their Clear Credential has led to a significant increase in the status and emphasis on training seminars, assigned tasks, and evaluation by professional development experts. There has been a commensurate reduction in the degree to which high quality interactions between participating teachers and their personal support providers are seen as central to BTSA program success. Participating teachers continue to emphasize the importance of their relationships with support providers, and thus see the shift in emphasis toward training seminars to be too much like their university pre-service training experiences.

**Observation #8:** As described elsewhere in more detail, development of the IPR process has tended to privilege the definition of “Standards Based Reform” to mean program
implementation standards, rather than teacher performance or teacher capacity development standards. The simplest way to see this happening is to recognize that the twenty standards described in the document, “Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction” is upper most in the consciousness of both IPR team members and the local BTSA program staff preparing for this review. This document has largely eclipsed both the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the pre-service teacher capacity constructs found in Teacher Performance Expectations document. These professional practice oriented documents would normally be thought of as having equal importance in defining the character and mission of the BTSA program.

Observation #9: Some variability in understanding the IPR process. There were some points of tension that arose in some of the program reviews because of divergent understandings of both what the local BTSA programs were expected to produce in the way of evidence associated with each standard and element and how the IPR teams should approach interpreting the adequacy of the evidence presented. On several occasions review team facilitators found themselves cautioning review team members not to use their own personal BTSA experiences as the basis for judging whether any given piece of evidence should be interpreted as adequately indicating that a standard had been met. Some local program directors also expressed the view that it was unclear whether the evidence requested would mean that program standards were actually being met, or only that specific activities had been carried out, regardless of their consequences. While these reactions were not widespread, they occurred in enough places to indicate that further training is probably needed for both BTSA program directors and IPR team members. This was, as noted above, the initial year for this process, so some of this variability is likely to disappear in subsequent rounds.
Answering Study Question #1: How well are BTSA programs meeting the objectives set forth in Education Code 44279.1?

Since Study Question #1 focuses on the BTSA program, we address it here. Other study questions are addressed later in this report after the needed background information for addressing them has been presented. In California, most people who plan to make teaching their profession enroll in a higher education teacher preparation program, complete the required course work, observations and student teaching, and earn their preliminary teaching credentials. Upon finding employment they begin their first year of classroom teaching. According to one school administrator, speaking from personal experience, those first years used to be a “sink or swim” time where “no one was assigned to help me.” Other administrators echoed similar words concerning their beginning years. So did support providers. One comment, “I think a lot of us remember the time when it was like, here’s the key, here’s the door and here’s your book. And that was very difficult,” prompted nods of agreement by everyone in the room. The introduction of BTSA, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment System (Education Code 44279.1), however, has radically changed the induction of first and second year teachers into the profession.

Transition into teaching careers

The legislation requires that BTSA provide an effective transition into the teaching career for those teachers enrolled in the program. An analysis of the case study data reveals that the overwhelming majority of participating teachers, BTSA grads, support providers, administrators and coordinators/directors believe that this transition has been much improved. While a variety of activities and procedures are contributing to make that success possible there is general agreement that the support providers, sometimes called consulting teachers, coaches or mentors, make a significant difference in the lives of most new teachers. Reflecting on this role, one support provider said,

I’d say the relationships beginning teachers build with their support providers has made them feel more comfortable because they have a place to go to. They all know who to ask, it’s a person on campus to go to. I know that’s decreased their anxiety and stress. The first year can be so overwhelming; there are so many acronyms, and it’s nice to have someone there for you.

Others stated:

It has given the PTs a jump start into Best Practices.
Relationships. They feel empowered. We give them the tools. It’s a ripple effect.

One support provider gave a vivid example of how her assistance made a constructive difference.

I know with my participating teacher, he was struggling with classroom management skills for quite a while. I would go in and I would script what was going on in the classroom, observe, and then I would leave him that script so that he could mull it over a bit. And he’d come to me and say, ‘What can I do?’ What do you see in the script as you read it? ‘Well, I see that people are out of their seats, I see that people are not raising their hands, I see that.’ Okay then, what can you do to change that behavior? We’d have discussions like that over and over and over again. All of a sudden he started to change the way he was doing things in the classroom and getting the kids out, lining them up so they don’t just rush to the cafeteria, that they’re lined up and they walk down – they are quieter in the classroom, they raise their hands better, they’re engaged but not in a disruptive way instead of what we had seen before.

The BTSA grads, teachers who have completed the two year program and received their clear credentials, reflected upon their experiences and offered comments like the following:

I had the goddess of support providers; her notes and reflective conversations allowed me to be a better teacher.

My experience was very positive because my support provider was good too.

When I got to my school, I had a really good coach. I already had a year in a credential program, but she helped me look at the things I really needed to focus on. Making my math lessons or language arts lessons more creative.

I’m teaching a subject I don’t know very well but I feel like, because of the project and the skills I gained from my mentor, I know what to do. I have the formula of what needs to happen so now it’s just applying new content to the same structure that my mentor helped me develop.

A mentor makes a big difference. My mentor was amazing and I still use little tricks that she taught me.
The participating teachers, those folks who are now fully in charge of their own classrooms, affirmatively attest to the contributions that the support providers have made to help them grow and become competent teachers.

...all the resources that I’ve got from my advisor have really helped me feel more comfortable, more competent as a teacher. Just better prepared. A lot more tools and stuff. She has been a great support.

The impact of my advisor is incalculable. It’s had such a strong affect on my success as a teacher.

As a new teacher in the beginning I was just so focused on the content and he’s really helped me expand new ways to assess students and new ways to engage students and model their learning.

I like sitting down with my advisor at the beginning of the year and going over things that are important, that you need to work on. And then you meet for your mid-year review and see how you’re doing and where you want to go from there. So, just for me, it really kind of maps it out and helps me to reach my goals and to better myself as a teacher.

Both administrators and directors recognize the difference a support provider makes. A director stated, “The support provider has a pivotal role in the collection of data with the beginning teachers. . . . It also means that our program is as good and strong as our weakest support provider,” while an administrator said, “The consulting teachers know more of what we are trying to get across. They bridge the gap.”

While support providers play a significant role in helping teachers cope with stress, uncertainty and develop needed instructional classroom management skills there are a number of other BTSA activities that contribute to their growth. Participating teachers, grads and support providers all agree that classroom observations make a difference. For example,

I got a chance to go to observe other classes. That was really cool. My support provider knew who were the best to see in various subjects and I got to see those best teachers. It was cool for me ‘cause I got to see the other people who are really good at their profession.
And

It was valuable to be able to observe other teachers. Looking at other teachers, I found so much information; even looking at what other teachers put on their walls.

Additionally,

I don’t know what the term was that they used, but it was sort of like a reflection process. They came in and observed a lesson, and we discussed it afterward. I think that can go two ways. It can be just filling out the paperwork, but if you take advantage of your coach and the situation, it can really help to fine-tune your teaching.”

It also makes you more confident because you can observe other teachers and they can observe you. The feedback you get from both makes you better.

My teachers always tell me that the most they get out of the program are the observations. Observations are so important; I can see the involvement of the class, and how throughout the year, all the stages of the year, they change.

Observations done by support providers also give the beginning teachers “confidence when they can say what they would do next time instead of you having to say it to them. That builds their self-confidence more, and it’s non-threatening.” And a new teacher confirmed this when she said, “A lot of people had to watch me teach. When my support provider would come in, she would give me plenty of feedback. This made it more comfortable when my principal came in and gave me my formal evaluation.”

Attendance at seminars and workshops is required of new teachers to enhance their knowledge and teaching skills. Likewise, reflecting on one’s actions and activities is also expected. In the opinion of one participating teacher, “The seminars, the events, and the observations really, really help, and reflection is a big thing; that’s one thing I’ve really learned. Because of reflection, there are a ton of things that I will do different next year, and for me, this is how BTSA has helped.” A grad concurred, saying, “Some of the experiences and the reflection activities were very valuable. The seminars and lesson plans were invaluable. The content was rewarding and improved my teaching skills.” Another noted, “I liked the short-term and long-term planning. Because the first year is so hard, it really helped to have that guide to plan it out. That has stayed with me forever; I have prepared monthly calendars. It has helped me be more organized.” An administrator summed it up very nicely stating,
The seminars and other activities give them constant support throughout the first two years, and is a proactive measure in creating a competent teacher. It provides them with skills and helps to create a two-way dialogue.

The following statements by participating teachers further illustrate the growth that occurred during their BTSA experience.

For me, it challenges me to move above and beyond my existing level of comfort, to try things that really challenge me as a teacher. There are activities that I will never revisit again because they are not my style. There are some activities that I grown to really enjoy and I want to use again and again.

For me it’s what I reflect on what I’ve done and to improve on it so I’m never done improving. For me, I just know every year I am getting better at what I am doing.

It really pushed me to move beyond my current level of teaching, to do different things to make sure that I was teaching for the whole spectrum of students that I have, not just middle level, or lower level, or the higher level but all of them. It pushed me to come up with new strategies.

And

It has me growing more as a better teacher. It has really opened my eyes to take steps to truly to get to know every one of my students. Middle school is not that easy, when you see them one hour a day and its 150 bodies. It provides you some activities and strategies that will help you learn each of those individuals and therefore each of their needs so you are not teaching a lesson to one large group.

Improved pupil educational performance

The issue of improved student achievement is tackled in our discussion of the data from one large urban school district which generously provided us with a five year longitudinal record of classroom level student achievement and provided anonymous access to the credential status, background characteristics experience levels and BTSA participation records of the their teaching workforce.

Teaching of diverse students
Recognizing that the majority of California’s educators need to teach and understand a heterogeneous student population, the BTSA Induction program is charged with the responsibility of “enabling the effectiveness of the beginning teachers in the instruction of pupils who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse.” The induction standards that new teachers must meet in order to receive a clear credential specifically address equity, diversity and access to the core curriculum (S.17), the teaching of English learners (S.19) and the teaching of special populations (S.20). This is done in a variety of ways. Some ways, according to the data, are more successful than others. As one participating teacher’s comment makes clear, diversity instruction is not always about pedagogical techniques. She said, “Personally, teaching Spanish, I don’t have too many ELLs. That is a problem I had, trying to find my ELL student. And when I did they were usually ELD-5, ready to step out. But having the multi-cultural training was helpful, because often there are rifts between the Armenian, Hispanic and Korean student populations.” BTSA programs, nevertheless, utilize several activities to facilitate improved instruction for a variety of diverse students, including those who are learning to speak English.

Seminars, colloquia and workshops

The most common set of activities consists of a variety of professional development seminars, colloquia and workshops designed to address these issues. New teachers are required to attend. Those providing the training and instruction may be district or county specialists, university or independent experts, representatives of community cultural and socio-economic groups, law enforcement and social agency representatives, or parents of special needs students.

The following are the reactions of some the participating and graduate teachers.

The poverty training and stuff like that was awesome for me. It was required by BTSA but the district supported it too so it was a hand in hand thing. Really opened my eyes! It was stuff we went over in the credential program but now we see it every day in the classroom. A whole different spin on it!

I went to a school workshop . . . this year and talked about special needs students in the classroom and got so many great ideas. A lady . . . gave the class, and her daughter has severe disabilities. We walked away so excited with a new bag of tricks that we could use. I knew who I was going to target with the activities but before the workshop I didn’t know what to do with them.
We had multiple in-services just focusing on ELL and we had a differentiation workshop that taught us so many strategies working with ELL students.

We also had a seminar on how to differentiate instruction, and that was huge.

There were lots of sessions with ELL students. There were two sessions, one for poverty and one for culture. I thought that was quite interesting. Even something like classroom management taught us how to look at those students.

They offered a lot of courses that dealt with ELL. The first couple of courses were really useful in the classroom; I got a lot of new ideas about different activities. I think they offered twenty lessons to help with ELL.

One of the support providers commented that at some of the seminars:

The participating teachers get resources. They do some ‘make and take’ things that make it easier for them to differentiate in the classroom, and also they work in teams, so they kind of have an idea of what’s going on. They feel like they’re part of a group. Are you doing this, and how does this work for you? So you get a lot of feedback from each other too. I think that benefits them as well.

Likewise, an administrator noted:

Well, they do some really good seminars. For instance, when I talk to my new teachers about differentiating instruction, they know what I am talking about. Some of the older teachers don’t, however, because they didn’t have the opportunity to go to seminars and learn about these things. So my young teachers are actually better at it than my older teachers, and they are teaching my older teachers how to differentiate instruction.

Some presenters include how teachers can make use of technology to find further resources. For example, one teacher said:

During the culture seminars, they would bring people in from different cultures to speak to us, and they were cultures that were represented in our district. They would tell us different things we might face with that demographic, such as different customs and habits. They even told us about different internet sites where you type
a word in English and it would convert the word for you from whatever language. And the contact information would be readily available.

And a director noted:

If the computer is connected to the internet, they can click on any of those and they can come up hotlinks. Can get additional info about spec pops, or ELLs, beyond what they need to in terms of the materials. They need more strategies for working with ELL, they can click and it comes up with about 12 websites. Spec pops – IDEA law comes up and what does that mean.

Focal students and Instructional Techniques

A second array of activities involves each participating teacher demonstrating and applying knowledge gained from these seminars by developing and executing lessons to meet the needs of a specific “focal” student each year. One year a focal student (also referred to as a focus student) may be an ELL and the other year, a student with special needs.

Participating and graduate teachers who did these lessons reported:

BTSA has workshops on ELL and Special needs. We have to focus on students and prepare special lessons.

I had a student from Vietnam who couldn’t speak a word of English when she started, and those lessons helped her. By the time she left, she could read at the end of kindergarten. It was good that I had so much because it allowed me to pick and choose the plans that were best in that situation. Instead of just theory, they offered things that actually helped us. Strategies and lesson plans and resources that you could use.

With the ELL, I have someone in my 4th period, it was helpful. Focus on one . . .then everyone can get it. It’s helped the student.

They also reflected on their instructional techniques and their effectiveness.

For each of our events, we have to look at how it worked for students and focus students. And usually, one of our focus students is either ELL or special education.
So, it really makes you think about how you should adjust your strategies for the needs of those populations. It really does force you to think about those two groups.

In addition, they typically indicated that the support providers played an important role in making the training effective.

There were specific observations where my mentor would come in and I would have to focus on making sure I was meeting the needs of my English language learners or students with learning disabilities.

I think the most helpful thing is the mentor experiences and insight. How to support your working with students that had extra needs. Their strategies and ideas were usually valuable – even their suggestions on how to come up with other support on staff.

There clearly has been an impact because support providers observed that “Being forced to focus on ELL has changed attitudes.” One provider stated,

My participating teacher makes sure she uses SDAIE every lesson. In first grade level, there are some students who struggle (not just ELLs) and she is trying to reach them all.

When you choose your focus students, it allows you to make comparisons with the general group. It also tends to focus you on the specific needs and differentiating and reaching every type of student. And I think it’s clear from the conversations with participating teachers that the strategies you use for specific populations will be good for others.

Finally, a support provider reflecting upon behavior that has become natural to her “after teaching many years” says of herself and others, “we’re going to say ‘how is Johnny in the corner.’” The new teachers “don’t ask that” but they are learning.

*Community Profiles and Data Bases*

In addition to seminars and focus students, the beginning teachers are expected create a “the community profile because it forces you to look at every aspect of your kids every year. It really helps to break down and analyze the class. How many ELL learners do you have? How many RSP kids do you have?” And they are trained to be able to interpret the district
data base “which explains which students are in Sp. Ed., have special needs, are ELL, LES, SDAIE, etc.”

**Problems and Frustrations**

While everyone agrees that BTSA is addressing the needs of various students there were also participating teachers who were critical of the ELL training provided. Some of their comments were:

The ELL lesson, it’s too shallow. You are just doing it but it has no meaning.

ELL on line- let’s be honest- I was excited to learn how to meet these needs for ELL. The class fell flat. It was “hit and miss” and missed the mark sometimes.

The EL seminar was a disappointment. I barely learned anything beyond what was taught at the university. I didn’t get enough to help my student, and I need to help him.

I actually had read some of the same articles in college.

And a group of teachers concurred when one member said,

BTSA did not provide anything new, we need more on SDAIE training.

Special education training was also disappointing for some participating teachers and grads. Commenting on seminars, they said.

We had two sessions on ELL and two on special education. Going back to the same theme, we are just passively receiving the information, both sessions are power point. There’s nothing worth remembering because there’s nothing to practice and see how it plays out.

In one class, the instructor spent two hours talking about the history of special education. It was unbelievably boring.

It would have been better if they focused on type that we are more likely to see, like kids with ADD. We are not all going to be dealing with autistic kids. Deal with the issues we have every day. Like one time, I had to look at someone who had a speech
problem. And I wasn’t sure if it was a speech issue or a language issue. And I didn’t want to embarrass the kid.

One teacher has second thoughts about the classifying students for special education.

For me, it was my first experience in special education, and I remember her distinctly saying that once a child gets into special education, it’s impossible for them to get out. And that point stuck with me. Now, every time I do an SST, I am wondering if I am ruining this kid’s educational career.

One administrator reported that the training does not always result in real understanding of key issues:

I don’t think teachers have a solid knowledge of special education needs. Once they go through it, they start to understand. But how they address it in their classroom is difficult. My new teachers seem to be mystified.

The Statewide Survey data, Table 11, shows help in the areas of special education and English language learns is less than 2.50 on a 4.00 scale.

In addition to criticism regarding the quality of training received, some teachers identified gaps in the coverage of important topics. For example, students with special needs also include the gifted and a number thought that there was insufficient GATE training. A participating teacher noted,

There should be a greater focus on GATE and higher achieving students.

Support providers agreed, saying,

We seem to need a little more focus on the gifted students. More and more of the responsibility for the gifted students’ education will be on the teacher. We need more support there.

Well, you can always focus on ELL, but what about the high kids. GATE students. It’s obviously more important to put the money towards ELL, but I had a PT who taught nothing but honors classes. It would have been important to learn how to challenge these kids.
And an administrator pointed out both the educational and political implications of not providing GATE training for beginning teachers.

I think one population we don’t think much about is the GATE student. And we have to do more with high-end students. Their parents are particularly demanding and they have no problem coming after a new teacher.

“Gay issues were not addressed in the diversity seminar. It could also be integrated into the health seminar,” was another issue not addressed in the training, according to a participating teacher.

A third issue, which an administrator believed should be addressed, is

The issue of generational poverty. It adds to the type of students we get in schools as well. And the issue of how we can adjust and adapt to their learning needs is important as well. This may not be a BTSA issue; however, it is impossible to completely extract BTSA from this issue either.

Finally, not all school sites have ELLs and/or special education students and meeting the “focal student” requirement becomes problematic. One person said,

You have to realize that in rural, upstate California, there are a lot of districts that don’t have ELLs. It’s hard to believe if you go to southern California, 70 different languages spoken, but in our district we have hardly any. So we address it but there’s not the practicum of working with ELLs if you don’t have any in your class or in your school.

Another added,

Our school is 98.2% white. It was a tough find for my PT – had to use a couple of socio-economic students. The diversity issue is huge in CA but it’s not everywhere yet.

**Individualized support for new teachers**

BTSA is also supposed to provide intensive individualized support for new teachers. Individualization has limits, however, as the State has to maintain common standards to insure a minimum level of quality. Moreover, new teachers come from sharply different
backgrounds and their pre-service programs vary substantially in content and in rigor. Hence, the ability of local BTSA programs to produce the expected individualization has been limited in both theory and practice. Thus, all new teachers to some extent receive the same training regardless of the skills, knowledge and abilities they bring to the job. The responsibility for providing individualized support, therefore, falls primarily on the shoulders of the support providers, experienced teachers who have been chosen by their districts or consortiums to guide, coach, mentor, collaborate, model, observe, interpret and, in some instances, instruct new teachers.

This works best when individualized support starts at the very beginning of the school year. “I think they are very frazzled when they first come in.... I think you can help them, and when you sit down and help them take it one step at a time they feel much better about what they’re going to be doing.” The “here’s the key, here’s the door and here’s your book” still goes on but, in most instances, the support provider soon follows. As a result,

The relationship built with the participating teachers has made them feel more comfortable because they have a place to go to. They all know who to ask, it’s a person on campus to go to. I know that’s decreased their anxiety and stress. The first year can be so overwhelming; there are so many acronyms, and it’s nice to have someone there for you.

Observations

Support providers also observe the new teachers in their classrooms. These observations serve several purposes. First, some of the full-timers do initial observations at the beginning of the school year to get better acquainted with their new teachers and their teaching skills. In addition, "I [then] can see the involvement of the class, and how throughout the year the year they change. The first week of teaching is going to be a lot different than right before spring break,” one provider said. “If there’s something they don’t see, I probably will. It serves as another pair of eyes.” Part-time support providers are less apt to use the observation technique for this purpose since it removes them from their own classrooms too often.

Then, according to one grad, the support provider looked to see,

If I was keeping my students engaged, if they were meeting the standards and if they were going where they needed to go. It wasn’t judging or anything like that; it was purely supportive, teaching me how to reflect and how to improve.
Another said,

I had about three observations a month. Those were cool, because I would say that this is what I am trying to do, he’d watch that and say, ‘try this next time.’ And then he’d come again at the end of the month.

And,

My support provider was coming up with things that I was doing that I had no clue about. Just little things, like saying thank you to a kid for answering a question. Little things like politeness and the way I respect the students that I may not see when I am teaching. She was like a mirror.

Second, in addition to being observed, the new teachers also receive feedback and are being asked to reflect upon what they do. This makes a difference according to one teacher, “Because of reflection, there are a ton of things that I will do different next year.” A support provider providing the individualized support, concurred, saying,

The observation is important to them, if they have a second set of the eyes in the back of their room, to write what you see. They are observed formally, but that’s evaluative. To get them comfortable having someone in the room not evaluating, just writing down what they see, how are you doing, how does it fit in your lesson plan, I know for my PT it was very valuable to her as was the reflection afterward...

Third, in conjunction seminars and other in-service activities, the new teachers are given specific assignments, referred to as “practicum,” and the support providers observe their execution. One teacher stated, “Formal observations are always a wonderful thing to do. To have someone objectively looking at you is nice.” Also,

For some of the twelve events, a support provider can do observations of us, and we can observe them. He/she observes a lesson that we do based upon a standard. They will take notes and then provide us with feedback. They may then observe again to see how we improved

Another new teacher acknowledged that but also put in a plea for more individualized support when she said,
I get observed a lot but a lot of time it’s for the BTSA assignments, for the practicum, so I definitely do different lessons for the practicum but I want to be observed for my regular lessons.

And support providers, recognizing their evaluative role in the induction process, declared,

The observations that are done in the classroom, and the discussions, that are held with the participating teachers afterwards, are based around the standards for teaching. That ensures that these standards are the foundation of what is being sought after by the participating teachers.

Fourth, being observed in their classrooms by their support providers “makes us feel more comfortable because the feedback from the support provider concerning the observation is not evaluative like it would be from an administrator. It is more supportive. They’re not threatening.” It also enables them to become used to being observed. “Constant observation and evaluation by my support provider really helped me when the Principal evaluated me.” This is important because there is clearly more of “a feeling of intimidation with the administration walk-throughs.”

In addition to observing the participating teachers themselves, some support providers are able to arrange for new teachers to observe both the support provider and other teachers in their own classrooms. One new teacher said about the release days, “My support provider and I took one of the days to go observe.” Others stated, “For some of the twelve events, a support provider can do observations of us, and we can observe them.” A support provider, previously cited, whose assistance made a constructive difference also said of the participating teacher,

He would come into my classroom and other teachers’ classrooms and see how they were doing things. He would incorporate a little bit here and a little bit there and he finally has come full circle and is managing his classroom.

Not all support providers are able to arrange such observations, however. “I wish the participating teachers could have more time to observe veteran teachers or pros, just be out of their classroom and into someone else’s classroom, they have asked me for this opportunity,” lamented one support provider.

Table 5 confirms that the beginning teachers believe that observing and being observed makes a significant difference in their learning process.

Paperwork
The need to do so much paperwork, check-offs and evidence collecting often was reported to interfere with individualization. For one special education teacher it definitely did not, however.

I think it is very helpful to have a support provider, because I find myself drowning in paperwork and it is nice to have the help of the support provider there. She helps with the IIP’s and setting levels and goals. From the special education point of view, the BTSA paperwork is too much. I don’t think it helps me necessarily to write these things down; but to have the support provider there helps. It is my interaction with her that provides me with the strategies to implement in the classroom. She takes the BTSA standards and translates them into classroom strategies. She also helps me with the paperwork, ‘she takes me by the hand’.27

In the opinion of a group new teachers and support providers, however, “The group feels there should be more of an emphasis on support provider/participating teacher relationships, and less on paperwork, especially in the first year. The first year should focus more on mentorship.” Another participating teacher echoed those words, saying,

That’s what’s funny. BTSA is supposed to be all about support during the first year. And I did everything the first year. And then my second year, you want to offer me support? It almost doesn’t seem valid. It’s less about lesson planning and collaboration, and more about, let’s get through the paperwork.

And a support provider summed it up well when she said, “It’s not about building a relationship with binders and paperwork, it’s about building a relationship with people – that’s our job.”

Three other issues have an impact on individualized support of new teachers.

Time

The amount of time that support providers can give to their teachers makes a difference. While full-time providers have a large teacher caseload they are able to see their teachers, during the

27 While BTSA does not routinely serve educational specialist holders, some BTSA programs cooperate with universities to facilitate education specialist induction. Apparently some other special education teachers also participate in BTSA. In 2006-07 5.2% of the BTSA participating teachers (1465) reported holding education specialists (see Figure 4).
contractual day, at least once a week and there is no need to be site specific. There is time, according to one teacher, to sit down at the beginning of the year and go over things that are:

Important to you, that you think you need to work on. And then you meet for your mid-year review and see how you’re doing and where you want to go from there so just for me it really kind of maps it out and helps me to get to reach my goals and to better myself as a teacher.

The full timer can also speedily respond to a teacher’s need. “All I needed to do was to ask for something and the next day, there would be boxes waiting for me,” said one teacher. Another commented, “It’s nice to have the mentor’s expertise at your fingertips – that they can help you with certain things.” The new teacher was going to teach a new series of lessons and her provider informed her of materials available in the district that would assist her instruction. Still a third teacher said,

All the resources that I’ve got from my support provider have really helped me feel more comfortable as a teacher, more competent as a teacher. Just better prepared. A lot more tools and stuff. She has been support.

With the exception of some retired teachers, part-time support providers are full-time teachers who, as one teacher lamented, “always has a tug between helping my new teacher and making sure my class was looked after.” This is particularly true at the elementary level since none of the teachers has a planning period during the time the students are present. This does have a negative impact on intensive individualized support because according to one participating teacher,

I can’t speak for everyone else, but the time I had with my support provider was great. And if anything I would like to have more time with him. Not after school, because by then you’re exhausted, but during school. I wish we had more release days or half-days to have with our support provider. If we had more days where the support provider could do more than just making sure we’re caught up, and could just sit down with us and talk about what’s working and what’s not working, then that would be great.

A support provider responded, saying,

I’d like to piggyback on that. My most productive days with my participating teacher are those during my contractual day. But it’s hard, because I have four teachers at four sites, and even though we have sub days, we have to prepare a sub plan.
The interview data and Tables 1 and 3 are in agreement.

*Site, Subject and Grade*

Site placement, subject and/or grade are also an issue. The majority of the new and supporting elementary teachers want to be at the same site.

Having someone on your site makes a big difference; it takes a lot of that pressure off of being a part-time support provider. There are infinitely more opportunities to run into each other and collaborate. It also takes a lot of the pressure off of being a beginning teacher. Because no one wants to be known as a beginning teacher, and when you see your support provider at your site, you feel more like a team; just like people working in a department together, or people working in grade-level groups together. It’s very helpful, and that’s always been a flaw; we just can’t get enough support providers at every site and every grade level. There’s no substitute for having someone at your site.

This is particularly true now that the district is placing so much of the assessment on us. There are so many internal politics at each site that makes it really hard on a new teacher. It’s nice to have support provider there on the site to help them through this.

In addition, “If I was having a crappy day, I knew she was right there for me. It was really nice to have someone to talk to who was only two minutes away.” And, “At the same school you can have lunch together, you can visit at recess, you just have the whole relationship.”

This, however, is not always possible. A part-time provider who had four new teachers, wanted them at the same site but circumstances in the district prevented that. Instead,

I am currently matched by grade level, and this makes it easier to overcome the being on different sites – curriculum-wise --, because I can email the same curriculum materials to each of my four teachers at the same time. And when I’m in the classroom, I know where they should be.

A participating teacher whose support provider was not on the same campus felt a bit differently,

We weren’t able to build as strong of a relationship because it was harder to meet. We had to do most of our stuff through email. I mean it wasn’t that we didn’t get along; it’s just I see some people who have this great relationship and ours just wasn’t that close
because we’d never have that face-to-face. We’d have to take sub days to do it. I think I’d have benefited a lot better by having someone on site.

There was the occasional teacher who preferred the provider be on another campus but this was unusual. According to one, “Even though there is a strong same grade network at my site, I still prefer to have a support provider from another site. It helps to provide a different point of view. It helps me see different ideas.” For another, “I found it beneficial to not have someone on site because if there were troubles you were having with someone on your site, you didn’t feel as if you were bad mouthing anyone. You had an outside perspective that was neutral.”

Special education participating teachers must be paired with special education support providers. This causes problems for districts. Because of geographical problems this requirement sometimes means that crossing over district lines is necessary to make a match. Or, in other instances

We struggle being able to find support providers that have specialties in special education. We have the people, but they don’t have the time to be support providers because they have so many other responsibilities.

The combination of being “burdened by the paperwork from the federal government” plus the paperwork demands makes a number of teachers feel it’s impossible to be both a full-time teacher and support provider.

Part-time support providers at the secondary level have a planning period and this helps mediate the problem of supervising a new teacher while maintaining a full class load. “For the CFASST events we have to conduct observations. So, when I do those, I do them during my prep time,” one teacher said. For the new teacher, however, who needs all the time he or she has to maintain her daily schedule, having the prep period “eaten up talking to my support provider” about the “busy work” was frustrating and unsatisfying. Or as another teacher put it,

A lot of the time with the support provider is spent muddling through the folders and portfolios. Our one hour a week is spent largely doing that. It would be nicer for a first year teacher to be able to compare lesson plans and strategies with teachers in the same subject. Working with the BTSA support provider should really be focused on how you’re teaching.
And at the secondary level, there was a slight preference for subject matter matching over site matching. Table 2 confirms the preferences of most the participating teachers regarding their matches with support providers.

A group of part-time support providers talking together said,

The full-time release providers, I think they have some advantages we don’t have. They have really the luxury of lots of time to do lots of observations without interrupting their own schedule – to do lots of real in-depth conversations where we tend to have . . . not only is the new teacher pressured but we’re pressured. I think as long as the full-time release teacher isn’t long out of the classroom they have credibility too.

*Training*

The case study data reveal that support providers today must be able capable of providing intense individualized support for the new teachers -- being sounding boards and confidants, helping new teachers “muddle” through the paperwork required to complete the induction standards, modeling and instructing good teaching practices, being a “second pair of eyes” and providing formative rather than summative assessment. To successfully meet the challenges of these various and sometime contradictory responsibilities requires more than being skilled in interpersonal relations. As classroom teachers the support providers’ primary clientele were students (and for the part-time providers this is still true). Now, however, in their support provider role they need “training needed to work with adults.” They need both the theoretical background and practical understanding necessary to not only provide the new teachers with a “bag of tricks” but also help them understand why such activities should produce constructive outcomes and how and when these activities need to be adjusted or modified. Rigorous training in formative assessment and the gathering of “objective evidence,” in new teacher “growth and development,” in the best teaching practices – these are just a few examples of the professional development and training support providers initially need. Then, so that they, like their new teachers, can continue to grow they participate in a support provider “community of practice, a learning community” in which they continue to receive professional development.

A grad declared that, “A lot of the ease of the first year depends on the support provider. If the support providers are getting the right training and are dedicated to their jobs, it makes the experience easier for the teacher.” Stated more negatively by a new teacher, “I think the providers need to have the same rigorous expectations that we do. Like mine never goes to the meetings, so I know more about it than she does. And I have to remind her of what I need to
schedule for my agenda. I just feel that if you want to be a provider, you really need to know what you’re doing.” One director asserted that the new teacher’s “success is, in part, only as good as the quality of the SPs.” That being the case, “investing heavily in support provider development” should produce “a winning combination.”

**Improved teacher rigor and consistency**

The timing of this study made it impossible to develop reliable indicators of how much or little new teachers improve in their instructional capacity. No observation could have been made until well past the middle point of the school year and none lasted over any extended period of time.

**Coherent assessment based on CSTP**

In addition to its enabling legislation and education code provisions, the BTSA program is grounded in two key documents: the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, and the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs*. These documents specify the goals of teacher induction and specify the criteria against which they are to be measured. There is a strong and consistent knowledge base according to the majority of case studies that BTSA and the induction standards are deeply rooted and well aligned to the CSTP. This knowledge was observed in comments concerning the BTSA program in general. It was also seen in comments that allude to specific components of BTSA. Finally, many of these responses came despite the fact that no topical question on this matter was asked of the respondents. These answers were usually given within the context of why BTSA has made participating teachers feel more confident and comfortable. In other words, the CSTP were not only connected with BTSA and the induction standards, but also directly referenced in comments about how BTSA helped teachers succeed.

Some of the comments made by the participants and directors of these programs reflect themes of a general nature with respect to BTSA being rooted in the CSTP. A site administrator commented that, “The program is ultimately based on the California Teaching Standards, and I feel this is important. The focus is there and the monitoring is there…” A support provider commenting on how BTSA made teachers feel more confident stated, “I think it provides that vehicle for discussion, and it addresses the standards for the teaching profession which is what teachers are going to be ultimately evaluated on. They [BTSA and the CSTP] are supposed to line up.” This comment was echoed by a site administrator who said, “…and it reinforces best practices and teaches the kinds of things that are evaluated by the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.” In addition, one director explaining the two year process of being a PT
stated, “If we look at the CSTP, year one PTs are evaluated on two and four – classroom management. And the second year is for one, three and five – instruction and assessment.”

Finally, a participating teacher discussing the BTSA activities commented, “I think the whole thing of the BTSA activities being aligned to the CSTP is very valuable…”

Similar to these broad and general themes was an idea that the CSTP provides a common language for the new teachers and support providers. A support provider discussing how BTSA makes one feel more comfortable as a teacher stated,

I think it really helps in ingraining the language of the discipline into the support providers. Knowing what CSTP’s are, knowing what the standards are in content areas. Knowing the language of what we do. Being a support provider has been huge for me. BTSA really helps you wrap your head around the language of what we do every single day.

A site administrator added,

That participating brand new teacher has something to bring to the collaborative meetings. They have something to offer, they understand the teaching standards.

And a support provider stated,

The CSTP is a wonderful tool for all teachers. It is a common language with teacher, Principal and Superintendent. It makes the conversation much richer.

The influence of the CSTP in the BTSA program was also detected in specific components of the BTSA programs. The idea that professional development training, seminars and other activities within BTSA were tied to the CSTP was expressed often. A director commented that, “…all of our professional development is based on the CSTP.” A site administrator stated, “They understand the standards for educators because they go through it all the time with BTSA training. And we reinforce the idea that that is what’s expected. So, there’s a match there.”

A director commenting on how professional development training is implemented stated,

Ours is really integrated. Some programs send them to EL training, and then technology, and then health and safety; and we really like to integrate it around the CSTP. So, if we’re looking at knowing your learners, which is the first session and the first two hours; well, we talk about knowing your learners in terms of health, special pop, etc.
Speaking specifically about lesson plans, a graduate teacher stated, “Yes, [with] most of the lesson plans I’ve seen, I’ve always seen a connection to the state standards.” Finally, a participating teacher commenting on the seminars said,

I think a lot of the induction forums [seminars] that are held for the teachers, the participating teachers, are in line with the state standards... They are also in line with the requirements that each candidate needs to meet to clear their credential. And I think those goals are pretty clearly defined.

Somewhat related to this last point, one site administrator felt that BTSA had helped to shape the issues of reform predominant in the professional learning community. He commented,

I would say that since its inception BTSA has helped to draw the reform issues of collaboration of the professional learning community. Most of the districts now use the CA Teaching Standards. That’s part of evaluation model and, of course, each district is different so the degree to which they are implementing those reforms is very much based on their culture and environment. But I do believe BTSA has a positive impact in driving those reforms.

Another prevalent theme that surfaced was the role of the CSTP in support provider observations. The CSTP is a reference point for the support providers, and they explicitly try to examine, through the observations, how the participating teacher is meeting them. One participating teacher commenting on her support provider’s note-taking stated, “…she puts everything [down], everything I said, everything the student said, she did not just write it chronically, she wrote on how each CSTP is applied to.” A support provider commented,

The observations that are done in the classroom, and the discussions that are held with the participating teachers afterwards, are based around the standards for teaching. That ensures that these standards are the foundation of what is being sought after by the participating teacher.”

And a program director said, “We have them [support providers] check things they just discussed so what they work on is all related to this CSTP or the induction standards.”

The data also illustrated that the CSTP were well-aligned with the programs’ forms of formative assessment and evaluation. A support provider commenting how he helps his participating teacher with the program’s formative assessment said, “But with that collaboration process we look at the areas of strength within the lesson, and then we look at areas of improvement
based on the CSTP.” A program director stated, “Our formative assessment system is based on the teaching standards – they [support providers] learn how to assess teacher growth and development.” The same program director went on to comment, “We have finally gotten to the point where all of the districts are basing their evaluation systems on the CSTP and with goal setting, a major review and an end of the year reflection – professional growth reflection.”

An additional prominent theme was the prevalence of the CSTP in the IIP. There was a consensus that the IIP was specifically designed around the CSTP. A support provider stated,

> They look at what they need to work on and what is going well from the CSTP to determine an area of growth, and then they connect that to an area of curriculum that’s important to them.

Another provider commented,

> They not only incorporate the CA Standard for the Teaching Profession [the teachers ask] how does that help me deliver that content standard better. This is deliberately and by design done that way.

There are a number of other legislative and executive concerns addressed throughout this evaluation study. The issues of teacher retention and the development of mechanisms for program accountability and improvement have been addressed in previous sections of this report.
**Interpreting Intern Program Operations and Outcomes**

We turn now to an overview of who has been participating in the intern programs across the state. On most issues we have intern data for six years and can take a slightly longer historical look than was possible for the BTSA programs.

**Who is participating in the Intern Programs?**

Figure 15 examines overall enrollment in the state’s intern programs and tracks that enrollment against the overall size of the California teaching workforce. The total number of intern candidates increased from 6,850 in 2001 to 8,618 in 2003, which is the year with the most intern candidates during this six year period. In 2003-04 the number of intern candidates decreased by nearly 300 (277 to be precise) and dropped even more sharply to 7,307 in 2005-06 (a loss of 1,034 interns). In the most recent year, programs have expanded again (by 863 interns) making up for most of the previous year’s loss.

**Figure 15: Annual Intern Program Enrollments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intern Count</th>
<th>All Calif Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>304,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>7,498</td>
<td>307,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>8,618</td>
<td>303,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>8,341</td>
<td>304,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>7,307</td>
<td>305,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>8,170</td>
<td>316,854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Consent Form Surveys
Looking at the entire California teaching workforce (depicted in the line graph at the top of Figure 15, scaled to the right hand axis on the graph) we recall that 2003-4 is the year with the smallest number of teachers working in the state’s public school system and note that it is simultaneously the year with the largest enrollment in the intern programs. As noted in our discussion of BTSA programs, this is reasonably strong evidence that teachers not meeting the No Child Left Behind law’s criteria for “highly effective teachers” were leaving the active teaching workforce in relatively large numbers and that a substantial number entered into intern programs seeking to acquire the needed certification to be deemed highly qualified.

Figure 16 graphically reports some key demographic differences between schools with and without intern teachers on the staff. The schools are divided into four groups – those with no interns on staff, those whose interns are all served by funded local intern programs, those with interns entirely from unfunded programs, and those schools where both funded and unfunded interns are working.

**Figure 16: Comparison of Schools with and without Intern Teachers**

| Selected Demographic Characteristics of Schools with various combinations of Intern Teachers |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| No Interns                      | 40.6     | 39.4     | 6.2      | 6.8      | 48.2    | 6.9     | 22.0    |
| Funded Only                     | 29.1     | 47.5     | 9.3      | 8.2      | 51.4    | 7.5     | 26.1    |
| Unfunded Only                   | 27.8     | 51.4     | 9.2      | 6.1      | 55.0    | 7.2     | 27.3    |
| Both                            | 23.2     | 53.2     | 10.6     | 7.8      | 57.6    | 8.4     | 27.4    |

Note: There are statistically significant group differences for all but Pct GATE and Pct Asian.
What is clear from this figure is that interns are definitely working in school settings that are more challenging than those where no interns are employed. This matches the legislative intent for the program, though it also raises questions about whether children in these more challenging settings are receiving equal educational opportunities.

The unequal distribution of children from Caucasian and Hispanic heritages is particularly vivid in this graph, while the differences in percent of Asian students and in the proportions of students identified as gifted are not statistically significant.

Figure 17 presents the 2006 and 2007 Academic Performance Index scores for the schools with and without intern credential teachers, with the schools grouped in the same clusters as presented in Figure 16. There is a very large (41.7 points) difference in the 2007 API score difference between the schools with no interns and those with both funded and unfunded interns on their staffs. There are somewhat smaller differences for the other groups, but all these differences are statistically very reliable and substantively quite substantial. Here again, the data confirm that the interns are located where the legislation creating this program would lead us to expect them – in low performing, hard to staff schools.
Figure 17: Comparing the Academic Performance of Schools with and without Interns

2006 and 2007 School Average Academic Performance for Schools with various combinations of Interns of their faculty
(5,185 Schools have no interns, 676 have only funded interns, 1,093 have only unfunded interns, and 2,599 have both funded & unfunded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance Scores</th>
<th>No Interns</th>
<th>Funded Only</th>
<th>Unfunded Only</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>API06</td>
<td>752.7</td>
<td>734.2</td>
<td>718.5</td>
<td>704.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API07</td>
<td>753.0</td>
<td>736.8</td>
<td>722.9</td>
<td>711.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Academic Performance Index files
Figure 18: Gender Distribution across Credentials Pursued by Interns

For the four years in which the data were collected, Figure 18 displays in the data table the total number of intern candidates working toward receiving multiple subject credentials, single subject credentials, and educational specialist credentials, and depicts in the line graphs the percentage of each candidate group that were women. We note first that the total number of candidates seeking multiple subject credentials has shrunk rather dramatically in the last four years (from 3,692 to only 1,775). During this same period, the number of single subject candidates has expanded modestly and the number of education specialist candidates has grown by more than a third to 3,678. Controlling for race and gender, these yearly trends have been statistically significant for multiple subject credentials ($\beta = -.17$, $p = .001$) and education specialist credentials ($\beta = .08$, $p = .002$).

Over the last four years at least 73% of the candidates working toward multiple subject credentials were female. The proportion of females in this category reached a high of 77.1% in 2005. Over 50% of intern candidates working toward receiving single subject credentials from
2003 to 2006 were women. There was an increase of women intern candidate representation in the education specialist credential area, from 66.2% in 2003 to 71.1% in 2006. Examining all four years of the Intern data collectively and controlling for year in the program and race, all three of these gendered differences in credential type were statistically significant: multiple subject credential ($\beta = -0.12, p = .001$), single subject credential ($\beta = 0.17, p = .001$) and education specialist credential ($\beta = -0.06, p = .023$).

Figure 19: Ethnicity of Intern Candidates

![Ethnicity of Intern Candidates by Years](chart.png)

Source: Intern Consent Form Surveys

Figure 19 shows the 5 major ethnic groups: Caucasian, Latino, African Americans, Asian, and other groups (including Pacific Islander, South-East Asian, Native American, and multi-ethnic). We arranged the data table from the biggest ethnic group to the smallest groups. The majority of intern candidates are white with total numbers ranging from 3,583 in 2001 to 4,386 in 2006. Latino/Hispanic is the 2nd largest ethnic group in the intern population. This group increased significantly between 2001-02 and 2003-04 when it peaked at 2,210 interns. The Latino population decreased between 2003-04 and 2005-06 when it reached its lowest level in the last
six years (1,639). While the number of Latinos grew, along with other ethnic groups in 2006-07, the percentage of this group among interns continued to decline from its high of 27% to just 22% of the most recent cohort.

African American intern candidates increased their representation from 463 in 2001-02 to 804 in 2004-05. Like other groups, however, their numbers decreased to 635 in 2005-06. Also like other groups there was a modest increase in African American intern participation in 2006-07.

Representation of Asians among the interns has remained modest in size. Their peak number was 474, reached in the last year. The size of all other ethnic groups has also remained modest, never reaching more than 750 in number. The number of candidates who “decline to state ethnicity” (shown on the data table, but not graphed) has increased fairly dramatically from a low of just 18 in 2002-03 to a high of 466 in 2006.

Figure 20 documents the intern candidates’ age ranges. We grouped candidates’ ages into 5 categories: under 30, 31 to 40, 41 to 50, above 51, and decline to state. There were more than

![Figure 20: Intern Candidate Age Ranges](image-url)

**Age range of Intern Candidates by Year**

*Including “Decline to State”*

Note: Under 30 dominates, older groups have declined from historic highs, Decline to State decreased
3,100 intern candidates under 30 years of age in each of the years from 2002 to 2006. The 3,929 younger interns in 2006-07 comprise 48% of the total intern population. These young candidates are likely to be recent college graduates without important prior work experience. The 31 to 40 group peaked at 2,382 in 2003-04 while the next older group (41-50 years old) peaked the next year at 1,414. Nearly 10% of the total intern population has consistently reported their ages to 51 years or older, making internship surely a significant career transition for this group. If we combine all the interns reporting their age to be greater than 30 years, we see that this older candidate group is as large or larger than the 30 and under group, indicating that the intern program has had substantial success in attracting second career individuals into public school teaching.

Figure 21: Intern Prior Career Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Educational Affiliated</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Non Education</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>4,597</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>5,789</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>5,899</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Immediate College Graduates are the fastest growing group, Education affiliated careers are declining, business and other non-education careers are fairly steady at about 1 in 7 interns.
Figure 21 depicts the intern candidates’ career experiences before they entered the intern program. The largest group, by far, are those who reported some direct affiliation with education (emergency credential, substitute teaching, paraprofessional roles, counselors, tutors, etc.). This group accounted for 4,957 (72%) of the 6,850 interns in 2001-02. The group shrank, substantially more than other groups over the last six years, reaching 4,177, or 51%, of the total in 2006. Recent college graduates not reporting any other career rose from 1,525 interns in 2001 to 2,094 interns in 2006, (26%) of the 8,170 enrolled that year. When all non-education related occupational groups (business, engineering, sales, manufacturing, journalism, etc.) are combined, they comprise about one-sixth to one-seventh of the intern population. These are the group usually thought of when policy makers discuss the intern program as supporting second career opportunities to bring new types of individuals into teaching. From this perspective, the success of the intern programs in building a second career “pipeline” into the schools is probably a bit more modest than many leaders would like, but it has produced just over 7,000 teacher candidates who would probably not have otherwise made this type of a career move. Unfortunately, we cannot determine accurately whether these second career people stayed as long or longer than did those who were using the intern program for mobility within education or as an alternative to traditional teacher education programs when leaving college. Among the “other” category of non-educational career experiences is a potpourri of individuals reporting diverse answers that include: social worker, business owner, salesperson, actor, waiter, yoga instructor, photographer, private music tutor or tour guide. Overall, the majority of the intern candidates have educational/teaching related experiences before they enter the program.

Figure 22 identifies the types of colleges from which intern candidates received their undergraduate degrees. The largest group, comprising about half of all intern candidates each year graduated from one of the California State University campuses. The next largest group is drawn from colleges outside of California. Except for 2004-05, when private universities produced the third largest group of interns, the third group in size has been comprised of interns who graduated from the University of California. Although they have produced almost as many interns as the University of California, the more than fifty private colleges and universities operating within California have typically produced the smallest number of interns. There have been modest fluctuations in the number drawn from each of these university groups. The number of candidates receiving degrees from non-California colleges and universities was as small as 1,356 in 2001-02 increasing to 1,626 intern candidates in 2006-07.
Figure 22: Types of Intern Undergraduate Degree Institutions

![Graph showing types of intern undergraduate degree institutions by year.](image)

Source: Intern Consent Form Surveys

Figure 23 compares the numbers of intern candidates pursuing multiple subjects, single subjects, or education specialist credentials (data on this question are only available for the last four years). This chart also includes the candidates who are pursuing a combination of credentials; hence, the total numbers listed on the data table for are slightly larger than the total count of interns each year.
As the bar graphs show, the total number of multiple subject credential candidates has declined steadily over the last four years while the education specialist group has been steadily expanding, and the single subject candidate group has fluctuated quite a bit, peaking in the 2004-05 academic year. There were 3,692 intern candidates pursuing multiple subject credentials in 2003, but that number rose to 3,332 the next year, then fell and rose again in the most recent year to 3,064. There were 2,485 intern candidates in 2003 pursuing education specialist credentials in 2003-04, but that number has increased dramatically to 3,064 candidates in 2006-07. These shifts, we were assured by local intern program directors, are very closely linked to the job market for teachers and indicate just where local school districts are having difficulty recruiting qualified teaching staff.

Figure 24 digs a little deeper into the subject areas in which single subject credential candidates are seeking certification and employment. The major subject areas are English, Math, Science, Social science, and other foreign languages. Candidates working to receive single subject
credentials in agriculture, health, home economics, music, or PE are combined in the graph into the “All Other Subjects” count.

Figure 24: Single Subject Credential Areas Pursued by Interns

There were 792 intern candidates who were working on English subject credentials in 2003, a number which remains nearly constant at 796 in 2006. The number of mathematics credential seekers has risen steadily over the last four years from 517 in 2003-04 to 822 in 2006-07. This increase is, in part at least, a by-product of the new standards for teacher preparation in mathematics adopted in 2003. As with English, the number of science credential candidates has remained relatively constant, ranging from 497 to 570. The number of social science candidates has also fluctuated a bit, but with a generally upward trend, reaching 300 in the most recent year. Foreign language teachers have constituted the smallest group, never reaching as many as 200 candidates per year.

Source: Intern Consent Form Surveys
Figure 25 shifts from the credentials being pursued to the subjects currently being taught by the single subject interns. In this graph art teachers have been uniquely identified and foreign language teachers lumped in with the “Other Subjects” category because of the important changes in the number of art teachers over the last six years. As the bar graph indicates, the number of English teachers in the intern programs has changed quite dramatically over the six year period for which we have data. This group dropped sharply in size between 2001-02 and 2002-03 (from 1146 to 549). In the next year this group rose to its highest point (1338) and then dropped back to just under 800 interns per year. The number of interns with math teaching assignments has also changed quite substantially, with a low of 198 in 2001-02 and a high of 1,208 in 2004-05. Intern teaching in the social sciences followed the same general pattern as with mathematics. Although never exceeding 2/3 the size of the English teachers, this group rose dramatically in 2002-03 and drifted downward in the most recent years. A group with interesting substantial change is the Art teachers. This group peaked at 224 in 2003-04, but has declined to a mere 63 teachers in 2006-7. No doubt this change in the number of
new art teachers reflects the twin pressures of the adoption of the requirement of art coursework for admission to the California public universities in 2003, followed by the pressure to raise test scores and prepare students for the California High School Exit Examination that followed immediately afterward.

Figure 26: Multiple Subject Intern Candidates by Year

Figure 26 displays the multiple subject credential areas taught by intern candidates. There were 4,864 intern candidates assigned to teach multiple subjects in 2001, but that number has decreased each year. In 2005 and 2006, data allow analysis of interns who taught in multiple subject classrooms according to school level: high school, middle school core, and elementary. As expected, this chart tells us that there are most interns teaching in multiple subject classrooms are in elementary schools.
How Interns Evaluate their Program Experiences

We conducted descriptive analyses on the intern statewide surveys for 05/06 and 06/07 to determine how intern candidates generally evaluate the operations and outcomes of their intern programs. We used 06/07 statewide survey result as our primary source for ordering survey item responses, arranging related survey questions in order of intern responses, rather than in the order in which they are presented in the evaluation questionnaire. There were about 7,307 interns in the state of California in 2005-06. Of these, 5,001 responded to the statewide evaluation survey that year. In 2006-07 there were 8,170 intern candidates; 2,895 of them have responded to the 2007 survey.

As seen in Table 26, among the 10 reasons listed for the survey question asking why interns chose this route to teacher certification, interns selected being “able to teach while getting certified,” “fits my lifestyle,” and “link theory and practice” as the top three reasons for entering an intern program in the 2007 statewide survey. These three reasons were also the top three choices for intern candidates in the 2006 survey. This tells us that intern candidates not only want a program that will help them to earn a preliminary credential but enable them to have classroom experience while they are receiving either university or district intern program training.

| Table 26: Reasons for Choosing Intern Training |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern Reports of Reasons of Choosing Intern Program for Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Percentage of respondents marking each reason)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why did you choose an Intern program for your teacher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>preparation?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(N≥3,834)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b Able to teach while getting certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e Fits my lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1j School based--link theory and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f Length of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c Convenience of course scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d Guidance from site Support Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h Out of pocket cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a Go through the preparation program as a cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g Organization of the intern instructional program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1l Program links college faculty and schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys
As Table 27 indicates, in the 2007 statewide survey the top three reasons that interns chose to prepare for teaching careers were: “to work with young people”, “the value of education in society”, and “interest in subject-matter field”. The same order is also found in the 2006 statewide survey. Except for job security, financial items were much lower in reported importance, indicating that intern candidates care about education because of it social and interpersonal significance and the intrinsic significance of the subject matter being taught, rather than for its workload or remuneration.

Table 27: Intern Reasons for Entering Intern Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern Reports on Reasons for Entering a Teacher Preparation Program</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥3,591)</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥1,824)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a Desire to work with young people</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2n Value or significance of education in society</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i Interest in subject-matter field</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j Job security</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f Sense of freedom in my own classroom</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m Influence of a teacher in ele/sec school</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k Long summer vacation</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c Employment mobility</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b Want a change from other work</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e Family member was a teacher</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2o Preparation program appealed to me</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d Financial rewards</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l Never really considered anything else</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h Need a second income</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g Influence of a teacher/advisor in college</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

The third question of the intern statewide survey asks intern candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of their course work (see Table 28). In the 2007 survey “teaching strategies” were seen as the most effective of intern program course work, followed by “creating effective learning environment” and “supporting diversity to core curriculum”. The order was different in the 2006 statewide survey results. In that year intern candidates selected “assessing students” and “understanding child development” as the two most effective areas that their coursework had covered. While this shift in views is statistically significant at the .001 level, it is not entirely clear why this shift in attitudes occurred. It may have arisen because local intern programs significantly improved their instructional programs in the areas of teaching strategy.
and creating effective learning environments during the year between the surveys, or it could mean that the interns have become more sensitive to and interested in these issues causing them to see greater value and significance in this part of their programs.

Table 28: Intern Reports on the Effectiveness of their Coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did your instruction/coursework completed prior to entering the classroom as the teacher of record including the following? If Yes, please rate the effectiveness of the instruction. If No, please mark “Did not receive.”</th>
<th>2006 (N≥2,269)</th>
<th>2007 (N≥2,365)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pct Did not receive</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i Supporting equity, diversity and access to core curriculum</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3l Teaching strategies</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d Creating an effective learning environment</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m Understanding and using student academic content standards</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e Instructional planning and delivery</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g Reading and literacy strategies</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3k Teaching special population</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a Assessing student learning</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f Professional, legal, ethical aspects of teaching</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c Classroom management</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j Teaching English learners</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h Subject specific pedagogy</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b Child/adolescent development</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3n Using computer technology to support student learning</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3o Working with families</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

Educational specialist intern candidates were asked to evaluate some additional aspects of their coursework (see Table 29). For both years, education specialist intern candidates evaluated “positive behavior support” as the most effective outcome from the coursework. The other two items relating to skills needed to work with students: “assessment and instructional accommodations” and “disability specific content” got the next highest effectiveness ratings. Items dealing with the collaborative and interpersonal aspects of the work: “transitions and IEPs” and “collaborative and co-teaching strategies” fared less well. “Adaptive technology” got the lowest ratings in 2006, but data on this item was not available in the 2007 data file.
Table 29: Education Specialist Evaluations of Coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did your instruction/coursework completed prior to entering the classroom as the teacher of record including the following? If Yes, please rate the effectiveness of the instruction. If No, please mark &quot;Did not receive.&quot;</th>
<th>2006 (N ≥ 778)</th>
<th>2007 (N ≥ 750)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Did not receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r Positive behavioral support</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3t Assessment and instructional accommodations</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3q Disability specific content</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s Transition and IEPs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p Collaborative and co-teaching strategies</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3q Adaptive technology</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

The fourth question, reported in Table 30, asks whether intern candidates had field experience in their pre-service programs and what type of experience they had. There were 2,928 intern candidates in 2007 who reported pre-service field experience (note: N's reported in Table 30 refer to the minimum size of groups reporting on each type of field experience, not the total size of the groups reporting some field experiences). “Observation by supervisor (master teachers or coach)” was the most common field experience.

Table 30: Intern Reports on Field Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you have a field experience in your program, please indicate the types of experiences</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥1,165)</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥975)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a Did you have field experience</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Experience</th>
<th>Mean 06</th>
<th>Mean 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4c1 Observation</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c2 Whole class instruction</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c3 Planning instruction/designing lessons</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c5 Tutoring/teaching single or small groups</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c4 Assessing student learning</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c7 Other</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

There were 3,072 intern candidates who had pre-service experiences in 2006. They also reported that observation was the most common field experience. Taken together, these
observations indicate that only about two-thirds of the interns had field experiences, and that between 74% and 92% of those with field experiences had one or more of each of the types of field experiences listed in this part of the survey.

The next question (Table 31) addresses the question of who was likely to provide intern candidates with support and supervision during their pre-service experiences. About seven in ten of the interns reported being supported/supervised by a “program/university supervisor” and/or a “master teacher”. A site based support provider was next most frequent source of support and supervision, with less than half the interns reporting contact with other potential support providers.

Table 31: Intern Reports on Pre-service Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥1,704)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥1,492)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a Program/University supervisor</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d Master teacher</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c Site support provider</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e Other site/district personnel</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b Start up coach</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f Other program/university personnel</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

As reported in Table 32, interns who responded to survey question 6 about whether the pre-service experience prepared them for their first day were quite ambivalent about how successfully their pre-service experiences really were. Interns rated their experiences as only modestly above the mid-point of 2.50 on the 4 point rating scale. They rated these experiences at 2.70 in 2007 and a little better at 2.77 in 2006. The 0.90 standard deviation for this question is fairly large, indicating that a significant minority of the interns surveyed did not feel adequately prepared for their first day.
When asked about the frequency of communication with site-based and program support providers, interns reported substantially more frequent communication with their local site support person (see Table 33). On average, they reported meeting with the site-based support providers nearly once a week, but with the university or program-based supervisor meetings were less than twice a month. The interns surveyed in 2006 reported less frequent meetings with support providers and supervisors. And, again, they reported meeting with their local district support providers nearly twice as often as with supervisors. The reported frequencies covered not only in-person meetings, but telephone, email or other types of communications.

It is not obvious from this table, but the multivariate analysis presented later will show that the frequency and duration of these meetings is of vital importance in the overall success of an intern program.

Table 33: Intern Communication with Site Support Provider and University Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often did you communicate with your site SP and Univ/Prog Supervisor about issues related to your teaching practice?</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥4836)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥2,854)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a1 Communication with site support provider</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a2 Communication with Univ/Prog supervisor</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

Table 34 reports the average length of communications with site support providers and intern program supervisors. In 2007 the interns reported meeting, on average, for nearly an hour at a time with the local support provider, and slightly more than 30 minutes with program based supervisors. The average amount of time spent was significantly less in the 2006 survey reports, with local support providers only a bit over 30 minutes per meeting and the program supervisors averaging almost exactly 30 minutes. These time periods would probably be
enough for serious one-on-one support, but there is no testimony in the data about how much of this time was spent in group work.

Table 34: Length of Intern Meetings with Support Providers and Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern Reports on the Length of their communication with their Site SP and Univ/Prog</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Means on a 1 to 4 scale: 1=15 minutes, 2=30 minutes, 3=60 minutes, 4=90 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Average, how long did you meet or communicate with your site SP and Univ/Prog Supervisor?</td>
<td>Mean 06 (N≥4,791)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b1 Length of meetings with support provider</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b2 Length of meetings with Univ/Prog supervisor</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

One question asked only in 2007 concerns the type of support provider interns get to work with. As shown in Table 35 more than 60% of the interns have Full-time teachers as their support providers. Some programs are hiring retired teachers or administrators and about one in nine interns relies for support on full-time released teachers.

Table 35: Release Time for Intern Support Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern Reports on their Site Support Provider Release Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is/are your site support provider(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired teacher/admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

Table 36 reports the quality of matching between site support providers and their interns on four dimensions: school site, knowledge of children the intern is serving, subject area and grade level. Overall, the matching is quite good as the interns report that they are, on average, at least “fairly well matched” on all four criteria. Location and knowledge of the children are significantly more often well matched than on subject and grade level. There are modest changes toward better matching in the 2007 data. Although there were occasional complaints
heard in the case study sites about access to support providers, interns are most likely to report that they are at the same or a nearby school, and that match has improved in the last year.

Table 36: Intern Matching with Support Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well matched are you with your Site SP in terms of</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥4,823)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥2,877)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8d match by geographic school sites</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c match by SP’s knowledge</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b match by subject</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a match by grade</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

Intern candidates were asked to identify the most important characteristic in being matched with a site support provider (see Table 37). Frequency analysis of survey data from both the 2006 and the 2007 surveys report a very strong preference for “Subject matter knowledge” and “Student population knowledge” as the primary considerations in making these matches work. More than 40% of is the most important characteristic that intern candidates have reported in both 0506 (43.28%) and 0607 (40.80%) statewide survey results. The second most important criteria is whether a site SP is knowledgeable about “student population” (38.04% in 0506; 35.27% in 0607). Match by the “grade level” (11.62% in 0506; 11.05% in 0607) or the “geographic proximity” (7.06% in 0506; 7.13% in 0607) are not the most important characteristic to the Intern candidates in a site support provider match. This tells us that Intern candidates prefer their site support providers know not only the subject matter but also know how to handle student issues.
When asked about the adequacy of time spent with their support providers and supervisors, interns provide a generally positive review (see Table 36). In both years, and for both types of support staff, intern candidates reported that meeting with their site support provider was above “adequate” on the four point scale used to record their responses. In the aggregate, interns felt that the meetings with local support providers were superior to those with program based supervisors.

The data in Table 39 summarize intern responses to a question about whether support services were available in a timely fashion. On the whole, the interns report that support was offered in a “timely” manner – a 3.0 on the 4-point scale. The report of timely support was highest for work with the locally assigned support provider (Mean = 3.28). There was a significantly lower level of reported timeliness for work with other teachers and for the classes and seminars, but

---

**Table 37: Most Important Intern/Support Provider Matching Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following characteristics above is the most important to you in site support provider match?</th>
<th>Frequency 06</th>
<th>Percent of the Response</th>
<th>Frequency 07</th>
<th>Percent of the Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8e2 Subject matter knowledge</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8e3 Student population knowledge</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8e1 Grade level</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8e4 Geographic proximity</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8e5 Other (asked in 2007 only)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response:-</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

**Table 38: Adequacy of Intern Meetings with Support Providers and Supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the context of all the demands on your time, was the meeting time with your site SP and univ/Prog supervisor adequate to meet your needs for support?</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥4,782)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥2,855)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9a Meeting time with site support provider adequate</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b Meeting time with Univ/Prog Supervisor adequate</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys
even here there is a positive tone in the responses. As with many other items, however, there are substantial standard deviations (ranging from 0.82 to 0.91) indicating that a substantial minority of the interns did not share the prevailing positive take on this question of timeliness.

Table 39: Timeliness of Intern Formal and Informal Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how often were the following types of formal and informal support offered timely in meeting your needs?</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥4,809)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥2,779)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10a Work with site support provider</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b Work with university supervisor</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d Work with other teachers</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c Classes, course seminars</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The 2007 survey erroneously labeled the response scale “not at all matched” to “well matched”

As reported on Table 40, the interns evaluated the relative usefulness of the support they received in ten different areas. Interns reported that “onsite observation” was the most useful support 2007 statewide survey results. In 2006 they reported that informal support from “the teacher down the hall” was somewhat more useful (Mean=3.31), but this item was not included in the most recent survey. Of the items appearing in both survey years, there were some differences in the rank ordering, but interns in both years agreed that on site observation was the most useful. Support provided by program coordinators, specialists, program alums and online one-on-one support were clustered closely behind the top item by those interns who evaluated these items. In general, the reported overall value of all items rose a bit in the 2007 survey. It is important to note, however, that many interns reported not receiving most of the services listed, and thus could not have felt them to be effective.
In Table 41 the overall effectiveness of intern instruction and coursework services are summarized. Intern candidates report that “applying effective teaching strategies” and “creating an effective learning environment” (with mean ratings of 3.02 and 3.06, approximately equal to the third point on the evaluation scale, labeled “effective”) were the most effective of the intern programs’ coursework. Overall, the interns in 2006 gave a pattern of responses to this set of items similar to that provided by the 2007 survey respondents. Consistently the items related to working with families, computer technology and child and adolescent development ranked toward the bottom of the list. Intern reports that some topics were not covered in their coursework parallels their assessment of effectiveness. The top rated nine items in both years were reported to be missing from coursework by less than five percent of the interns.

Table 40: Usefulness of Various Types of Intern Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>2006 (N=795)</th>
<th>2007 (N=1,566)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pct Did not receive</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a Onsite observation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h Program coordinator</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11f Support from alum</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e Specialists support</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c Online one-on-one support</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d Phone support</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b Cohort support seminars</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11i Nonclassroom support</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d (06 item order) Chat room support</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h (06 item order) Informal Support</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions not asked in 2007

Source: Intern Annual Surveys
Educational specialist interns were asked to report on the effectiveness of some additional program components that did not affect general education single and multiple subject credential seekers. Their responses are summarized on Table 42. They reported that “Positive behavioral support” and “Assessment and instructional accommodations” were the two areas with the highest effectiveness, on a par with the top items in evaluated by all interns. Items for this group were ranked in the same order in both the 2006 and 2007 surveys. Except for the “Adaptive Technology” item that was dropped from the 2007 survey, only a few interns reported not receiving these specialist coursework experiences.

# Table 41: Effectiveness of Intern Coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the instruction/coursework you completed during the time you were in the classroom as the teacher of record include the following? If Yes, please rate the effectiveness of the coursework. If No, please mark “Did not receive.”</th>
<th>2006 (N≥2,579)</th>
<th>2007 (N≥2,346)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pct Did not receive</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a Applying effective teaching strategies</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e Creating an effective learning environment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12j Supporting equity and diversity to core curriculum</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f Instructional planning and delivery</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b Assessing student learning progress</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12h Reading and literacy strategies</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12l Teaching special populations</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12m Understanding and using standards and frameworks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d Classroom management</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12k Teaching English learner</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12g Professional aspects of teaching</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12i Subject specific pedagogy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c Child/adolescent development</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12n Using computer technology</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12o Working with families</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys
Table 42: Effectiveness of Support for Education Specialist Interns

Completing Educ Specialist Interns Report on the Effectiveness of Coursework

(Mean on a 1 to 4 scale from "Not Effective" to Very Effective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the instruction/coursework you completed during the time you were in the classroom as the teacher of record include the following? If Yes, please rate the effectiveness of the coursework. If No, please mark &quot;Did not receive.&quot;</th>
<th>2006 (N ≥ 491)</th>
<th>2007 (N ≥ 805)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pct Did not receive</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12s Positive behavioral support</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12p Assessment and instructional accommodations</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12t Transition and IEP’s</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12r Disability specific content</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*12q Collaborative and coteaching strategies</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12q Adaptive technology</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 12q in 2007, next response labeled 12q in 2006

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

Table 43 reports the interns overall judgments regarding how helpful their intern program was in preparing them for various aspects of their teaching responsibilities. “Improving teaching knowledge and skills”) and “plan/deliver instruction” were the most helpful aspects of the internship training. In 2007, eleven of the fifteen items in this survey question were ranked in helpfulness about 3.00 on the 4-point scale. Rankings were generally a bit lower by the 2006 survey respondents indicating that there has been some growth in the ability of the intern programs to provide helpful coursework. Two items – using technology and working with families – had scores low enough to suggest that these topics are probably under-represented in the typical intern curriculum.
Table 43: Helpfulness of Intern Program for Teaching Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent your Intern program helped you?</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥4,874)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥2,844)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13a Improve teaching knowledge and skills</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b Plan and delivery instruction</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c Create a supportive environment for student learning</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13d Address equity and diversity in your teaching</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13e Meet your students' differing needs</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13f Manage classroom behavior</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13g Improve ability to use standards-based assessment</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13h Understand performance levels for students</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13i Improve student achievement</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13j Teaching special student populations</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13k Provide subject specific instruction</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13l Analyze student work</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13m Teaching English learners</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13n Using technology</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13o Work with families of students</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

Table 44 shows how confident interns are that they will continue to work in public education. Overall, they were quite confident that they would remain in the teaching profession, but were substantially less confident that they would remain in the same district or school. Indeed, the respondents to the 2007 survey were more confident that they would end up in an educational leadership position than that they would remain in the same school. At a mean of 2.48, the probability of remaining in the school is only about 50/50. Responses in 2006 closely parallel those of 2007.

Table 44: Intern Confidence that They will Continue Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In 5 years, how confident you will be:</th>
<th>Mean 06 (N≥4,923)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean 07 (N≥2,911)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14a In the teaching profession</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b In the same district</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14d In Other educ. leadership position</td>
<td>Not asked 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c In the same school</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys
A frequency tabulation of the interns plans for remaining in teaching is presented in Table 45. About three out of every five interns (62.3%) report planning to teach for fifteen or more years. If the 2006 response “As long as I am able” is combined with the commitment to fifteen or more years given that year, we see a commitment of more than seven in ten interns (71.7%) to long term teaching careers. Previous research literature tells us that commitment to teaching careers is a reasonably strong indicator that individuals will actually continue to work in this occupation.

Table 45: Intern Commitment to a Teaching Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 How long do you plan to stay in teaching?</th>
<th>Frequency 06</th>
<th>Percent of those Responding</th>
<th>Frequency 07</th>
<th>Percent of those Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 Yrs</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 Yrs</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Yrs</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ Yrs</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Long as able</td>
<td>2419</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>Not asked in 2007</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>787</td>
<td></td>
<td>567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The item was dropped in 2006-07 Statewide Survey

Frequency summaries for whether interns are likely to recommend their intern program to others are reported in Table 46. More than three-quarters of the interns gave a definite yes answer to this question. An additional 16 to 18 percent indicated that they would “maybe” recommend the intern program. Only five or six percent indicated that they would not recommend this program.
Table 46: Intern Willingness to Recommend Internship Program to Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 Would you recommend this program?</th>
<th>Frequency 06</th>
<th>Percent of those Responding</th>
<th>Frequency 07</th>
<th>Percent of those Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3640</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>2284</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

Table 47 reports on information gathered only on the 2006 survey which asked the interns about their teaching preferences in three domains: socio-economic status, academic performance levels and proportion of children who are English language learners. A substantial portion of the interns declined to answer this question (from 37% on the SES question to 58% on the API question). Of those reporting, 38.7% reported a preference for teaching low SES schools and only 10.5% preferring High SES classrooms.

When asked about school level API preferences, 28.5% of the interns who responded reported that they would choose schools which are in low performing, Deciles 1-3 schools. A nearly identical number reported a preference for high performing, Deciles 7-10 schools. On the question of working with English learners, interns responding to the question were about evenly divided with more than 20% opting for each degree of ELL concentration. The large number of non-respondents indicates that the question of what type of student population the interns want to work with is either of low importance or they are reluctant to report preferences that might not be “politically correct” for a program created specifically to help find high quality teachers for hard to staff schools.
Table 47: Intern Preference for School SES, API and ELL Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern reports on their Preference of school's SES</th>
<th>Percent of those Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17a Type of SES school you would choose?</td>
<td>Frequency 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>1224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid SES</td>
<td>1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern reports on their Preference of school's API</th>
<th>Percent of those Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 1-3</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 4-6</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 7-10</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern reports on their Preference of school's ELL population</th>
<th>Percent of those Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10%</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 30%</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 50%</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50%</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: These questions were dropped in the 2007 Statewide Survey*

Source: Intern Annual Surveys

A Structural Model of Intern Program Operations

Multivariate statistical analysis enables us to interpret the dynamics of the Intern program operations and outcomes. The same overall strategy used in our analysis of how successful BTSA programs operate is followed here. The 2005/05 survey data collected from participants in the intern program is modeled in four different ways in Figure 27 through Figure 30. The first structural model displays how intern program success is produced for the modal intern candidate in the typical intern program. A few notes on how to read the diagram depicted in Figure 27: A Structural Equation Model Outlining Core Elements in Intern Program Success are in order. First, note that the three indicators of how adequately this model represents the survey data (GFI = .975, CFI = .961, and RMSEA = .046) all indicate that this model is robust and a highly reliable depiction of how intern programs produce success in the eyes of their candidates.
Figure 27: A Structural Equation Model Outlining Core Elements in Intern Program Success

The overall pattern of intern program operations is represented by the variables that appear in the large circles/ovals on the diagram. These variables represent combinations of the responses intern participants made to several groups of questions on the survey itself. The large oval toward the left of the diagram labeled “SP Match” summarizes the extent to which Participating Teachers and their Support Providers are well matched on location, subject matter, grade level, and shared knowledge of the students in the intern’s classroom. The SP Match variable calculates a weighted sum of the combined responses of interns to the survey questions asking them, “are you matched with your assigned site support provider(s) in terms of a) Grade level (the rectangle labeled “Grade” on the diagram), b) your subject matter (the rectangle labeled “Subj” on the diagram), c) Geographic proximity (the rectangle labeled “Locat” on the diagram) and, d) Knowledge regarding the students the intern is teaching (the rectangle labeled “Know” on the diagram). Notice that these four questions are all substantially accounted for by the SP Match variable (coefficients range from .63 to .80 and all have the highest level of statistical significance (p-values = .000).
Up and to the right of the SP Match oval is one labeled “SP Meets.” This variable is the weighted sum of intern responses to question regarding how frequently they meet with district or school level support providers (the rectangle labeled “SP Freq”), and how long these meetings typically last (the rectangle labeled “SP Len”). More frequent and longer meetings will be reflected in higher scores on this variable.

To the right of the SP Meets oval is one labeled “U Meets.” This variable parallels the SP Meets variable. It is the weighted sum of intern responses to the two questions regarding how frequently interns meet with university based support providers (labeled “U Freq”), and how long these meetings typically last (labeled “Univ Len” on the diagram).

Further to the right in Figure 1 is a circle labeled “Supports.” This variable is composed of a weighted sum of intern responses to a number of survey questions inquiring of them whether the received “Adequate,” “Timely,” and “Useful” support as a result of their participation in the intern program.

Finally, there is an oval below the Supports variable labeled “Success.” This is composed of a weighted sum of responses to four sets of survey questions. The first asked whether the interns were confident that they would continue to teach in their current district, school and classroom (labeled “Confidence” in the diagram). A second cluster of questions asked whether the interns had found a variety of support activities to be helpful in their professional development (labeled “Helpfulness”). The component of Success was the response to a question regarding whether the interns were committed to continuing in a teaching career (coded 1 for interns committed to 10 or more years, 0 otherwise). Finally, intern program success reflects the interns’ responses to the question of whether they would recommend their program to other (coded “no,” “maybe,” and “yes”).

The arrows connecting these five factors (SP Match, SP Meets, U Meets, Supports and Success) show how the intern programs typically generate successful training experiences for the intern credential candidates. The two arrows originating in SP Match pointing toward SP Meets and U Meets show that close matching of the candidates with their support providers has a strong positive effect (coefficient = .74, p = .000) on the frequency and duration of meetings with their school district support providers (SP Meets). Close matching with support providers tends, however, to reduce the frequency and duration of meetings with university based support providers (coefficient = -.18, p = .000). Apparently close matching allows the interns to rely much more on their district based support providers. Note, however, where interns have frequent and lengthy meetings with their district support providers they also tend to get more
time with their university supporters (coefficient = .58, p = .000). Since this indirect link to increased interaction with university support providers is much stronger than the direct effect of the -.18 link from the SP Match factor, the overall effect of close matching is to raise the level of interaction with both district and university support providers, but to increase interaction with university support providers it is apparently necessary to first assure that interns are securing more interaction with their district support staff.

All three of the matching and support provider interaction variables have a substantial impact on the interns’ beliefs that their support system is providing Adequate, Timely and Useful support as they learn professional teaching skills and abilities. The three matching and interaction variables make nearly equal contributions to a positive support system (the coefficient from U Meets to Supports has a weight of .32, from SP Match the coefficient is .30, and from the SP Meets variable the coefficient is .29 (all p-values = .000). Thus, matching interns with their support providers makes a direct contribution to their appreciation of the quality of the support system, independent of the frequency and duration of meetings with district and university support providers. However, variations in the amount of interaction with school and university support providers accounts for two-thirds of the explained variations in intern appreciation of the support system.

Finally, we note that the quality of the support system has a dramatic impact on the interns’ belief that the program has been successful in helping them learn to teach, to make a career commitment to teaching and to be willing to recommend the program to others. The coefficient of the arrow from Supports to Success is .74 (p = .000), meaning that the quality of the support system accounts for more than half of all variation in the interns’ belief that the program has been successful.

It is important to note that some lines of connection are not needed in Figure 27. There are no direct links between matching interns with their support providers and the level of program success. And there are no direct links between either of the intern/support provider interaction intensity variables (SP Meets and U Meets) and the level of program success. The lack of significant linkages here mean that interns perceive the program to be successful only if they find the support system to provide them with adequate, timely and useful assistance. Just having warm social relationships with the support providers, regardless of who they are, is not sufficient – they need to get substantial and timely assistance with learning to teach.

Figure 28, Figure 29 and Figure 30 add some useful detail to the strong overall picture presented in Figure 27: A Structural Equation Model Outlining Core Elements in Intern Program Success. In Figure 28 we have incorporated some key demographic variables into the model to
see whether the intern programs work differently for interns drawn from differing age, gender and ethnic groups. As with Figure 27, this structural equation model is a very reliable fit to the intern survey and consent form data (GFI = .973, CFI = .951, RMSEA = .040). In order to understand the role of these demographic variables, it was necessary to include whether or not interns were enrolled in a program preparing them for an Education Specialist credential (labeled “Ed Sp” on the diagram). As indicated on the diagram, Education Specialist credential candidates are significantly more likely to be drawn from an older age group (coefficient = .22, p = .000). The Education Specialists are also less likely to be female (coef = -.12, p = .000) and less likely to be members of a Latino ethnic group (coef = -.06, p = .000).

There are two important ways in which the Education Specialist candidates report significant differences from interns in other credential programs. First, the Ed Specialists are quite a bit less likely to interact intensively with university based support providers (coef = -.12, p = .000). Second, the Ed Specialists are more likely to believe that their training program has been a success (coef = .06, p = .000).

In addition to probably feeling more successful because they are in the Ed Specialist program, the older candidates are more likely to report a successful experience in the intern program, regardless of which credential they are pursuing (direct path coeff = .06, p = .000).

The only important consequence of being a female candidate is the reduced likelihood of enrolling in an Ed Specialist credential program. Otherwise, successful intern experiences for males and females follow the basic pattern outlined in Figure 27.
The three ethnic groups with significant variations in their program experiences all report significant differences in the level of experienced program success. Caucasians (White) report a reduced level of program success (coef = -.05, p = .000). African American (Afro) and Latino candidates report more successful program participation (Latino coef = .12, p = .000; Afro coef = .05, p = .000).

Two of the three ethnic groups also report higher levels of success in becoming matched with support providers. Both groups report that their matching is closer than that reported by the “Other” and “Declined to State” ethnic groups not shown on the diagram. (The African Americans report a non-significant improvement in matching compared with the ethnic groups not shown). Caucasian (White) candidates report the best matching (coef = .10, p = .000). Latinos are next with a positive (i.e. above the average intern) coefficient of .09 (p = .000).
In sum, age, gender and ethnicity have modest but significant effects on intern program success. Most of the effects of these demographic variables are mediated by their impact on enrollment in Ed Specialist credential programs, however. The effects of demographic difference are generally positive for non-Whites and for older credential candidates. Except for the tendency for females to be less well represented in the Ed Specialist credential training, however, the intern programs appear to be working about equally well for men and women.

Figure 29 explores how prior career experience influences successful participation in intern certification training programs. Here again it is important to distinguish Ed Specialists from other credential candidates, and to include age as an important variable.

**Figure 29: Structural Model Showing the Influence of Prior Career Variables**

Note 1: All marked paths have statistical significance p-values < .01
Note 2: Small circles labels starting with "e" are error terms and generally do not add materially to the interpretation of the structural equation model.
Three careers have the clearest influence on intern candidates: a) having some sort of business or industry experience (labeled “Busi” in Figure 3), b) having just graduated from college before entering the profession (labeled “Coll” in Figure 3), and c) having experience as a public school paraprofessional, substitute teacher, emergency credential holder or holding some other instructional staff position (labeled “ParaP” in the figure).

As noted in Figure 2, older interns are somewhat more likely to feel well supported, and to be seeking Ed Specialist certification. And the Ed Specialist credential candidates remain, in this model, less likely to have intense interactions with university based support providers, and slightly more likely to feel that their intern experience has been an overall success.

Naturally, the interns who are entering this program directly from college are also significantly younger than those from those making career transitions, while business and industry career changers are significantly older than others. As expected, there are significant negative links among the career options – business and industry transition interns are not likely to also have been paraprofessionals or to declare their recent career to have been in college. And paraprofessionals are not likely to be just coming out of college when entering the intern program.

Of more substantive significance, recent college graduates entering the intern program are less likely to be seeking Ed Specialist credentials and are somewhat less likely to feel that their intern experience has been completely successful. Paraprofessionals are significantly more likely than others to be seeking Ed Specialist credentials (business and industry career changers, like recent college graduates are less likely to be pursuing this credential).

Figure 30 shows the extent to which graduates from California’s different university systems experience their intern program participation differently. The most important point to be garnered from this model is that the influence of graduating from University of California, California State University system or from a private college or university has relatively little influence on the intern experience. University of California graduates are a bit less likely to seek Education Specialist credentials. Graduates from the California State University system are a bit more likely than others to feel that they have been fully supported during their intern experience. Otherwise, the intern program appears to work quite similarly for intern candidates regardless of where they took their undergraduate training.
Figure 30: Structural Model Showing the Influence of University Degree Variable

![Structural Model Diagram](image)

Note 1: All marked paths have statistical significance p-values < .01
Note 2: Small circles labels starting with “e” are error terms and generally do not add materially to the interpretation of the structural equation model.

Figure 31 examines the extent to which reporting different reasons for choosing to pursue certification through an intern program rather than other pre-service training program influences a candidate’s intern experience. Of the ten possible reasons for choosing the intern program offered in the intern survey, three had the most influence on the intern experiences of those who identified these reasons as important factors. These three reasons are: 1) the “Organization of the intern instructional program” (labeled “Org” in Figure 5), 2) that the internship is a, “School based program (linking theory and practice)” (labeled “Theory” in the figure), and 3) that there is “Convenience of course scheduling” (labeled “Conven”).

As shown in the figure, interns checking any or all of these three reasons for choosing to become intern candidates tended to believe that the program is more consistently successful. Those who selected the school-based theory-to-practice reason also reported significantly stronger interactions with their school based Support Providers. The interns who identified the organization of the intern instructional program as an important reason for choosing this road
to certification reported more positive experiences throughout their intern program. In addition to feeling that their overall intern experience was more successful, they felt better matched with their support providers, more likely to be actively engaged with university based support providers and more likely to feel that they were fully supported by the intern program.

Figure 31: Structural Model Showing the Influence of Reasons for Interning

Figure 32 examines the impact of program spending on the overall operation structural equation model that accounts for typical program operations. The variable on this figure labeled “Dollars/Tch” represents the direct per intern teacher expenditures reported by each program. Since the basic state allocations are constant at $2,500 per intern, there are only two important sources of variation in the per teacher expenditure variable examined here: 1) whether or not the intern is in an enhanced internship program and thus supported by an additional $1,000 per intern and 2) the amount of in-kind or direct cash subsidy provided by local districts. As shown in Figure 32, increasing expenditures have four moderating impacts on intern experiences. The strongest relationship is a reduction in the amount of interaction with
university based support providers (“U Meets”, with a negative coefficient of -0.12, p = .000). Apparently programs that put more resources into the training of interns tend to rely more on district support providers. There is a second modest, but reliable, negative outcome of increased expenditure – interns in the better resourced programs report a somewhat reduced level of matching with support providers with regard to grade, location, subject matter or knowledge of children.

Figure 32: Structural Model Showing the Influence of Financial Support

On the positive side, intern programs with greater per teacher expenditures report a small but statistically reliable increase in overall program success, and also report a significant improvement in the level of interaction between interns and local program support providers.

In sum, there is a very powerful common thread defining the route to success in intern programs. The flow runs from close matching of support providers with their interns to frequent and extended interactions with local support providers and university supervisors.
The matching and interaction variables play a major role in determining whether interns will find the support system to offer adequate, timely and useful support for learning to teach. And only if the support system is robust, timely and helpful do the interns report that their program experiences have been successful. Success is defined in this analysis as leading interns to believe that the intern program has helped them learn to teach and to meet core program standards, to be confident in and committed to a teaching career and to be willing to recommend the intern program to others.

Accounting for Variations among Intern Programs

We turn next to examining how and why, in the course of our eleven local intern program case studies, we found the intern programs to differ fairly dramatically from one another. We became convinced that the best way to account for the program differences was to recognize that, from a theoretical perspective, alternative teacher preparation programs like the California Intern program are appropriately seen as creating a regulated and subsidized market for the development and delivery of professional teacher training services. Subsidies are offered by the State in an attempt to overcome what would otherwise be two market failures: 1) a failure of the State’s pre-service training providers (primarily public and private colleges and universities) to attract and prepare teachers in sufficient quantity and with the appropriate skills to serve the needs of the public school system, and 2) the failure of the teaching labor market to sustain teacher motivation and commitment resulting in a high rate of teacher attrition. The provided subsidy ($2,500 to $3,500 per Intern teacher in state funds which are used to leverage an additional $2,500 in in-kind support from local education agencies) is believed by state policy makers to be a sufficiently powerful market influence that grants of money can be accompanied by reasonably strong state regulations regarding who should be trained and how they should be trained.

By stimulating the development of 72 different local training agencies -- each fiscally managed by a sponsoring public school agency (local district, county office of education) -- the state has established a nominally competitive market structure among the local intern training programs and an even more competitive market within and between these new programs and the traditional college and university pre-service programs that up to about 1980 largely controlled teacher training and certification.

When local program sponsors enter the subsidized and regulated market for teacher preparation services created by adoption and funding of the California intern program, they must answer two fundamental questions: 1) to what extent should the service (teacher preparation) be redefined and restructured, and 2) should marketing alternative certification programs be directed primarily toward the school districts needing staff or toward the intern
candidates seeking entry to the occupation. Data from our qualitative case studies demonstrate that program sponsors answer these questions in very different ways. In particular, some local programs give primary emphasis to redefining pre-service training, while others concentrate on developing new marketing strategies, and some devote substantial attention to doing both. Table 48 provides a few details of how these different responses idealize different intern program designs.

Table 48: Alternative Approaches to the Development and Marketing of Intern Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redefine the nature of pre-service teaching?</th>
<th>Teacher Employers</th>
<th>Intern Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, the issue is efficiently producing more teachers to meet pressing needs</td>
<td>&gt;Integrate interns into existing pre-service programs &lt;br&gt;&gt;use established courses&lt;br&gt;&gt;keep down costs&lt;br&gt;&gt;work with districts to produce NCLB “highly qualified” teachers</td>
<td>&gt;Integrate interns into existing pre-service programs &lt;br&gt;&gt;use established courses&lt;br&gt;&gt;keep down costs&lt;br&gt;&gt;work with districts to produce NCLB “highly qualified” teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, this is an opportunity to change the whole culture of preparation</td>
<td>&gt;Professionalization of training &lt;br&gt;&gt;move away from universities toward LEAs&lt;br&gt;&gt;use professional rather than academic trainers&lt;br&gt;&gt;market to district administrators as controlled, targeted preparation&lt;br&gt;&gt;Market as responsible ‘professionalism’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on marketing to:</th>
<th>Type A</th>
<th>Type B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intern Candidates</td>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>Type D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;diversify operations &lt;br&gt;&gt;create multiple training locations&lt;br&gt;&gt;use on-line instructional options&lt;br&gt;&gt;market to candidates on cost and convenience</td>
<td>&gt;Intensify training in both content and time&lt;br&gt;&gt;Interning is student teaching on steroids&lt;br&gt;&gt;focus on critical subject areas&lt;br&gt;&gt;insist on pre-training and resist last minute enrollment&lt;br&gt;&gt;market as highest quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally Type A programs are well represented among the CSU campuses. They tend to emphasize using their traditional pre-service courses and supervision system, together with a declaration that they are “market driven” responses to district staffing needs. Type D: is illustrated by one program with restrictive enrollment, limited aim of providing science, math and English single subject preparation and insistence on substantial pre-program preparation.
Type C: tend to be private and entrepreneurial programs that emphasize multiple, convenient locations and direct candidate recruitment efforts.

Type B: tends to be found in single district and county office of education programs where training is undertaken primarily by experienced teachers and not by university faculty, where emphasis is placed on working with districts and on keeping close to issues of professional practice rather than theoretical concept development.

Employers want teachers who can be hired immediately and managed effectively. Some seek moderate quality and immediate, low cost, availability. Others seek professionally oriented, more manageable teachers. In short, focusing on the employers means responding positively to the “new managerialism” approach to organizational productivity.

Some candidates want low cost, convenient, low effort training. These teachers are being prepared to fit into the managed educational service delivery associated with the “deskilling” idea of a reduced professionalism in teaching. Others are willing to make substantial commitment of effort and resources if they believe that the training is of especially high quality guaranteeing them professional success. This approach means focusing on the development of a new professionalism in the schools.

Exploring the Retention of Intern Graduates in the Teaching Workforce

As with the BTSA program, one important reason for creating and sustaining the intern program was to improve the willingness and ability of teachers, once credentialed, to remain in the profession and to continue to work in schools serving challenging students. For this reason, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing has asked intern programs to maintain records of whether their graduates are continuing to serve as classroom teachers. As noted in our discussion of BTSA program impact on teacher retention, the best method for systematic tracking would be through the California Basic Education Data System’s Professional Assignment Information File (CBEDS/PAIF). As noted, however, CBEDS lacks the capacity to provide longitudinal tracking of individual teachers. Until the planned new teacher identification and tracking data base is created, we will need to rely on data collected by program directors and on a sample of identified CBEDS data provided by a few school districts. As with the BTSA program our teacher retention findings regarding intern retention must be viewed as tentative rather than definitive.

Because local intern programs have limited resources for tracking the careers of their graduates, a substantial number of program graduates are listed as status “unknown.” If these missing cases are primarily teachers working in other California school districts that those
served by their intern program, or if they are teaching in other states or nations, the data reported her could be substantially under estimating the actual teacher retention rate.

The graph lines on Figure 33 depict the retention of intern graduates over several six-year periods from 1993 through 2005. The dashed line labeled “Average” on this graph is the average retention rate across all available records. One thing to notice about the multiple six-year period graphs is that those from cohorts that participated in intern programs since 1998 have significantly higher long-term retentions than those who got their credentials in earlier years.

Figure 33: Intern Graduate Retention Rates as Reported by Intern Programs
Exploring the Links between Interns and Student Achievement

This section investigates through the use of data provided by a large school district in California two research questions pertaining to the Intern program.

The first question examines whether intern teachers are placed in more challenging schools than non-intern teachers. Challenging schools are characterized by being low performing and having large numbers of minority students, students who are not proficient in the English language, special education students and low SES students. The second research question examines the relationship between intern teachers and student academic performance on the 2005-2006 California Standards Test (CST). Although the primary focus is to measure the relationship between the type of teacher (intern vs. non-intern) and academic performance we are also interested in understanding other factors that might be related to students’ test performance such as teacher characteristics, and student characteristics and their involvement in school and the education process. These factors, as well as student CST scores in 2004-2005, are also used as statistical controls to isolate the contribution to learning offered by teacher type (intern vs. non-intern). For example, by controlling for the students’ prior year scores, we can better establish the value added by the type of teachers students are assigned to within the current year and reduce the influence of performance that is based simply on the child’s ability level relative to others at the beginning of that year.

Students at different school levels experience different school structures, processes, and mechanisms. As a result, we decided to use elementary school students in both our analyses. The advantage of focusing the analyses on the elementary level is that students tend to have self-contained classrooms and thus it would be more appropriate to isolate teacher effects. For both analyses we included students enrolled in grades 3 through 5 in SY05. Students at earlier grade levels were not tested in SY04. Finally, for the academic achievement analysis we only included a sub sample of elementary schools that have both intern and non-intern teachers to further control for school conditions that might impact student outcomes.

Since the data analyzed represent only one school district, generalizing the results is inappropriate. However, our analyses highlight certain factors that are worth investigating in-depth if we had access to data from more than one school district in California. A major challenge that we faced, and are still facing, is having districts agree to release unidentified longitudinal data on their schools, teachers and student so we can provide definitive answers to the questions that the state policymakers are posing. Although our results should not be applied to other settings, an important aspect of our analyses is illustrating the method that can
be utilized to analyze the two research questions. The next section describes the models we used.

**Model**

To answer the first question – whether interns are placed in challenging schools – we used a logistic regression model. Logistic regression is a regression procedure for binomially distributed response/dependent variables. It is useful for modeling the probability of an event occurring as a function of other factors. In our study we estimated the probability to which students are assigned to intern teachers (vs. non-intern teachers) based on their intakes and prior academic experience.

To answer the second question – examining the association between the type of teachers and students’ attainment in math and English – was addressed using multiple regression model. This procedure provides regression analysis by one or more factors and/or interval variables. The factor variables divide the population into groups. Using this procedure, it is possible to test null hypotheses concerning the effects of other variables on the means of various groupings of a single dependent variable. This procedure assumes that the data are a random sample from a normal population and that in the population, all cell variances are the same. A test of the normality and the homogeneity of variance assumption have shown that these assumptions have not fully been met.

Since students are nested within schools we used a clustering procedure to account for variations at both the student and school levels to correct the standard errors resulting from the lack of independence of test scores of children within the same school.

**Indicators included in the analysis**

In predicting the assignment of interns, eight variables are entered into the logistic regression.

- Student academic achievement in 2004-2005
- Student ethnicity (White, Hispanic, African-American, Asian, Native American)
- Student grade level 05 (grades 3 -5)
- Student gender (Male Female)
- Student poverty level (Free Reduced lunch)
- Student special education status
- Student GATE status
- Student English language proficiency (English only, English Learner, Fully English Proficient)
In predicting student achievement in math and English, eleven variables are entered into the multiple regression variables.

- Student academic achievement in 2004-2005 in math and English
- Student ethnicity (White, Hispanic, African-American, Asian, Native American)
- Student grade level 05 (grades 3-5)
- Student gender (Male Female)
- Student poverty level (Free Reduced lunch)
- Student special education status
- Student GATE status
- Student English language proficiency (English only, English Learner, Fully English Proficient)
- Number of days students absent
- Teacher Education Level (BA, BA+30 credits, MA, MA+30 credits, PhD)
- Teacher Ethnicity (White, Hispanic, African-American, Asian, Native American)
- Total years teaching
- Teacher status (non-intern, intern)

As indicated earlier, in order to isolate the association between teacher status and student academic achievement it is critical to control statistically for other variables such as student and teacher intakes that might influence this relationship. Students’ primary grade levels were included in our academic achievement analysis to control for student developmental and grade level curriculum differences in addition to practice effects. Teacher characteristics, and the number of days students have been absent were also incorporated to take into account teacher practices and student exposure to the amount of instruction.

The relationship between student intakes and teacher intern assignments

Table 49 presents the results depicting the relationship between student intakes and their assignment to intern teachers. The table reports the odds ratio indicating how much more or less likely students with certain intakes are to be assigned to an intern teacher. An odds ratio of 1.0 for a variable indicates that the students with this characteristic are equally likely to be in an intern’s or a non-intern’s classroom. That is, the variable with a 1.0 odds ratio is not related to the assignment of students to interns. Variables with odds ratios greater than 1.0 indicate students with this characteristic are more likely to be found in intern teacher classrooms. Similarly, an odds ratio less than one means the variable being tested is less likely to characterize the students being assigned to interns. The asterisks indicate the statistical significance (p-value) for each variable.
Results show that students of African American and Native American backgrounds are 4 times more likely to be assigned to an intern than Caucasian students. Special education students, poverty students and English Learners (whether or not fully English proficient) are also more likely to have interns as their teachers (odds ratios of 2.7, 1.4, and 1.3 respectively). Intern teachers tended to be assigned to higher grade levels. Surprisingly, students’ prior academic achievement, although statistically significant, was not a good predictor of teacher assignment (odds ratio of 1.0).

**Relationships between teacher type and student academic achievement**

Table 50 presents the results depicting the relationship between teacher type and other student, parent and teacher characteristics and students’ 2005 achievement in math and English after controlling for student prior academic achievement.

| Table 49. Odds of Interns having specific student characteristics in their classrooms |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Student Variables                  | Odds Ratio         |
|                                    | (N=142503)        |
| Prior achievement in Math          | 1.0 ***           |
| Prior achievement in English       | 1.0 ***           |
| **Student Ethnicity**              |                   |
| Hispanic vs. White                 | 1.9**             |
| African American vs. White         | 4.3***            |
| Asian vs. White                    | 1.3               |
| Native American vs. White          | 4.2***            |
| **Student Grade Level**            |                   |
| Grade 4 vs. Grade 3                | 1.3               |
| Grade 5 vs. Grade 3                | 1.6**             |
| **Gender**                         |                   |
| Female vs. Male                    | 1.0               |
| Freed Reduce Lunch                 | 1.4**             |
| **Gifted**                         | 0.8               |
| **Special Education**              | 2.7***            |
| **Language Status**                |                   |
| English Learner vs. EO             | 1.3*              |
| Fully English Proficient vs. EO    | 1.3*              |

NOTE: ***p=.00              **p<=.01               * p<=.05

The table reports the regression coefficient for each variable – indicating the amount of change in student academic achievement for each one standard deviation change in the continuous variables, and one unit change for the indicator or categorical variables. The asterisks report the statistical significance (p-value) for each variable. The larger the standardized regression coefficient (in absolute value) the more powerful is the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

The primary objective of this analysis is to investigate whether students assigned to intern teachers perform differently than students assigned to non-intern teachers. Our results show that teacher type is not associated with academic achievement. In fact, students assigned to both types of teachers on average scored the same on the 2005 CST exam in math and English after controlling for prior academic achievement, student intakes and teacher qualifications (educational level and years of experience). The analysis however, have highlighted that other factors are much more powerful in predicting academic achievement. Statistically, the most powerful covariate is student’s prior academic achievement in Math and English. Other covariates that are statistically significant but have a weaker impact on math and English
achievement are whether students are special education or gifted. This is followed by student grade level, ethnicity, language proficiency and absenteeism. Teacher education level and years of teaching experience do not seem to impact student achievement in either math or English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 50. Factors influencing student achievement, including whether they have an intern teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math (N=59,799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Achievement in Math/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Ethnicity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic vs. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American vs. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian vs. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American vs. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Grade Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 4 vs. grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 5 vs. grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female vs. Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freed Reduce Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gifted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner vs. EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully English Proficient vs. EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of days student absent in SY05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Education Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA+30 vs. BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS vs. BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms +30 vs. BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD vs. BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Ethnicity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic vs. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American vs. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian vs. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American vs. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in teaching profession</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Status (Intern vs. non-intern)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: ***p=.00              **p<=.01               * p<=.05
Fiscal Analysis of the Intern Programs

The California Education Code (sections 44380-44386) enables the CTC to “provide funding to programs that include innovative training, assessment, or support models and strategies that have the potential of improving the quality of the teaching force.” The CTC administers incentive funding for the Alternative Certification (Intern) Program through a competitive grant process based on the following criteria:

- Program Rationale and Leadership
- Number and Source of Program Participants
- Quality of the Instructional Program
- Quality of Support System
- Quality of Assessment of Participants
- Extent of Collaboration and Transition
- Quality of the Program Evaluation Plan
- Cost-Effectiveness and Budget
- Geographic Location

Grant awards require school districts and county offices of education to provide matching funds covering 50 percent of the cost of the intern program. Funds available through the grant process provide $2,500 per intern per year to qualified sponsors of internship programs to support the costs of providing instruction, support and assessment to interns. Further, in 2006, Senate Bill (SB) 1209 authorized the Enhanced Intern Grant Amendment, which enables to CTC to provide additional incentive funding to internship programs that agree to add specific enhancements to their program. “Education Code § 44387 adds three new provisions that constitute an enhanced intern program:

1. Adds 40 clock hours of English learner (EL) pre-service preparation to the existing preparation expectation of 120 clock hours or the equivalent.
2. All enhanced intern programs must include at least 40 clock hours annually of on-site support for each intern by a similarly certificated teacher assigned to that school.
3. Schools and districts in funded intern programs must maintain specified ratios and comparative percentages of new and experienced teachers in high priority schools.”

Programs that agree to include these provisions in a funded intern program are eligible for an additional $1,000 per intern for a total of $3,500, which do not require matching funds. This

grant is awarded on a per capita basis and not all interns, districts or schools are required to participate. However, every participant for whom additional incentive funds are requested by the sponsoring LEA must meet all three provisions of the incentive grant.

The amounts available for grants to alternative certification programs have varied over the years. In fiscal year 2002-03 the budget provided $29.8 million for alternative certification or internship programs managed by colleges, universities, and LEAs. This amount was reduced to $24.9 million in 2004-05, but augmented by funding for emergency pre-internship preparation programs for a total of $28.4 million in state funding. Pre-internship and internship programs share a combined funding pool, which allows resources to be reallocated based on candidate needs in each program.

**Intern Program Budget Data Sources**

Once a local induction program is affiliated with the state, it must submit annual budget sheets to the Internship Program Office of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing that itemize proposed spending on instruction, support, candidate or program evaluation, and administration. Each local agency provides a projection of anticipated dollars from state grants and local matching funds to the Internship Program Office for the coming year on an annual basis. Similar to the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program, the first apportionment of internship funds is made to programs in October based on the projections outlined in the budget. In December of each year, participating teachers complete and submit an online form to the Commission that indicates their consent to participate in the program. Based on the revised information received through the consent forms, another apportionment is made to programs in February.

In addition to the budget sheets that itemize proposed spending at the program level, spreadsheets that list final allocations to each program are also available from the Commission. The spreadsheets list the number of participating teachers and the amounts allocated to each program from the state from the program’s inception to the current funding year. Additionally, these spreadsheets provide amounts allocated to each program for survey and special grants from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. For the 2005-06 year, survey grants were allocated to each program in amounts of either $6,000 or $12,000 depending on program size. These grants are meant to reimburse programs for expenses associated with the administration of user surveys. In addition to survey grants, special grants are awarded on a competitive basis to regional network providers to coordinate regional meetings and activities,

---

32 Prior to 2001-02, an affiliated internship program could carry funds over from one year to the next. In subsequent years, this practice was eliminated so that programs could not use carry-over funds.
provide technical assistance and enhanced support systems for interns and to assist with the implementation of intern user surveys and program evaluation.\textsuperscript{33}

For example, during the 2005-06 year, eight programs received special grants of $95,000 each, for a total allocation of $760,000 in special grant funds. In 2006-07, different amounts allocated to each program for enhanced internship grants are also provided. The state allocation spreadsheets available from the Commission provide data on the base amounts allocated to each program, as well as amounts allocated to each program for survey and special grants (for the 2005-06 year) and enhanced grants (for the 2006-07 year). The budget sheets described above and allocation spreadsheets form the basis of our analysis of state and local funding.

Finally, teacher survey data are available for all programs for the 2005-06 academic year. At the time data were analyzed for this report, the 2006-07 survey data were not available. Table 51 below provides the number of programs with data from each source for both the 2005-06 and 2006-07 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Allocation Data</th>
<th>Program Budget Data</th>
<th>Teacher Survey Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>73 programs</td>
<td>58 programs</td>
<td>72 programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>71 programs</td>
<td>25 programs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Much is Allocated by the State for Each of these Programs?

In 2006-07, the California Department of Education provided nearly $24.3 million in allocations to internship programs throughout the state. This amount included base grant allocations ($2,500 per intern), enhanced grants (additional $1,000 per qualified intern) and special grants ($95,000 per qualifying program) and financed the participation of 8,140 beginning teachers (an average of $2,874 per teacher). Of the 71 programs for which there were valid state allocation data available, programs ranged in size from as few as 4 participating teachers to 994, with a median of 60 teachers per program. Although the state provides a set amount per teacher that is defined by state law, if funds allocated for all purposes are included, the actual state allocations ranged from $2,500 to $4,375 per teacher depending on the program. Some of the variation between programs in state allocations per teacher is due to differences in program

\textsuperscript{33} http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/intern/docs/RFP-2007-08-Regional.doc
eligibility for enhanced grant funding and special grants provided to individual programs from the state. Table 52 provides a historical context for actual program allocations from 2001 to the present.

### Table 52: Historical summary of State Allocations for Intern Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Participating Teachers</th>
<th>Total State Allocation</th>
<th>Average State Allocation per Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>$18,309,533</td>
<td>$2,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>7,505</td>
<td>$18,762,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>8,616</td>
<td>$21,540,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>8,342</td>
<td>$20,855,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>7,304</td>
<td>$19,566,000</td>
<td>$2,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>8,140</td>
<td>$24,266,000</td>
<td>$2,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to allocations provided by the state, each program is required to contribute local matching resources. Estimates of anticipated matching contributions are listed in budget sheets that programs submit to the state. Although the state requires matching contributions of $2,500 per Intern teacher and many programs report matching funds at this level, these amounts range from $2,339 to $21,621 per teacher with a median reported match of $2,693 for the 25 programs for which budget data were available for the 2006-07 academic year. The five programs listing the largest matching contribution are included in Table 53 below.

### Table 53: Matching amount per intern for highest matching programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Number</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Matching amount per teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>San Francisco Unified School District</td>
<td>$21,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>San Diego USD/San Diego State special education</td>
<td>$12,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>Imperial County SELPA Alternative</td>
<td>$8,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>Loyola Marymount University</td>
<td>$6,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>CSU Stanislaus/Merced Consortium</td>
<td>$5,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This amount of variation is huge and this degree of variation is relatively consistent across years. In previous years, this variation will be shown to be even greater across all sites reporting fiscal data described in more detail below. These figures suggest that while some sites had local matching resources that were less than what is required by the state, others dedicated matching resources to the program that were over eight times this requirement. These data also suggest vast disparities in the resources available at the program level across programs due to very differing levels of commitment in terms of the local match. However, the extent to which this is truly the case as opposed to simply reflecting differences in local reporting conventions in regard to matching funds cannot be determined through these analyses. As discussed below, instructions regarding what local funds may be counted in terms of a match are quite vague.

It is worthy of note that similar to the BTSA program, these budget sheets are stored in hard copy format at the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. As a result, these are seemingly not designed for analysis. Additionally, budgets are only available for programs that submitted them to the state. It appears that other sites participate in this program and receive state funds without submitting such fiscal reports.

As a result of these and other factors with regard to the timing of data collection efforts, it was not possible to obtain all budget sheets for all programs for each year. At the time these data were compiled, the year with the most complete budget data available was the 2005-06 academic year. Additionally, at the time this report was written, the participating intern surveys, which provide the only uniform basis for comparing program outcomes, were not yet available for the 2006-07 year. Therefore, the subsequent analyses of resource inputs and program outcomes are based on data for 2005-06.

**Fiscal Year 2005-06**

In 2005-06, data on state allocations to all programs and budget estimates of anticipated state and local matching funds were available for 73 programs. As illustrated in the table above, during the 2005-06 year, the state allocated approximately $19.5 million to individual Internship programs. Excluding state allocations for survey and special grants, state allocations per-teacher were identical across programs at $2500. The matching contributions reported for this year were approximately $25.6 million and ranged from $0 to $29,441 per teacher with a median reported contribution of $2,828 per teacher for the 58 programs which fiscal data were available.

**Changes in Reported Matching Contributions over Time**
Based on budget estimates provided to the state from each program, it is possible to calculate matching contributions as a percentage of the total intern budget at the program level. Looking at the sample of programs for which historical budget data are available, (See Table 54) reported matching contributions have remained relatively stable as a proportion of total budget over time.\(^{34}\)

**Table 54: Historical summary of intern matching contributions as a percent of total budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Programs in Sample</th>
<th>Matching Percentage of Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Estimates of Anticipated State Funding versus Actual State Allocations**

For each program we can compare budgeted state allocations per teacher to subsequent actual state allocations in order to determine how closely they correspond. Additionally, we can compare the anticipated number of teachers with the actual number of teachers funded for each program. For both variables, we can calculate a measure of how well programs anticipated the amount of state funds per teacher that they would receive and the number of teachers ultimately receiving funding to participate.

In 2006-07, collapsing across all state programs for which data were available, the projected per teacher estimates were right on target with the actual allocated amount from the state. Table 55 displays historical data showing the difference between projected and actual state allocations per teacher and between the estimated and actual numbers of funded teachers over time. This table generally shows consistency across these measures. However, in 2001-02 year, programs received $588 more per teacher than anticipated.

\(^{34}\) These figures should be interpreted with caution due to differences in sample sizes as a percentage of the total universe of Intern programs across years.
Table 55: History estimated and actual state contributions to intern programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median difference between projected and actual allocation amount per teacher</th>
<th>Median difference between projected and actual number of funded teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>-$97</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>-$588</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do Budgets Differ Across Sites?

As with the BTSA program, the only basis available for considering program fiscal adequacy are financial data described above. For the purposes of these analyses, budget sheets that itemize anticipated funding from state allocations and local matching funds from 2000 to the present were made available from the Commission for a sample of programs. The advantage of using the budget sheets to determine how much programs anticipate receiving is that they provide similar data from all of the participating internship programs in a systematic format across programs and across years. The budget sheets provide information about, 1) how local agencies planned to divide resources between teacher salaries, travel, administration, and supplies and materials and 2) the amount of required local matching funds. In the sections below, an exploration of differences in the reported local match and projected budgeted amounts to individual sub-categories within each program and their correlates are presented.

In considering fiscal adequacy, we must first attempt to analyze varying degrees of resources available to programs across sites. Observing how program outcomes vary at differing levels of program inputs provides the basis for these analyses. For the internship program, as the basic allocation per teacher from the state is the same, the only potential sources of funding variation come from differing reported levels of local matching funds per teacher and from the fact that some sites receive special and survey grants associated with this program and others do not.

However, the degree to which either of these potential sources of resource variation accurately reflect the resources actually available for program provision at the local level are open to
question. Concerns with the reported local match amounts as reported under the BTSA discussion pertain to the Internship Program as well. That is, we observe a fairly large range of variation in what is reported as the local match by site when calculated on a per teacher basis. However, due to vague instructions and a lack of clarity what can or should be counted and what cannot in regard to the required local match, the degree to which these reported variations in local match accurately reflect differences in levels of resources actually available for program provision is open to serious question.

The fact that some sites receive special and survey grants could also be considered as a basis for differentiating available resources at the local level. However, as these grants are earmarked for specific purposes, the degree to which they may affect local program provision is unclear. While there may be spillover benefits for local programs receiving these funds, it seems inappropriate to treat these revenues as if they were being directly applied to local Internship Program provision.

In summary, while there are reasons to believe that Internship Program resources do vary across sites, e.g. that varying degrees of local matching resources actually invested in program provision could matter substantially in regard to program results and should be included in consideration of fiscal adequacy, we do not appear to have very accurate measures of these variations. Thus, if we strip away these two potential measures of Internship Program resource variation, we leave only the state allocations as accurate reflections of the resources available for program provision at the local level.

Given that the best resource measure we have, i.e. state aid per teacher, is the same across all programs, we have several options for considering fiscal program adequacy. First, we can accept that there are no reliable measures of fiscal resource variation at the local level and consider the adequacy question from the perspective that all programs have resource levels that are exactly the same. Second, we can assume that the budget sheets, including projected revenues from both state and matching sources, are the best measures we have with regard to the full range of funds available at the local program level. Last, we can use responses to selected survey items pertaining to teacher perceptions of resource quality and availability as proxy indicators of program inputs. In the sections below, we include elements of all three approaches, recognizing the limitations of each. In addition to the above, which are alternative approaches to considering total available resources across sites, we also examine possible relationships between reported resource use (as indicated by the budget sub-category data) and program results.
**Differences in Program Size**

Similar to the BTSA program, there is no relationship between program size and total amount per teacher budgeted at the program level for either the 2005-06 or the 2006-07 academic years. However, as with the BTSA program, size does seem to matter at the extremes. Because more complete fiscal data are available for the 2005-06 academic year, subsequent analyses examine data from the 56 programs that submitted budget sheets to the state during that year. In 2005-06, individual internship programs anticipated funding between 8 and 432 participating teachers. When we look at the ten programs with the greatest number of teachers and compare them to the ten programs with the fewest, we see a large difference in the total budgeted amount per teacher (state and local contributions), with very small programs reporting approximately $3,350 more per teacher on average than very large programs. Because there is little variability in per teacher state allocations across these sites, these differences are primarily due varying reported matched funds. Although, as mentioned above, it is difficult to place too much emphasis on the meaning of these reported local contributions, these data may suggest some diseconomies of scale associated with the smallest internship programs.

**Division of Funds between Infrastructure Operations and Support for New Teachers**

As mentioned, Internship budgets are broken down into the four main categories of instruction, support, candidate or program evaluation, and administrative costs. Each of these budget categories can be further divided into the sub-categories as shown in the table below. There is considerable variation in budget breakouts by these categories that suggest differing implementation strategies at the local level that could impact the quality, amount, and type of support experience that participating teachers receive. Even at local program sites where total per teacher budgeted amounts are identical, differences in resource distribution will affect the amount of funds used for alternative program components (e.g., differences in the funds allocated to administration vs. instruction). These program design characteristics could potentially differentiate between effective strategies related to overall program success.
Table 56: Reporting Categories from Intern Program Budgets

1. Instruction
   a. Instructors' salaries and benefits
   b. Books and supplies
   c. Other

2. Support
   a. Support provider training
   b. Support provider release time
   c. Support provider travel and supplies
   d. Other

3. Candidate or Program Evaluation
   a. Supervisors' and evaluators' salaries and benefits
   b. Assessment instruments
   c. Training of assessors
   d. Release time
   e. Other

4. Administrative Costs
   a. Travel
   b. Facilities
   c. Equipment
   d. Administrative salaries and benefits
   e. Clerical salaries and benefits
   f. Postage, phone, duplication, etc.
   g. Other
   h. Indirect

Perhaps the most important resource allocation distinction reflecting program design differences is the degree to which programs invest Intern Program resources in administration as opposed to other budget categories, e.g. instruction. This is also subject underlying the second research question cited for these analyses, i.e. how is funding divided between infrastructure operations and direct support to new teachers, and is this division the most effective use of funds? Across all programs, we summarized information from program budget sheets that itemized budget amounts for instruction, support, evaluation, and administration.

Table 57 provides the average percentage of total budget earmarked for individual budget sub-categories for 2005-06. Further analyses will reveal whether there are differences in program characteristics related to configurations of budget sub-categories that may relate to differences in program quality.
Table 57: Average percent of total budgets marked for key sub-categories 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Average Percent of Total Program Budget</th>
<th>Highest Program Percent</th>
<th>Lowest Program Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note, however, that on average the largest percentage of program funds (nearly one-third) are reported to be allocated to administration. Even though the categories “instruction” and “support” likely both primarily connote forms of direct service, this reported amount for administration seems high.

In addition, vast variation is reported across the sites, with one site reported an unbelievably lean 2% administration while another shows nearly all Internship funds going toward the administration of this program (85%). These reported variations seem to suggest some further need to review these data and perhaps more closely follow up with the sites showing such extremes. The fact that another site reports over half of its funds as being budgeted for evaluation raises questions about the degree to which these reported allocations are scrutinized and/or are uniformly reported.

**Indicators of Program Quality**

As a component of participation in the program, beginning teachers complete an annual survey that measures satisfaction with and experience of various program elements. Responses to these surveys are available for all 74 Internship programs for the 2005-06 year.\(^{35}\)

This survey asks teacher participant opinions about the availability of support providers, the degree to which they felt matched to their provider, and the frequency with which they met. Supplementing the fiscal data reviewed above, these measures provide an alternative perspective on variations in inputs across program sites. In addition, the survey asks teachers

---

\(^{35}\) At the time this report was completed, survey responses were not available for the 2006-07 year. As a result, it was not possible to examine relationships between enhanced grant funding and program outcomes as measured by the teacher survey.
to rate program satisfaction and helpfulness as well as the likelihood that they plan to continue in the teaching profession. These are the best proxy program outcome indicators available for these analyses.

Measures of program resources and program results are fundamental to the consideration of program funding adequacy. Adequate funding is simply the amount required to fully meet specified program goals. Survey items indicating participant perceptions regarding availability of program resources and access to program components provide alternative measures of program inputs that can be compared and contrasted to reported budget allocations as alternative views of the program resources available at the local level. In addition, participant ratings of program satisfaction and helpfulness are the best indicators we have regarding the degree to which program objectives were met or of overall program success.36

In order to evaluate differences between programs in the following analyses, we used responses from the participating teacher surveys aggregated at the program level. One benefit of using surveys as one measure of program quality is that they provide detailed information about program components in a format that is systematic enough to enable cross-program comparisons. A drawback is that they are self-reported data and responses may be related to factors other than the elements of program provision. As a result, it is important to explore the relationships between survey data and other factors that may affect survey responses. It is possible, for example, that beginning teachers in districts with lower percentages of students in poverty will report more positive experiences with regard to their induction program than teachers training in districts with larger percentages of students in poverty. Controlling for these variables will give us a more precise picture of relationship between program inputs and outcomes.

**Analyses Using Total Budgeted Amount Per-Teacher**

Based on the outcome of factor analyses and the Structural Equation Model (SEM) presented earlier in this report, 14 primary constructs of interest have been identified, comprised of individual items or groups of individual items. They are listed below in Table 58:

---

36 Also available are survey responses from program administrators and intern support providers. However, responses to these surveys have not been included in the following analyses.
Table 58: Input and outcome proxy measures from participating teacher surveys

**Input Variables:**

- Degree of local support provider match at same grade level (Q08a)
- Degree of local support provider match at same subject (Q08b)
- Degree of local support provider match at same location (Q08d)
- Frequency of interaction with local support provider (Q07a1)
- Length of interaction with local support provider (Q07b1)
- Frequency of interaction with university support provider (Q07a2)
- Length of interaction with university support provider (Q07b2)
- Adequacy of support (Q09a-b)
- Timeliness of support (Q10a-d)
- Usefulness of support (Q11a-j)

**Outcome Variables:**

- Confidence in teaching (Q14a-c)
- Program helpful (Q13a-Q13o)
- Commitment to teaching (Q15)

Hypothesized causal paths suggest that an intern’s degree of perceived match and frequency of communication with available local and university support providers leads to a successful program experience. For the fiscal analysis, we operationalize these constructs as “input” and “outcome” variables. Of course, this distinction is not always clear as these sets of items are typically correlated with each other, which simply suggests that satisfaction with perceived inputs is related to overall program satisfaction.

However, it is important for the consideration of fiscal adequacy to evaluate further evaluate the relationship between constructs measuring teacher perceptions of the availability of program resources and the quality of those resources, and teacher perceptions of overall program success and program impact on their long term career choices. Therefore, for these purposes, input variables are those that define interns’ access to and quality of interaction with various support providers; whereas, outcome variables define the degree to which interns believe that the program has helped them learn to teach, led to increased commitment to teaching, and allowed them to feel more confident as a teacher.
In addition, there may be important program characteristic variables that affect the relationship between survey input and outcome measures. For example, the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch was negatively related to the degree to which Intern teachers believed they were well matched with their site support provider at the same grade ($r = -.38$, $p<.01$) and subject ($r = -.30$, $p<.05$). Student poverty was also negatively related to participating teachers’ perceptions that support was useful ($r = -.239$, $p<.05$). Additionally, program size was negatively related to participating teachers’ ratings of the timeliness of support ($r = -.35$, $p<.01$).

Due to these relationships and the difference between very large and very small programs in the amount budgeted per teacher, the coefficients shown below in Table 9 represent partial correlations controlling for program size and the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch. Perhaps the most important observation from this table is that variations in budgeted allocations at the program level for the most part do not show statistically significant positive relationships with specified measures input or output measures from the participant survey. While it was noted above that perceptions of resource availability seem tied to proxy measures of program outcomes, the table above does not show this relationship clearly reflected in variations in the budgeted amounts reported by site.

We know these budget based data are problematic due to the fact that nearly all of the resource variations reflected in these data come from the reported local match. However, it is the best measure we have of systematic resource variation across sites. In addition, the questions associated with these budget data seem reinforced by the one statistically significant relationship observed in this table, i.e. that budgeted resources are negatively correlated with perceived adequacy of support as reported by program participants.
Table 59: Partial correlations of program aggregated survey data with intern expenditures controlling for program size and student poverty (NSLP eligibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Teacher Questionnaire Item/Construct</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Amount per Teacher (anticipated grant and matching)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INPUT PROXY VARIABLES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of local support provider match at same grade level (Q08a)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of local support provider match at same subject (Q08b)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of local support provider match at same location (Q08d)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of interaction with local support provider (Q07a1)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of interaction with local support provider (Q07b1)</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of interaction with university support provider (Q07a2)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of interaction with university support provider (Q07b2)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of support (Q09a-b)</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of support (Q10a-d)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM OUTCOME PROXY VARIABLES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of support (Q11a-j)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in teaching (Q14a-c)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program helpful (Q13a-Q13o)</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to teaching (Q15)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistical significance at the .05 level.

Analyses Focusing on Budget Sub-Categories

As mentioned previously, internship budgets are divided into four sub-categories: instruction, administration, training, and evaluation. Analyses outlined below for 2005-06 examine the proportion of total resources allocated to each of these budget sub-categories and their correlates is examined in more detail.

**Instruction**

The proportion of total budget earmarked for instruction was not related to any survey items measuring perceived instructional quality. More specifically, there were no observed
relationships between the proportion of total budget for instruction and teachers’ reports that the program was effective with regard to instructional planning, applying teaching strategies, helpful analyzing student work or improving student achievement.

**Administration**

Significant negative correlations were found between the proportion of total budget allocated to administration and indications by teacher respondents that they were matched well with support providers by grade and subject (grade r=-.30, p<.05; subject r=-.30, p<.05). Additionally, the percentage of total resources budgeted to administration was negatively correlated with teachers’ estimates of the length of meeting times with an onsite support provider (r = -.29, p<.05). However, the strength of these relationships was moderated by program size and student poverty. Multivariate regression analyses showed student poverty as a more consistent moderating variable than program size with regard to the relationship between the budget percentage allocated to administration and availability of an onsite support provider.

Dichotomizing the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch at the median, the negative relationship between the percentage of total budget allocated to administration and provider support were only apparent in programs with relatively higher percentages of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch. Interestingly, the lower poverty programs were not more likely to allocate larger percentages of program resources to administration. However, this percentage was only negatively related to support provider availability for low poverty programs.

**Training**

Preliminary analyses show a significant positive relationship between the proportion of total budget allocated to support provider training and release time and teachers’ estimates of the length of support provider meetings (r=.38, p<.05). There is also a positive relationship between the total amount allocated to support provider training per teacher and meeting time (r=.38, p<.01). These relationships remained statistically significant even when controlling for program size and student poverty.

Interestingly, the proportion of resources budgeted to support provider training and release time was not related to teachers’ reports of the degree to which they were matched with their support provider, the timeliness with which they received support or the usefulness of different types of support offered. This was the case even after controlling for program size and student poverty.
Evaluation

Marginally significant positive relationships were found between the proportion of total budget earmarked for evaluation and participant responses that the program was effective in helping participants apply teaching strategies ($r=.27, p<.05$). There was also a significant positive correlation between the proportion of total budget earmarked for evaluation and participant responses that they received timely support from their university supervisor ($r=.34, p<.05$).

Further Analyses of Administration as a Percentage of Total Budget

Since the percentage of total resources budgeted for administration was related to several survey items that measured teachers’ perceptions of access to support providers, further analyses were conducted to examine other unique characteristics of those programs showing a small percentage of budgeted resources for administration. As mentioned previously, a higher percentage of total resources budgeted to administration was related to lower teacher ratings with regard to the availability of support providers for teachers in programs with low student poverty.

Programs showing less than 10% of their total resources allocated to administration are listed in Table 60 below, along with other relevant program characteristics. From this table it is clear that there is diversity among programs which anticipate allocating less than 10% of budget resources on administration. Programs ranged in size from 16 to 218 teachers and budgets ranged from $2,500 to nearly $32,000 per teacher.
However, as a group, there was a difference between these programs and programs earmarking a larger percentage of resources for administration in the overall pattern of survey responses. When the responses are combined, participating teachers from these programs respond more positively on indicators from the teacher survey of perceived program resources as measured by the perceived availability of support providers and a better match to their support provider.

Teachers from these relatively low administration investment sites also reported improved program outcomes as measured by perceptions program usefulness, improved teaching knowledge and skills, their ability to plan and deliver instruction, that their program was beneficial in helping them meet student needs.

Moreover, teachers from these programs were less likely to report that their program provided effective adaptive technology or opportunities for collaborative co-teaching. In addition, teachers from these programs were less likely to express confidence in the teaching profession and listed, on average, fewer years when asked how long they planned to stay in the teaching profession. Thus, further analyses of sites reporting relatively low percentages of program resources on administration appear mixed in regard to perceptions of program inputs and outcomes.

37 SF Unified was an extreme outlier in matching contribution. After consulting with Intern program staff at the state Internship office, a determination was made that the large difference in reported matching contribution was not likely a result of actual program funding differences, but rather differences in reporting strategies. As a result, subsequent analyses are conducted with SF Unified removed.
Budget Profiles of “Successful” Programs as Indicated by Survey Responses

We combined survey responses from items that measured teachers’ confidence in teaching, estimates of program helpfulness and commitment to teaching in order to develop an overall measure of program success as defined by the teacher survey. We then dichotomized this measure at the median so that programs with relatively higher outcomes on these selected survey items could be compared to programs with relatively lower survey outcomes. Table 61 summarizes percentage allocations by budget sub-category comparing relatively higher and lower outcome programs, as indicated by these selected teacher survey items.

Table 61: Comparison of budget category allocations by intern program performance 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Survey Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see from this table what may be important differences in the percentage of resources allocated by budget sub-categories for programs with relatively higher and lower survey outcomes. The fairly striking difference is the higher percent allocation shown for instruction as opposed to administration in these high versus low outcome programs.

These data are the closest we will be able to provide in attempting to address the second research question listed for this fiscal component of the evaluation above, i.e. how is funding divided between infrastructure operations and direct support to new teachers, and is this division the most effective use of funds? The data above suggest that sites allocating the majority or program resources to instruction and a lesser amount to program administration (approximately 25%) appear to be more successful at affecting positive program results as opposed to sites allocating higher percentages of program resources to administrative support. Given the previously noted questions regarding the fiscal reporting for this program however, especially in the case of the reported match, these results should be interpreted with the utmost caution.
What is a Sufficient Level of Internship Program Funding?

In summary, the data currently collected through statewide program implementation are insufficiently defined and are not measured with enough accuracy to address the question above.

The BTSA analysis includes recommendations as to how the question of funding adequacy might be more fully addressed in the future in both of these programs. Specifically in relation to the Internship Program, however, short of evidence to recommend otherwise, if the overall evaluation recommends continuance of the Internship Program, current data provide no basis for future funding at the program level that is substantially different from what is currently being provided.
Summary of Evidence on Study Question #2: Meeting Legislative Intent for the Intern Programs as specified in Education Code Sections 44382 to 44386

California provides an alternative pathway for people wanting to enter the teaching profession, people who are unable, for various reasons, to enroll in a fifth year preliminary credential program. This is the Alternative Certification Program and its purposes are specified in Education Code sections 44382 to 44386. With special emphasis on case study data, this section reviews the evidence collected during this evaluation study. It examines the extent to which the State’s 72 intern programs consistently meet the legislature’s intent for the program.

Are candidates drawn from and/or serving in subject and geographic shortage areas?

One intent of the Alternative Certification Program is to place intern candidates in schools where a shortage of teachers has occurred as a result of geographic location or lack of single-subject credential holders. Based upon the interview transcripts, intern candidates are serving in subject shortage areas. Some of the program directors indicated that:

During the summer, we get districts calling us for potential interns, especially in the areas of math and science, although language arts is big this year. We always have a couple of foreign language interns.

Because the interns are in a shortage area like Special Education, math, science, or BCLAD, the employers just snatch them up. We have students who are enrolled in the conventional program and are offered employment. They come to us and ask if they can switch to the Intern path.

And

There are some people who may have had a career that involved mathematics or science who, after a decade or so, decided they wanted to teach but are not in the position to go full time in a university. This alternative certification is just what they need in order to remain employed as they make the transition from what they were doing before to become teachers.

Response to subject matter needs

In 1995, the state elementary classroom reduction legislation (20 to 1) created an immediate need for elementary multiple subject teachers. As class size conversion was completed this no longer seems to be a need. Moreover, as a result of reduced funding class size has started to
rise again. One director stated, “There are fewer multiple subject interns now with the lack of jobs out there.” Another said, “We dropped the multiple subjects’ piece and started focusing on single subject math, science, social studies because those are our needs.” In addition, most schools hire credentialed teachers first and there are now “so many multiple-subject credentialed teachers out there it’s very competitive.”

The legislature also reduced the size of ninth grade English classes (20 to 1) and that created a temporary shortage of secondary English teachers. Once the funding necessary to support the reduction was withdrawn additional teachers were no longer needed in this area either. “We’ve recently reduced the English track because there aren’t as many English positions open.” Again, there are a lot of English teachers on market with full credentials. As a result, we now have about 6-8 English interns a year, 15-16 in science and 23 in math.”

When the University of California added the fine arts entrance requirement the number of single-subject secondary level fine arts teaching positions also increased. According to the interview data, however, interns are not filling these positions.

At the present time the field of special education has the largest number of openings according to the directors and site administrators. The next areas of need are math and science. A substantial number of the directors tend to see science as physics, and chemistry. Biology has fewer unfilled vacancies. Foreign language interns and a few English are needed.

*Geographical placement*

Interns are most often placed small rural schools, large urban schools and areas of high population growth because that is where there are the greatest teacher shortages. The wealthier districts have greater success in hiring credentialed candidates. One director stated,

> Intern programs are typically in hard to staff schools, in math and science, and maybe special education as those are the 3 big need areas. In science it’s not biology, it’s probably physics and chemistry. There are extra costs in supervising these people.

There are extra costs in teacher supervision in many of these placements because many of the interns struggle with learning their craft during the first several months on the job. Many are not familiar with needs and values of the students they are teaching. They come from a middle class socio-economic background but are hired to work in settings where poverty, non-English home languages, low parent education and other
challenging circumstances have already discouraged more experienced teachers from seeking these appointments.

While interns may not be from the specific school district where they find employment, they are usually from the area. One university-based director indicated that almost all of their intern candidates are graduates from their university and there were no examples of individuals relocating in order to become a part of an intern program. The interns generally became a part of an intern program in their general area.

**Do candidates entering the program have substantial and relevant work experience?**

Another intent of the internship program is to assist those wishing to change careers. The case study data indicate that only a moderate number of interns are making substantial career changes. A large group, however, is responding to district internal labor market opportunities by moving from paraprofessional and substitute teaching positions into the intern credentialing program. According to a faculty member involved in instructing and supervising Interns,

> About two-thirds are university graduates who did an undergraduate education minor. The other third are career changers. They come to the university for a year as a graduate student doing the minor courses and then come to the intern program.

The largest group entering the intern program are currently enrolled in or recently graduated from a college or university undergraduate program. Following them are many former paraprofessionals or substitute teachers who said,

> I started out as an aide, then substitute and now a long-term math teacher. I’ve been at this district the whole time and been doing primary grades most of the time. And I’m doing a split position right now, going to different classrooms. It taught me a lot.

> I did a long term sub at the school where I currently am for about three months.

> I started substitute teaching about six years ago. I subbed from Kindergarten to middle school. After subbing I went back to school to get my credential in education and my master’s. Then I started teaching third grade and fourth grade. Now I’m teaching special education, my first year. I came back to get another credential in special education.
The interview data did identify a number of individuals who are changing careers and who do not have educational backgrounds or work experiences. The following are some of the professions of these people.

I was six years a banker.

I came from a background of retail management for about 15 to 20 years.

I started out as an optician.

I entered through Troops to Teachers. I’m also in the National Guard. I changed careers, I used to work for the phone company, I was an engineer for the phone company, a telephone engineer, not a real degreed engineer.

Background in Business- Restaurant for 20 years MBA Business Univ. of Chicago.

This is my fourth or fifth career. I most recently work for Fed Ex.

I’m a software engineer turned Peace Corps volunteer turned teacher so I just started with the intern program last July in pre-training and started teaching for the first time in September. Teaching has been one of the things that I was thinking about. A school district actually advertises the district intern program in a magazine for peace corps volunteers so I got a little reminder every month that they’re looking for math teachers. I knew that I wanted to return to that district’s area.

Many Interns report that the biggest draw to the program is the fact that they are getting paid while working toward their teaching credential.

I knew this district intern program was right for me because I’ve been to school enough and I’m finished paying for school, so I love that it’s free, I love that it’s designed just for the people like me – I feel like it’s designed for me whether it’s true or not.

It wasn’t a question of whether to be an Intern or a student teacher, I knew I couldn’t take a year or two off from work.

I was going through the program as you would normally. It just worked out perfectly. It was so easy. I got a better job and I got more money and I was able to support myself. There are so many plusses with the Internship program.
The benefits of paid employment are particularly attractive to first generation college goers and children from families of modest means for whom a fifth year of college is unaffordable. Table 25 and the case study data agree about the main reason for choosing intern training.

Several of the Interns expressed their belief that the intern pathway was the best way to learn how to teach. A number of those in supervisory positions, however, are less sure that this pathway is the most effective route to growing good teachers. And a district administrator stated, “Some are just not ready to go it alone. Student Teaching would have been better. Interning is not for everyone. Student Teaching gives the opportunity to grow up and mature.”

The Intern Program as envisioned by the policymakers as a pathway for career changers is not the primary focus of most programs. Less than one-third of the Interns are actually career changers whereas two-thirds are using the Intern pathway as a fifth year and a means to have an income while earning their credential. The assumption that Alternative Certification would draw people from other related careers to subject area needs, such as math and science teaching, has had limited success. The majority of career changers are paraprofessionals and substitutes. Of the older students recruited to the Intern program, their educational background and work experience is usually unrelated to their teaching area. What does draw people to the Intern program is the fact that they are able to make a living while earning their credential. While the Interns readily admit that it is very challenging to work and take classes at the same time, they generally feel that the Intern program is the best way to learn how to teach.

How are intern teachers being trained and how effective is this training?

Intern training is conducted by public and private universities, school districts, county boards of education and private organizations. With one exception, the interns in all the programs included in this study carried a full teaching load and took teacher preparation classes at the end of the day or on the weekends. Interns are required to have 120 to 160 hours of training and observational experience prior to beginning their teaching work and the programs we observed typically offer this training in the form of course work during the summer, prior to teaching in the fall, and also provide their interns the opportunity to observe and do a short period of student teaching. Not infrequently, however, we were told of some interns who were recruited by school districts just as the school year is beginning (or even after school has started in some cases). These interns get a “crash program” of pre-service training and find themselves working on a temporary permit until they accumulate the required pre-service hours.
Tables 29 and 30 of the Intern survey data report the interns’ responses to questions on their pre-service training.

One university in this study has designed a significantly different program. There may be others, of course, as we only were able to visit 11 sites, but this one deserves special attention. The majority of interns at this university begin their pre-service work as undergraduates, taking both their single-subject courses and education courses in their senior year. They also tutor, observe and participate in a student teaching experience during that time. Then in the fall, on their intern credential, they teach no more than 60% of the school day. They remain at their school sites for the whole day, however, participating in intern program activities that further their education and teaching skills. They also have classes after school. Those having completed their undergraduate work and want to enter this intern program must enroll in graduate school for a year before they may teach. No intern in this program is permitted to begin teaching without prior instruction in pedagogy and teaching methods.

The director of a private university described their program thusly,

> Ultimately what we did was take our fifth year credential program structure and reorganize it to make it accessible to students who are fully employed. Then we added enhancements to make sure our interns would be well prepared to start off the year as interns with the essential skills they would need for success. So, our intern program doesn’t look much different from the coursework in our traditional credential programs, but it is scheduled more into the summer.

Interns are organized into cohorts by some programs. A program director describes how this is done.

> Basically our organization is a cohort. We have interns moving as a group through the two year single subject credential program. They take classes together and the instructors are directed to take advantage of their experience during the week and relate it to the curriculum that they are participating in. As a cohort we think that is a big part of the support that they get.

Intern and intern grads who participate in this form of program find the cohort method very supportive. They discuss the pros and cons of their teaching experiences with both their instructors and supervisors and with each other. They feel that it strengthens them.

Some other programs’ interns described a similar program structure,
There are 10 courses, approximately one month of intensive, comparative courses. Supposedly we’re doing two months of work in one month with a lot of writing, lots of discussions, various styles of teaching, some testing, creating essays, and a lot of very high-level authentic writing.

Interns move through by modules. Four terms. Fieldwork and student teaching. Seven units per term.

One supervisor stated that some of the teachers he was supervising were taking courses that were not scheduled in an organized manner. The classroom management techniques class, for example, was not offered until the second semester, making it necessary for this supervisor to provide individualized instruction to his interns to tide them over until they could take the course. Some programs allowed interns to begin teaching after the academic year began and not take any classes until the next semester.

**Effectiveness of training**

Many participants in the intern programs believe the training they received was highly effective. One intern grad said,

> It was a lot of work but it was nice to be able to practice everything you were being taught during classes. So you would do something at night and the next day you would decide to try it or to fit it. That part was nice. It was a lot of work but it was just nice to practice everything we were being taught.

A second agreed, adding,

> That made it really practical. All that I needed to apply in the classroom was right in front of me. It was great that we were learning as we were doing.

The interns’ report on the effectiveness of their coursework is in Table 27.

Numerous interns stated that their supervisors also made a significant difference. The following are comments from three interns:
I appreciated the supervision that went on. I think that was the strongest piece of the program. Having a supervisor come in and do observations in your classroom.

There were frequent observations so I got immediate feedback and constant feedback. And that was what really made me grow – more than the coursework I think.

I went into special education. I got two fabulous supervisors. I saw them once a week. I can tell you I went that entire year until May until anyone from that school did any kind of observation. It prodded me to be really prepared. I got a lot of lesson plans. I used my evaluations for interviews.

The enthusiasm expressed for supervisors at the case study sites is balanced, to some extent, by the survey data reported in Tables 32 and 33. Those Tables show that meetings with site based support providers are somewhat more frequent and somewhat longer in duration.

A number of site administrators like having interns and recommend a program to people who are considering entering the teaching profession. Some administrators themselves had been interns and knew, intimately, what was involved in the program and its effectiveness. One intern grad-principal said,

One of the things that was good for me in that we would go to class at night and the next day we would apply what we learned immediately and we could come back and say “it works or it doesn’t” and then talk about why didn’t it work. I didn’t implement it or whatever. It was an immediately application which I thought was good. It’s ridiculously hard, it is. To say anything less would not be truthful.

Another administrator stated,

I can base it on teachers who went through the program. The Intern program is providing the necessary preparation for interns to succeed in school. They seem to be natural leaders and try things out and not say. ‘Oh we've never done anything like that before.’ Having interns is working well for me.

An enthusiastic intern support provider declared,

I think the intern program is a wonderful creation. I went through the fifth year program here at the university, way before the intern program was created, and
wish that I had it because I was coming from one career trying to decide if I wanted to teach. It took me a very long time to get through the program. If I had the structure and support of an intern program I would have finished quicker. I love the support and the organization that it provides for my teachers. The teachers going through the intern program are more enthusiastic and better equipped with tools to provide the students with than those who do not go through the program because these teachers have that intrinsic motivation. The intern program gives them the support they need. I’m really happy with how the intern program supports teachers who are more challenged. They do whatever it takes to get them through the program, because they would probably not make it otherwise.

It is also clear, after reviewing these comments, that this form of teacher preparation requires a certain stamina and internal fortitude because, as the principal said, “It is ridiculously hard.” Some intern candidates drop out of their programs before the school year ends as they just cannot keep up.

These programs are also subject to criticism. The most serious problems relate to special education training for regular classroom teachers. Students with special needs are being mainstreamed into regular classrooms and the teachers receiving them need to know how to adapt their curriculum for special education. A number of support providers made comments which echo the following,

One issue not being addressed is that of adapting curriculum for special needs students. The book may be at 4th grade level, but the students may read at 2nd grade level. Still they are expected to share the same curriculum. It is very difficult for the interns because they do not have the experience to do this.

Some of the special education teachers also do not feel sufficiently prepared to handle many of the problems they face in their classrooms. As first year interns they find themselves trying to teach 18 to 20 students with a wide variety of physical and mental problems. Without constant immediate and continuing classroom support they have an extremely difficult time and everyone suffers. These problems are particularly serious in those programs that find themselves perpetually challenged to find credentialed special education teachers to work with the interns. More than one school finds itself with an intern covering the only special education staff position in the school and having no one to assign as a support provider.

In sum, California interns, their support providers, university based faculty and site administrators all see learning to teach while serving as a full time teacher of record in a public school classroom to be both demanding and exciting. Interns report considerably more
excitement than frustration, but they also offer focused and sometimes quite sharp criticisms of this method of qualifying for a California teaching credential. The greatest frustration for program organizers and trainers is the tendency of local schools to expect too much of the interns and to give them too little support. Among the interns themselves, frustrations focus on specific pedagogical and curricular needs, like how to work with special education students and English language learners.

**What assessment data are available?**

By and large, intern skill levels are being assessed using the same tests and measurements used for regular pre-service credential candidates – course grades, supervisor evaluations, CBEST passage prior to admission and teacher performance assessments prior to completion. Perhaps a more appropriate assessment of intern competency than any currently available tests or assessments is to examine their retention rates over time. Since school administrators can generally exercise their discretionary authority to terminate intern credential holders without triggering teacher union involvement or creating a basis for legal redress, they are probably more stringent in renewing contracts for these teachers than for most others.

**Are programs operated collaboratively? With what collaborating institutions?**

Intern programs actively collaborate with various stakeholder groups. School districts that have their own programs collaborate with a number of institutions of higher learning. School districts with interns from multiple programs work with a number of universities and other sponsoring agencies. School districts go to and/or host various advisory committee meetings with their collaborating partners regarding intern training and supervision. According to a district intern director,

The university reps sit on the Advisory Board and work with us concerning teachers (in the student teaching programs) and interns. The universities are invited to the TPA (Teacher Performance Assessment). We talk to them and the group of interns. We are also on the universities’ Advisory Boards. The president of the teacher’s union is also involved. The interns, because they are employed, are members of the union.

Many institutions of higher education have Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with school districts or county offices of education arising because the intern programs are funded under Proposition 98 fiscal constraints as to what agencies can qualify to receive state money allocated to education. The MOUs cover matters regarding how
interns will be placed in schools, who is responsible for their supervision and how state funds will be allocated. One director indicated that, “Every time an intern comes, there is a MOU.”

Some school districts mentioned that they collaborate with the state agencies regarding instruments for assessing interns (using Performance Assessment for California Teachers - PACT). One program director related, “We do PACT as our assessment for the state and are involved with that consortium.”

The reason most cited by district personnel for initiating contact with their partners is to resolve problems regarding individual interns who are experiencing difficulties. A university intern director monitoring a large number of interns stated,

The articulation between the university and district revolves around what is expected. It seems there is a real effort to monitor and work with the interns. If there is a glitch, we fix it. You can’t have intimate relationships with 120 districts at one time, so we meet and talk to them when there’s a problem or when there’s a thing, but no news is good news in a lot of situations with our relationship with the districts.

Some university, county and private programs have a different operational mode. One program director stated, “Every year we have an advisory committee meeting with all 47 districts and 12 non-public schools.” Another program director describing their relationships with districts:

It does vary among the districts. A couple of examples, locally, come to mind. We have sitting on our board a director of personnel that has been with us for over 10 years. And when they hold their support providers meetings we frequently have a staff member go to the meeting and talk about the needs of our interns and hear the challenges that they face, that we need to be alerted to as it relates to the interns. That is not for every district, but it is for several districts. This is more of a collegial relationship than a governance issue there.

Once interns are placed, however, program personnel also seem to initiate contact with their partners most often concerning problems regarding interns they have employed in the various school sites. A university director stated,

We have a formal memo of understanding with our school districts where somebody is designated as the point person for that district. That is the person who will come to the
advisory board meetings. That is the person we will call when we have some issue in the district that we need to address or discuss.

A number of university, county, and private intern programs actively recruit people to enroll in their programs, using a number of outreach techniques. Some of the tools used are websites, EDJoin, and flyers. They also host meetings to introduce their programs to prospective candidates. One university program director described common recruiting practices, saying,

We were able to hire two full time recruiters this year who are working to enhance our applicant pool. We were able to go to state and out of state teacher recruitment fairs. We also use of our own media outlet, EdJoin, and other websites. We’ve done a lot to connect with our districts, to be very involved with to them and be sure we are meeting their needs and demands. And when they identify prospects, they refer them to us.

These programs have “advisory” groups that meet on a periodic basis to provide feedback regarding their program. A university director stated, “All the program directors in our service area come to this campus on a quarterly basis. It’s been invaluable in terms of our discussions. They all tell us that. We meet to discuss what we’re doing and what they’re doing and to see how we can help one another.”

Collaboration also involves individuals, representing individual programs, sitting on regional or other program advisory groups. A university representative indicated, “We have a lot of advisory councils that we get together with. We get lots of feedback from intern and BTSA programs. Together with other Universities, we collaborate on regional projects.”
Summarizing Responses to the Remaining Six Study Questions

The remaining six study questions ask about issues affecting both the BTSA and the Intern programs. Answers to these questions, as they appear in the case study data are summarized in this section.

Study Question #3: Program management decisions for direct assistance

What, if any, policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that district and university interns receive appropriate direct assistance from experienced teachers?

Since the question of adequate direct assistance applies as much to BTSA participating teachers as to intern credential holders, both programs are addressed in response to this question. From the evidence gathered in the comparative case studies of Intern programs, this is perhaps the greatest area of need and concern expressed by the Interns, particularly those in hard to staff subject areas such as Special Education or low socio-economic, urban areas. They report a great deal of variation in the amount and quality of assistance from district support providers or “buddy teachers.” For example, an intern graduate responds to the question, “How do you assess the adequacy of support from your (district) support provider?” with:

He was very nice, but didn’t know anything about special education. He really shouldn’t have been a Buddy Teacher. I found my own Buddy Teacher. She sat me down and taught me how to do IEPs.

Other interns said things like:

I would say though that on the support provider, the gentleman who I’m teamed up with is very capable and actually has done very well through this particular program, and yet that assignment for him came later in the year. So when I came to the school in October the support provider wasn’t yet available until March. . . . I think the district intern program strives to have all the interns teamed up with an on-site support provider from our school. Making that happen takes of course not just time and energy but commitments from those who are going to give the interns their time.

. . . to put it very diplomatically they short-changed the program and it’s not their fault, I agree. It’s a function of not having enough bodies who are volunteering to do this mentor work or this support provider work. So it wasn’t for want of trying but I didn’t get mine until – I started in November, the end of October, October 31st, and I didn’t
my support provider assigned until three weeks ago, which puts us at sometime in May. I had some very good support at the school, teachers and literacy coaches and what have you. Maybe it’s a funding issue or maybe it’s an organizational issue but I think ours is not an isolated story in terms of support providers.

I have a weird set-up. (This Intern has a continuation school position.) I have another teacher who is my master teacher (SP), but she teaches middle school. So, I don’t have like a real master teacher, like, “How do I teach this part of History?” So I’m winging it and just working my butt off, to get it done.

I was assigned a Buddy Teacher, but she never comes to see me. Those in administrative and supervisory positions are also aware of weaknesses in the area of district support providers for Interns. For example, “I want to kick the whole buddy teacher/support teacher arrangement up a notch because I feel there has been a huge disconnect.”

Since the BTSA program is California’s primary new teacher support mechanism, the issue of intern support is intertwined with issues regarding the relationship between these two programs. When asked, “What’s the relationship between BTSA and the Intern program?” Administrators responded with observations like:

I’d like to start with the BTSA piece because the Interns, while they are full time teachers, are not eligible for the BTSA program because they are not credentialed. But the district treats them as if they were credentialed because they have an Intern credential. And there is sort of a catch 22 as they’re not getting district support (as compared to beginning teachers in BTSA).

And,

Looking at increased – the demand for teachers in the next five years seems to out -pace what we’re able to produce, so if anything intern programs are gonna increase and yet it’s really disserving the students in the school to get those teachers that first year, especially when they start off poorly. I’m of the opinion that they develop bad habits. Instead of developing good pedagogy and good practice they develop poor pedagogy and poor practice and then we’re working to undo the things that they have mis-learned. It’s a struggle. I think our districts struggle truly with providing the support provision that they are required to do that on paper say they must do. We provide the supervision but there’s not always a good match there.

On the other hand, some of those Interns who are receiving district support have glowing reports of the benefits of having a support provider or “buddy teacher.” They remark:
My buddy teacher is great, too. He’s our school math coach so he only teaches three periods a day. He has three prep periods which works out great so I have three periods I can speak to him if I want to. He’s been teaching for a long time.

And,

I have support from the school too. We all are required to have a support provider at the school so I am blessed with a wonderful lady as a support provider that was teaching for 17 years (at the same high school as the Intern) and I take it as a blessing. She’s very supportive in all areas.

Or,

I was in a unique situation. The school I went to, they only had 300 students, and they had a staff of 17 teachers, and that’s it, and that’s in all subject areas, so my department in P.E., there’d be one P.E. teacher and then me filling in a class, and the social sciences, there was a main social science teacher and then me, and then in English, there’d be a couple of English teachers and then me, and health, there was just me, so my mentor was actually in math, and he basically became my mentor because I also – he was my assistant coach, and it became a while – the science teacher was my head JV coach, and then the guy that ran my department was very helpful as well, and then of course my principal. It almost was like mentor by team, and I felt free to stop in on any of these people whenever I wanted to, and they’d offer, “Why don’t you come by and observe, and I’ll show you what I’m talking about.”

And a university supervising teacher said,

I deal with one district where one of my students, my first semester student is now the district coordinator who (provides) support for special education interns – well everybody in special education but particularly the interns. So I know that she’s there for them ‘cause I ran into her on the site and we talked about what so-and-so is doing and she was helpful. Before she got that job she was at another site and in fact my other student has the notebook that she had.

These quotations illustrate that even among successful support provider experiences, there is great variation as to the implementation of the support provider role. Some Interns who are assigned a support provider end up finding someone else whom they feel is better able to meet their needs. Some are happy with the person the district assigns. Others receive or seek out support from a variety of sources.

There was much discussion of the job description (or lack thereof) for the support providers. What does the memorandum of understanding (MOU) require? Who assigns the support providers? Are they paid adequately?, etc. A director commented,
Site mentors, the selection of them frankly are left up to the principals, ours is pretty much a contractual relationship and we agree to 750 dollars if they will agree to carefully select and provide some sort of training to certify that they have actually performed the mentoring service and as we mentioned before, we also have the interns sign off on that so that one can check the other. And then finally, we ask that the principal give us an end of the year okay that this is a good person to use for another year.

When asked about Intern program support on the part of site administrators, university based intern program staff were of mixed opinions. A university supervisor said,

In my observation, I don’t think they (the districts) know what the rules are. In some cases, I know the Intern has rarely been visited or has been visited at the last minute. That compounds the pressure on the Intern. I don’t know what the State does in terms of procedures and policies for schools.

Another reported:

This is what I think. As far as the support providers, that is in place. I think as far as the personnel people at that level, the administrators all meet together and there is a faculty representative who meets with them. We update them about issues related to the Intern program. They are our cosponsors, we are a collaborative . . . . That part is all there, but it’s at the site level, principals and vice principals and sometimes department heads, particularly in high schools and middle schools, that is a sort of no man’s land. That’s where we could use help.

A director with a broad ranging program commented that support varies sharply from place to place,

In the County, for instance, the site providers for those interns are right there on site and they’re there all day. They’re either next door, they’re department heads, they’re program directors, wherever. In the County we rely on the county having their own site providers, and I have no control over how many times they see them, what kinds of things they do when they see them. Do they do formal observations or just a, “How are things going? Okay, bye. Thanks.”

District support providers were quick to point out some problems associated with providing adequate intern support. These include:
It seems like so much of the time it is immediate needs. Sometimes helping them right away helps it not to get out of control. I had an Intern who was very mature and interesting, but I think she would be the first to admit that the whole process is just overwhelming. And I felt I didn’t do near enough for her because there just wasn’t enough time.

Another indicated lack of support for supervision on the part of the district, saying,

If you didn’t have overlapping preps they would say you could take a day off. I think you should be in the same building and have a common prep. There should be some buy-in by the district that this is a priority for us to prepare teachers properly. Some kind of an agreement.

Still another teacher agreed,

Making people take whole days off occasionally is not particularly effective. I think the University sent me a check for $100 for my services which was very unprofessional I think for the time . . .

However, an administrator reported that the system seems to work quite well,

I see the mentor at my school every week for about an hour and (he/she) comes into my office and gives me a copy of the evaluation and discusses with me for a few minutes. We have a conversation about (the Intern) teacher and how she’s doing, her progress. It’s very positive.

The question of how Interns are selected for specific teaching positions often entered into the conversation. The significance of this discussion is the placement of Interns by the districts in challenging assignments. The intent of the policymakers was to find teachers for hard to staff subjects and geographical areas. These placements are often in challenging environments where an inexperienced person is likely to flounder without adequate support. The evidence indicates that this is too often the case. University faculty members are most likely to point this out as when one said,

It depends on what the selection process is for a given district as to how the interview process. It’s the same as it would be for a teacher that wanted to transfer in from another district or something like that.
And another said,

I understand that the principal gets involved with all these first year teacher he has and forgets who’s a mentor, who’s an intern and who’s not and what things we have to do for first year. But if they have somebody that really is helpful on the staff and the administrator is helpful and the university mentor is helpful, yeah. Then it can be a real good situation. Otherwise, just dumping them into a classroom and watching to see if the duck can swim is kind of difficult.

A university supervisor reported,

I find that in the public school system my intern right now, she’s doing a job share situation, and she feels that even though she has a master teacher for her partner she hasn’t really been assigned a person to say this is your person to help you and guide you so in that sense I feel that they lack support. And she feels. This is what she shared with me.

Again, where support is provided and evaluated, success is more likely. A couple of university supervisors reported,

I find that the interns I have in the private school sector are receiving much more support because they’ve been physically told and introduced to the person who’s going to guide them through the whole process.

If an administrator can identify a person to work with them I usually meet with the person and tell them what I would hope they could do for that intern. So that it’s not just being assigned someone and hope that they follow through with it. But I try to check in occasionally to see if they’re actually providing some support for the intern

In summation, these quotations, taken from the intern case study data, illustrate the positive and negative feelings regarding both the appointment of support providers in a district and the support provider-intern relationship. Interns, because they have significantly less pre-service training than the BTSA teachers, are even more vulnerable when they assume control of their classrooms. Thus, the role the support providers play in facilitating their teaching experience and acquisition of teaching skills is of even greater importance. That being the case, there are two basic issues that must be addressed and resolved, if possible, to insure high quality intern training.
The first issue is the level of sophistication and capacity of the support provider who is assigned to work with an intern. While the intern faculty, trainers and university based supervisors have more sophistication and a better opportunity to participate in the process they are not intimately familiar with the school districts, with some exceptions, and do not know the students. In order to overcome many problems that arise in classrooms, however, it is important to know both the intern and the students. This being the case, interns need more than buddies, they need teachers who have, at the very least, training similar to that provided to BTSAs support providers. They need the trained ability to critically observe and analyze the intern’s teaching performance and help them to reflect on that performance. More than that “bag of tricks,” so often mentioned by intern teachers, is necessary.

The other issue is time, the amount of time that is available for a support provider to work with an intern and when it is available. First, is an intern provided with a support provider in a timely fashion? Second, is the support provider available when the intern needs advice, counsel, instruction or feedback or is availability possible only when it can be fit into the support provider’s schedule? Third, does the district allow support providers adequate time to both observe and counsel their interns?

Some of the quotations cited above show that not all interns are assigned to support providers in a timely fashion. Sometimes, it is the willingness of other campus faculty members to provide temporary assistance that prevents the intern from “sinking.” The unevenness of support provider timeliness is confirmed in the statewide survey data (see Table 39).

Interns were variously pleased and disappointed with the assistance provided by the support providers assigned to them. While most make themselves available to their interns in a timely fashion, some are not very timely and others who see their interns rarely or not at all. Support providers should be, among other things, assisting their intern teachers to develop good teaching practices and responding to their calls for help. As an administrator noted, absent the assistance of a well-trained support provider and left to their own devices, some interns develop bad habits – poor pedagogy and practice – that have to be unlearned, a sometimes difficult task.

Finally, well trained full-time teachers acting at support providers for interns need adequate time to respond to intern needs and to observe. Ideally, at the secondary level, both parties should be at the same school site and teaching schedules should permit support providers and interns having the same prep period time to meet together, with release time provided to the support provider to observe the intern teaching a class. Since teachers at the primary level do not have prep periods during the contact day, the same site and grade level would make the
best match so that the support provider knows what the intern is teaching and enable their having contact at recess, lunch, at grade level meetings as well as meeting after classes have ended. Once again, support providers should have frequent release time to observe the intern teaching. And, interns should have release time to observe highly qualified teachers conducting their classes as this also aids in the interns’ professional growth.

The AIR preliminary fiscal analyses, as previously stated, confirm both a significant positive relationship between the proportion of total budget allocated to support provider training and release time and teachers’ estimates of the length of support provider meetings and a positive relationship between the total amount allocated to support provider training per teacher and meeting time.

**Study Question #4: Program management decisions to support special populations**

What, if any, policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that beginning (Induction) and intern teachers are prepared to address the needs of special populations of students – especially English learners and special education students?

Beginning induction and intern teachers are expected to become effective in the teaching of diverse students, particularly English language learners and those certified for special education services. An analysis of the case study data reveals that participants in both programs generally believe that they are receiving a minimum level of class work and training in ELL. “It was imbedded in the program and almost every class had discussion on working with ELLs,” “… four courses that just deal with that population,” and “There is differentiated instruction based on the language proficiencies,” are typical comments made by the interns in this study. One intern said, “Because I work in a school that’s predominately ELLs, it was helpful to have the ELL class while I was teaching the kids. Because you read it in class and then you put it into practice the next day. The kids go, ‘Oh, yeah!’”

Since interns are employed in greater numbers in urban areas their classes are apt to have more ELL students. Thus it was not surprising that at least one intern program requires their interns to have the B-CLAD credential.

BTSA induction teachers also make positive comments about their ELL training but, according to some of them, it is not enough. “You are just doing the ELL lesson but it has no meaning.”
It seems to be a lot of the same repeated work at a lesser level.” The “one size doesn’t fit all,” nor should it if teachers are expected to enable English language learners to make a successful transition to English speaking learners.

Many beginning teachers want ELL instruction to have greater depth. Those who have gone through the preliminary credential training want a second, more rigorous course during their BTSA training. They want more SDAIE instruction, additional materials to teach ELL classes and, in some instances, subject specific materials. While more interns have positive opinions about their ELL training some of them also want courses with greater depth. And the most negative statement was made by an intern who said, “I have two classes that are entirely ELL. I inherited the SDAIE materials from the man who taught the class and then retired. However, there are some classes that don’t even have a curriculum, textbooks or standards.”

When it comes to instruction regarding special education students the teachers in both programs report that course work is provided but the results are often less than satisfactory. Students needing special education instruction and services are either mainstreamed into regular classrooms, spending part of the day in another classroom with a special education resource specialist, or in a self-contained special day class composed entirely of students with special needs. And there are two different groups of special education teachers who do this work: university pre-service teachers and special education interns. The first are those who have completed a fifth year of university course work, prior to full-time employment, which addresses the exceptional child, guidance and assessment in special education, mild and severe disabilities, and teaching methods. In addition, many of them have a general education credential and also complete a Special Education M.A. or M.Ed.

Because the University is responsible for the induction and clear credential recommendation of these new teachers they are not automatically included in the BTSA program. Some universities, however, have been successful in persuading BTSA programs to include these teachers as funded participants in their induction process. Whether they do or do not participate in that process, each new special education teacher’s supervisor or support provider must also be a special education teacher.

Interns make up the second group of special education teachers. Some interns have been classroom aides, substitutes, have a family member with special needs or, already credentialed, they are changing their focus to special education. A larger number, however, consists of people with an undergraduate degree and no teaching experience. Prior to entering the classroom as teachers of record the interns’ pre-service preparation usually consists of two classes, one addressing the exceptional child and the other a survival course that touches on a
little bit of everything. The rest of the course work is taught once school has begun and after
the intern’s teaching day has ended. The interns in university or private programs must have,
at a minimum, a university supervisor and those in district programs must have a support
provider. An MOU determines whether university interns are also assigned district support
providers.

BTSA  general education and subject-specific teachers have at least one pre-service course in
special populations. Intern general education teachers do most of their course work during the
school year. A number of the interns made positive comments about classes. As noted in
Question 2, the BTSA teachers also have seminars and workshops during their induction period.
Some found them enriching while others were less satisfied. In particular, those teachers
believed they needed more assistance with the problems that most of their mainstreamed
students would have, i.e. more strategies for working with ADD than with autism. They deeply
appreciate it when support providers observe their work with special education focal students
and report learning a lot from these experienced teachers’ insights and strategies. But as one
administrator noted, many are still mystified about how to address these needs in their
classrooms.

The general education and subject-specific intern teachers are also highly complementary of
the supervisors and mentors who assist them. Comments such as “The advisors are very
professional, they understand our background,” “she taught us how to read the IEP . . . or how
to contact the resource person for a student,” and “we have our special education resources
person on our school site were expressed by interns.

A supervisor in one district stated that,

   We have done our staff development with the (regular) support providers and the
special education support providers. We’ve been doing role-playing scenarios. It’s
giving us exposure on how they work with their intern teachers, the challenges they are
facing with their students. I think we benefit from that.

Concern about the adequacy of the experiences interns working with special needs students
were having was expressed by a number of people working with these teachers. An intern
graduate said,

   I think that more can be done to train and to support the general education people
coming in as to mainstreaming my guys, because at that point it’s a shared responsibility
and obligation to those special ed. students who have the right to be mainstreamed.
And yet it is not always the case that my aide or I can come in and support them with
their 20-some kids already. So it kind of leaves them high and dry. What do I do? How
much intervening do I need to do? Or do I just set them in front of the computer? How do we support the general ed. and what is their role with the mainstream student.

Support providers discuss the skill level of the mainstreamed students and the curricular problems the general education teachers and the students face.

The majority of the classes I’m going to are moderate to severe. I’ve had kids who are being mainstreamed into a General Ed class and going into fifth grade when their skills are on second grade level. So I said, “Okay, understand they can be exposed to it, but they’re not going to be able to do all of the writing and whatever.”

An area not being addressed is curriculum for Special Education. The regular curriculum must be adapted for Special Education. It is difficult for some Interns to adapt the curriculum. We provide as much help as we can. We help by example and observation.

One issue not being addressed is that of adapting curriculum for special needs students. The book may be at 4th grade level, but the students may read at 2nd grade level, but they are expected to share the same curriculum. It is very difficult for the Interns, because they do not have the experience to do this.

Commenting on a mathematics methods course one intern also addressed this issue stating, I just thought it was really more for mild to moderate students ‘cause they’re talking about how to teach kids long division. Most of my kids can’t talk, they can’t write. I really need to know how to modify and adapt things for a basic level and I don’t think there was a lot of time spent on that. When you’re just in the classroom and you’re trying to teach somebody and you’re getting blank stares you’re like, ‘How can I change those?’

How to control special needs students with behavior problems was another problem that was mentioned.

I don't think they have classes on how do you handle children with Attention Deficit, children that cannot sit still in the classroom, they have to run around and the parents don’t want them on medication. So how do you address these needs? And new teachers have no concept – I think regular Ed have no concept of how to refer them to specialists. And I think there needs to be some more training addressing the serious needs of today’s children.

When you have a brand new teacher that has these kinds of issues it’s real discouraging when there’s not a lot of consistency or some kind of a program or something to help these kids who have consistent behavior issues.
The problems and frustration of special education interns were also very clear. A supervising teacher declared,

    They are dumping kids in any special education classroom and you (the interns) are expected to be the miracle workers. We’ve got one gal with 18 to 20 kids, she has learning handicapped, autistic, a couple of EDs, a couple OHEs, probably an OHI.

A director stated that,

    In special education the expectation is that they want them to contain the classroom. To teach children with disabilities and address behavior and you need to have a lot of experience in your pocket so that’s a lot to ask from an intern. (Then) when they can’t deliver the goods, then the principal says well, this intern needs to go. So that’s that.

A special education intern who is working with general education teachers who have mainstreamed students declared,

    We have teachers who are trying to fix their curriculum to kinda meld us into it and we have to change it as we go. We are kinda teaching ourselves a lot and teaching the teacher certain things at the same time.

Finally, according to one university instructor, “The biggest challenge is finding credential teachers on site to work with them. At one school there is not a single credentialed teacher in the spec education department.” And another added, “We have asked the pts to find their own support provider. Generally we are able to find support providers. If there is just one credentialed teacher in the school then it is not fair to have them support multiple teachers.”

What is not clear from field data like that collected for this study is whether the frustration and anxiety generated among BTSA and intern teachers confronting the complexities of managing classrooms and teaching academic content to special education and English learner student can really be overcome by better support and more training. These frustrations are felt by experienced as well as novice teachers. Indeed, experienced special education teachers are leaving these classrooms at such a rate as to create a severe shortage of such qualified teachers. It may be that the challenges of special education and English learner instruction will require substantially more training than can be provided in today’s teacher preparation programs. And substantially smaller case loads may be required for the teachers with these responsibilities.

Traditionally organized general education classrooms can be run efficiently because they rely on the implementation of instructional programs rather than the treatment of individual student cases. Special education policies and practices and, to a lesser extent, English instruction for English language learners are being pressured to adopt a case management approach rather than a program implementation approach to teaching. But case management systems require much better data management systems, more thoroughly professional staff,
and much more individual and intimate contact with clients than public school teaching now provides.

Nevertheless, policy makers and program managers could take prudent steps to upgrade the preparation of the teachers to bring a more case management perspective into their classrooms. More detailed cases analyses, more longitudinal tracking of focal students, better training in how to monitor student responses to teacher interventions would all help to ameliorate, if not resolve, the frustrations and anxieties we encountered.

**Study Question #5: Administrative Structures**

*What, if any, state, regional and/or local administrative structures could improve the support services for Induction and intern teachers?*

There are at least five ways in which better administrative structures might lead to better support for teachers. Helpful administrative actions can provide one or any combination of the following:

1. Increase opportunities for motivated and skilled support providers to spend quality time with the teachers who most need them.
2. Enhance the capacity of existing support providers through training and self-reflection.
3. Authorize and direct the focus of support providers – foreclose and prevent unsupportive activities and call attention to more effective methods and actions.
4. Redirect human and fiscal resources to provide greater incentives for high quality support services and to reduce incentives for less productive ones.
5. Develop and implement more effective accountability mechanisms to assure best use of the support provider capacity that already exists.

In this section we review briefly some of the most logical administrative structure changes implicit in the case study and quantitative data collected for this study.

*On Opportunity*

We were singularly impressed by how broadly the leadership of both BTSA and Intern programs are motivated and engaged in this work. We were also impressed that they often feel constrained, and not always helpfully so, by the regulations and guidelines that flow toward them from many sources. One site administrator, commenting on the constraining character of the BTSA formative assessment system said of the new teachers at his school:

*They have so much more to do than we did. And we can’t give them extra duties because they are so committed to the box, and the box becomes their life. The nature*
of the relationship with the support provider changes from one of coaching, to one of trying to figure out the box.

Additional constraints arise from the classroom work responsibilities affecting support providers,

Because of the support provider’s own classroom responsibilities and the amount of work required in her job, the new teacher is often left on her own trying to innovate solutions. And when a program that is ostensibly supportive has this result, then it defeats the purpose of the program.

One area where enthusiasm was evident but opportunities limited was in the potential for a disconnection between program support providers and school site administrations. One story makes it clear that opportunities in one area are not always matched in the other. The following episode related by an administrator illustrates the point very well.

We had a situation with a teacher who seemed to be humming along, the support provider and I liked what we were seeing in the classroom. He still had work to do, but seemed to have a nice way of relating to the kids, doing a good job at the lessons. I started to become aware about probably in the last two months; this person is not engaged in the team philosophy piece. Kind of keeping to himself, doing his own thing, concentrating on his lessons, so looking really good in the classroom, and performing very well but not connecting with the rest of the learning community. My team came to me and said, “we don’t think that this is the person that we want,” and I’m like, [gasp]. And we realized that somehow it was . . . I felt very very badly about it. Because we had not had those conversations. We are trying to figure out how as part of BTSA, we could make sure ... now it is so important, that collaboration piece, meeting, working together, talking about instruction, talking about assessments, that if someone is in the closed door mentality, I’m doing my thing in my classroom, everybody else is out there. That doesn’t work at my school. I am not looking for a person like that. No matter if they are effective in the classroom. It was kind of a huge dark cloud I wasn’t real conformable dealing with it. We’re gonna try to make sure at least there’s an awareness of that level of participation, with the team, planning, talking to the team, kind of seeing how that relates.

Another administrator put this matter bluntly, saying,

For a teacher who is about to be non re-elected, there should be more collaboration and not so much confidential information. We want the teacher to be successful. There is a division. We are all in this together. I don’t know if every SP can do that to help improve instructional practice and retain teachers- that is my goal!

And another said that her support provider,
rarely sees me. I would like her to be on the leadership Team or in some capacity as a leader at the site.

On Capacity

The capacity to provide support for new teachers rests on the skills and abilities of the support providers as much as on their motivation and opportunities to be of assistance. Sometimes case study data provided evidence of support providers who were too distracted by their own work responsibilities or carrying such a large “case load” of teachers to whom they were assigned to be able to provide help at the time and of the quality needed. More often, however, when the support system was seen as having difficulty, the comments were more like the one provided by the following administrator who said of himself:

Being a new administrator I still don’t have all the tools and all the knowledge of how to work with a first year teacher and so the intern program has offered me a lot of help. Not directly but offered me a lot of help to get this teacher where she should be to serve the student population that we have in a good manner.

Support providers in both the BTSA and Intern programs reported learning much from the new teachers they were assigned to assist.

Most important, as described throughout this report, quality support depends on the personal skill and capacity of individual support providers. Repeated testimony from new teachers in both BTSA and intern programs and the powerful structural equation models documenting successful program operations document that support must be skilled as well as timely in order to be effective. In addition to having mastered the core educational skills of classroom management, curriculum planning, achievement monitoring and child development, support providers can only work effectively if they understand adult learning, professional role development, peer counseling and the management of relationships with peers and superiors in the school organization. These latter skills are not native to successful classroom teachers, they need to be nurtured and supported providers need to be screened and trained for their ability to master these coaching and counseling skills.

Overall, the BTSA programs we studied had more training for their support providers than is being provided to intern support personnel, but more could be done to assure that all support providers are adequately trained. We saw many sites where there are good training materials and heard many reports of their effective use. What is needed is more thorough and more consistent training. This is a particularly serious problem where support providers are being replaced every two or three years.
On Authorization and Direction

The most challenging aspect of high quality support for new teachers is to balance the flexibility needed to address the needs of individual teachers with the uniformity of service required to meet program and professional teaching standards. In the BTSA program we found more regularity and uniformity. The support providers, along with the teachers they are trying to help, and the BTSA program staff directing and coordinating their efforts all feel substantial pressure to execute required activities and to provide required evidence of completing them. They generally believe that they are not authorized to excuse an already competent participating teacher from required training. And new teachers who may have some strengths but lack skill or sensitivity in a particular area, nevertheless are asked to complete most or all of the standard courses and activities. This leads to complaints that the program is designed as a “one size fits all” package with too much emphasis on evidence collection and paperwork.

To be sure, some program leaders in both BTSA and intern programs have felt sufficiently empowered to elaborate and revise the program to emphasize support, but a significant number do not. A few have administratively combined BTSA and intern programs and some are talking about the virtues of trying not to,

look at teachers differently and differentiate them. “That one is an Intern.” “This one is BTSA.” They are all teachers.

But rather to “Look at the person, not the credential.”

The important point here is that tightening direction and elaborating standards for each program to meet can reach a point of sharply diminishing returns – especially when professional staff feels pressed for compliance and not authorized to make situational adjustments.

On Redirecting Resources

The overall effectiveness of support for new teachers could be significantly improved by modest redirection of state and local resources. The first target for resource enhancements would be the support providers. The primary problem is not so much cash stipends (though they are valued, and the lower state support for interns has meant inadequate cash stipends for attracting these support providers).

The more serious problem involves giving support providers the skills, time and resources needed to provide high quality assistance. Adequately training support providers is not cheap. In one of our case study sites we saw what serious training can do for support providers, but this site manages to garner thousands of dollars per support provider in outside funding to
support their training. What we saw, however, is that support providers need quality time to learn and practice skills that are not typically needed by classroom teachers – even excellent teachers need not have the peer counseling, reflective conversation and other crucial skills to be routinely effective in working with the new teachers. For part time support providers, this training would require both cash stipends for time spent in the training process and fiscal support to secure release from other duties in order to participate in the training.

A third target for enhanced resourcing is in data management. With current fiscal data management it is impossible to monitor either budget categories or expenditure patterns in a way that allows for assessing the cost effectiveness of either BTSA or intern program operations. And monitoring the impact of either of these programs on either teacher careers or student achievement is practically impossible. As the fiscal studies developed by staff at the American Institutes for Research (Palo Alto), demonstrate quite clearly, it would take a major, multi-year study to identify the actual costs of these programs and to determine whether what resources are being used for is the most effective way to invest taxpayer funds.

**On Accountability**

As described further in the policy recommendations section of this report, the accountability systems for BTSA and intern programs are complex and in need of careful review. It is premature to identify the most appropriate adjustments to be made, but the broad outlines of what might be done are found in the best practices identified in our case study and overall population studies described previously in this report.

Conceptually, the road to improved accountability is fairly easy to describe. For the intern programs there is simply too little accountability. There are program standards that helpfully indicate what these programs are expected to accomplish. As we outlined in our discussion of Table 48, however, intern programs are responding to very powerful market forces that cause them to operate in very different ways as they try to find a viable market niche. The market place is holding these programs accountable for meeting perceived intern preferences and articulated local school district needs, but these market forces do not guarantee, and may even serve on some occasions to undermine, meeting state goals. Having a low cost way to fill classrooms with teachers who are learning on the job can be a vehicle for improving teacher training, but it can also be a way of providing the children with the greatest need teachers who are not yet ready for the responsibilities they have undertaken. Providing an opportunity for young people with limited financial means and experienced workers with family and mortgage obligations a way of earning a teacher salary while being trained to do the job often helps bring
new people into this occupation – e.g., first generation college goers whose families cannot afford training beyond the BA, returning members of the armed forces, second career seekers. At the same time, demands of teaching the most challenging students when not yet fully trained to do so, going to school at the same time, and possibly supporting a family, house and car can easily lead to bad instructional habits. Much can and should be done to bring to the intern programs some of the accountability mechanisms that have developed and matured in the BTSA program. Routine external reviews by members of other intern programs, careful review of evidence of program implementation and effects, and establishment of regional support networks have all worked to build broad understanding and commitment to common goals and similar processes across the BTSA programs and could so also for the intern programs.

For the BTSA programs there are strong accountability mechanisms, but we noted two important ways in which they could be improved. First, there has been an explosive growth in the “standards” to which the programs are held to account. While the program documents identify just 20 standards in three areas, by holding programs responsible for independently meeting each and every element in 12 of these standards has, in effect, confronted the local BTSA programs with more than 75 distinct obligations. It would help significantly if the BTSA Task Force would agree that any element which deserves to be independently evaluated should be called a standard and that any elements that are not independent of the standard which they serve to operationalize should be considered as being illustrative of the standard rather than required performance. This would lead to a reconsideration of the program standards. It could mean an expansion beyond 20, but it is clear from observation of the induction program review process that reviewing a program for evidence of meeting 75 to 90 discrete standards easily leads to an explosive disaggregation of the program and results in a search for evidence rather than for meaning.

The second aspect of BTSA’s accountability system that needs work is the recognition of the difference between evidence of performance and an account of program activities. What BTSA needs is to put more “accounting” into its accountability model – accounting in the dictionary sense of “furnishing a justifying analysis or detailed explanation” of one’s actions. Evidence of actions without an understanding of what that evidence accounts for deflects program staff from a real sense of accountability for results.

**Study Question #6: Level of Funding**
What would be a sufficient level of funding for Induction teacher and intern programs, and what criteria should state agencies use to help facilitate legislative passage of appropriate funding levels? How is funding divided between infrastructure operations and direct support to new teachers? Is this division the most effective use of funds?

Within the time limits imposed on this study it is not possible to provide very satisfying answers to this question. We have described what resources are available to the BTSA and intern programs, and identified some key indicators of performance. These are the starting points for determining whether funding is adequate. The work for this study has been severely limited by the quality of the available financial data and our inability to link it in any direct way to the outcomes which serve as reasonable indicators of program success. As described in detail in our discussions of statistical models of the relationships between various program activities and the qualitative description of their success in the minds of program participants, we are able to show what kinds of services are most important in producing successful programs. Without time to go to sites and work with business offices, as well as program directors, to ascertain the real costs of doing business, however, it is not possible to say whether variations in program outcomes are actually controlled by either the amount of money involved or the particular mix of goods and services purchased by the available funds. Our study team has no doubt, however, that on close examination it would become clear the intern program needs as much or more funding as provided to the BTSA program. Teachers in this program have more to learn and are in need of even greater support as they are making dramatic life changes.

**Study Question #7: Standards Revision**

What, if any, revisions of the BTSA and/or Intern Program Standards would facilitate increased teacher competency and/or reduce engagement in unproductive activities

**BTSA**

In reviewing the case study data there was very little concrete information concerning increased teacher competency. Site administrators were positive in their views, saying such things as, “I had 19 evaluations . . . I noted a marked improvement in skills,” and “My young teachers are . . . teaching my older teachers how to differentiate instruction.” Directors were also confident that improved competency was an outcome, commenting that, “The teacher leaders are usually graduates of our BTSA program”. And one administrator said of BTSA, that it is “very influential in bringing new ideas into the school, bringing new procedures and strategies into the school.” Quantitative data, rather than these personal and qualitative assessments, would be expected to provide better answers this question. And the CSTP is the
proper template for judging teacher competency. Presently, however, no solid quantitative measures of competency are to be had. To get the evidence teacher performance needs to be tracked with reasonably precise instruments and over an extended period of time and this has yet to be done.

The Induction standards are the primary templates for focusing BTSA program activities on the development of needed teacher competencies. In response to these standards, participating teachers are expected to successfully execute a series of tasks presumed to demonstrate that they have completed these standards and achieved the competencies needed to qualify for a clear credential. In order to meet the induction standards, they must not only engage in the prescribed activities, they must also provide documentary evidence that they have met elements listed in Standard 14, Completion of the Professional Teacher Induction Requirements.

The case study data show that interview participants agree that there must be evidence and that it will take the form of paperwork. There is not agreement, however, about the amount of paperwork that is presently required. The following is a sample of the comments made by participating teachers, completers, support providers, administrators and directors about this issue.

From Participating Teachers

I think the idea behind BTSA is great but the process in buried in paperwork. We are always filling out forms.

From BTSA Completers

A lot of what we’re doing here is duplication. The paperwork is immense; maybe, part of that should be trimmed down and there should be a focus on other things. For me it was just a ton of paperwork. It was just making a lot of checkmarks and dealing with red tape.

From the Support Providers

I think the paperwork has always been a complaint. We always hear how it is redundant, and that it needs to be streamlined.
We could get more accomplished if we didn’t have to use our hour every week to nail some of the paperwork.

From Site Administrators

Is there any way to reduce some of the time consuming paper work kinds of things? There are a lot of ways to show competency without having to write it down over and over again.

From the Directors

There is a lot of redundant paperwork with BTSA. “Did I already read that?” And then you go down and say, “Didn’t I already read that?” And having written all of that, there is certain level of frustration of writing the same thing again and again and again.

The cause of much of this excessive paperwork is believed to result from two things. The first is the elements in the standards. A number of people believed that an element found in one standard which then repeats itself in another just does not need to be there. PTs stated they had to put identical documents in numerous folders because the same proof was needed for a number of elements. One person neatly summed up what others were saying with the following comment,

Twenty program standards with a zillion competencies are way too many. I think standards around content and pedagogy, ELL, special populations and equity are important standards but I’d shrink their competencies from a zillion to 10. What is the essence we need new teachers to know and be able to do. I’d also look at the 20 and see if we could get down to 15 or something.

The second cause is CFASST and the CFASST box. Discussion of this problem is found in Study Question number eight.

**Interns**

Most interns spend their working days in hard to serve, high poverty, urban districts, districts that cannot hire enough certificated teachers to fill the classrooms. Then, when they finish their contractual day, they are back in the classroom as students – learning how to teach. They
routinely report that they hope to use what they learn in their classroom immediately, the very next day if possible. Hopefully, they will build a better sense of curriculum sequences and instructional options as the year progresses (most do) but until that happens they find long term planning difficult and frustrating. Adding to the hectic schedule of teaching, studying, planning and consulting with support providers is the need to prepare for and complete Teaching Performance Assessments – the assessment vehicle used to determine whether they should receive the preliminary credential. No one argues that this formative assessment should be discontinued. Instead, they wonder how to make the process less burdensome and still fulfill its purpose.

Careful screening of intern applicants is important to their success as they need to have emotional maturity, a sense of how to work with children and a decent grasp of the subjects they are expected to teach. But the pressure to fill classrooms with teachers who meet the requirements of No Child Left Behind, the encouraging of young people to begin their teaching careers as interns, and the financial incentive of earning a teacher’s salary while preparing for a credential all conspire to keep careful screening of candidates from becoming the top priority for many schools, intern applicants and program directors. No matter how well screened, every intern needs a strong support provider. We find that this need is not always met as school systems and university trainers struggle to find qualified support providers willing to take on this responsibility for the quite small amounts of money offered for their services.

Many programs are able to make certain that each intern receives regular support and attention from both a supervisor and experienced teacher. One of our case study intern programs has gone so far as to tell their interns that they are not permitted to work full-time, because they do not believe that it is fair to the interns or their students. Hence, interns in this program teach no more than 60% of the school day. A number of interns in this program share classrooms, each teaching 50%, so that the classes have full teacher coverage.

Where money is an important consideration – often for first generation college students whose families cannot sustain them beyond the bachelor’s degree – the state might consider whether significantly raising the size of scholarships and fellowships for interns. This would enable them to routinely begin work in a shared teaching assignment, and thus to concentrate on their own training as well as that of their students.

Finally, when interns complete their program and receive their preliminary teaching credential they are often faced with two years of BTSA. These people have already been full-time teachers when they begin work on the clear credential and their need for further professional development differs from that of the pre-service teacher assuming solo responsibility of a classroom for the first time. Careful thought should be given to providing in-service programs which enrich and enhance their growth rather than repeating the work they have just
completed. Instead of receiving the “bag of tricks” from the seasoned teacher these clear credential candidates should now be analyzing how and why the “tricks” work, using their seminar and workshop time to become active creators and “givers” in the process. Absent substantially enriched support and development options, most teachers coming through the intern programs should have an opportunity to elect the BTSA Early Completion Option to shorten their induction obligations.

Study Question #8: Eliminating Duplication

What, if any, changes in laws, regulations and/or policies would help eliminate duplicative requirements, streamline and coordinate support services for beginning teachers and interns?

An analysis of the case study data reveals that the participants – the participating teachers (PTs), BTSA completers, support providers, site administrators and coordinators/directors - have both similar and differing opinions about the BTSA Induction program activities and procedures. For example, there is general agreement that support providers (consulting teachers, coaches, mentors) make a significant difference in the life of a new teacher. A director stated, “The support provider has a pivotal role in the collection of data with the beginning teachers. . . . It also means that our program is as good and strong as our weakest support provider,” while an administrator said, “The consulting teachers know more of what we are trying to get across. They bridge the gap.” A BTSA completer declared, “A mentor makes a big difference. My mentor was amazing and I still use little tricks that she taught me.” And a PT stated, “What do I want to teach [my students] them and how am I going to get them there? My coach has been really helpful.”

Classroom observation by support providers and observing other teachers also received high praise.

I got a chance to go to observe other classes. That was really cool. [my SP knew who were the best to see in various subjects] So I go to see those best teachers. It was cool for me ‘cause I got to see the other people who are really good at their profession,

was the way one PT stated it.

Another commented it was, “Valuable to be able to observe other teachers. Looking at other teachers, I found so much information; even looking at what other teachers put on their walls.” And when it came to seminars, workshops and/or in-services, people generally agreed that
those addressing classroom management, diversity, gangs, differentiation training, and tiering were well received. In addition, PTs believe, “The better workshops are ones that give us stuff to take back to the classroom. It’s particularly valuable to have things we can use in the classroom.”

While the following sentiments are not universal the data reveal there is quite a bit of concern among the various participants about other activities and experiences within the BTSA program. As one director said,

The program was originally intended to be a seamless transition from the university program to the district’s program of Induction. . . And the support provider working with the participating teacher and that participating teacher was suppose to come from the university with documents in hand to say, ‘this is a snap shot of my learning from the university program. Take me from here.’ And you know, ‘take me from here’ instead of having repetition of university work. Those documents have not been forth coming.

And this lack of information has contributed to significant static in the system. The BTSA teachers, having their preliminary teaching credentials, come to the schools having completed a series of courses, a number of which are very similar to those offered in the BTSA program. According to the focus group data those who went through rigorous fifth year programs feel that some of the seminars have been redundant, time wasters. They are particularly critical of the technology course that is offered by most programs. Comments include remarks like, “Having to do this course [technology], it’s almost insulting,” “I would like educational software and stuff I could use with my kids because I’m an Excel master and I don’t need to learn [excel sheets] anymore,” and “The technology course that I took last year was the biggest waste of time.”

Other participants concurred saying, “The technology standard is too simple. It was redundant, low level.” “A waiver should be offered to those who don’t need the technology component.” An administrator commented, from on-going conversations with PTs, that “The technology . . . components are not really valuable for new teachers - they’ve already acquired those skills.” A director, aware of the issue, stated, “The technology training is obsolete; new teachers already know it - even in terms of application.” And because technological equipment is not always available for classroom use a support provider said, “Maybe there needs to be a little more leeway in what is counted as evidence for technology. Some schools have less, a lot less, technology than others. It might be better to ask how you used the technology available to you to enhance your lessons.” While it may be a realistic accommodation to an all too frequent
situation, this requested leeway would, of course, tend to undermine the goal of having a universal standard of technology utilization.

A number of participating teachers were also critical of the health course and, depending upon the quality of the seminar or on-line course, the ELL presentation. They know that ELL training is valuable to them (unless they are teaching foreign languages) but the “ELL lesson, it’s too shallow. You are just doing it but it has no meaning.” Another commented, “I actually had read some of the same articles in college.” The following sums up their feelings. “BTSA did not provide anything new,” we “need more on SDAIE training.”

Static in the system has also arisen from the way that CFASST has been applied. One BTSA completer commented that “It would be interesting to know how CFASST has changed. Because I know they have cut down the number of questions and events.” Said another, “They probably took out some of the redundancies.” An analysis of the data, however, reveals that some people believe there was either no change or there wasn’t enough. PTs said, “CFASST should be reevaluated to determine how much time should be spent on each event and to eliminate repetitiveness in different events” and “Within the BTSA box, we are signing off on the same certificates in every event. So that was repetitive and not too useful.” Other BTSA completers responded,

Cutting down the redundancy and unnecessary detail of CFASST would make it more reconcilable with interpersonal aspects of BTSA.

The documentation for CFASST is so immense and unnecessary; it seems that it’s like ‘big brother’ watching over you. It sometimes served to shake my confidence.

and

Some of the paperwork was good, like the evaluation piece where you had to rate yourself. But there were certain pieces that I had just felt that I done in college. It’s not so much the paperwork, but it’s the redundancy of it. They have the same questions just reworded in different CFASST events.

One administrator concluded, “It’s the redundancy within the box. There are a lot of ways to show competency without having to write it down over and over again.” There was general consensus among a group of administrators that “the things that are really important . . . become overshadowed by the box. And they stop seeing value in the whole program. We have to find a more efficient way to document the process, so the teachers appreciate the value to the process.” Moreover, according to another administrator, “There is a lot of overlap between
the professional development at the district level and what BTSA does. Having the flexibility to eliminate this overlap would allow for the new teacher to have more time and less work. Also, we have so many staff development meetings that we could check off a lot of the competency areas for a new teacher and cut down on the CFASST paperwork.”

Finally, in at least one director’s opinion, “CFASST - the burdensome and redundant nature causes teachers to become disillusioned about BTSA.” She didn’t feel that the CFASST training sessions are useful.

The CFASST events and the induction standards are also criticized because they have produced “too much of a one size fits all” program. Some of the PTs say,

Make the program more subject specific. There are multiple subjects where we have to collect evidence and, on the secondary level, that can be burdensome and not very practical. It shouldn’t be a one size fits all program. And with CFASST, there’s not as much room for negotiation. There’s a reason to get a single-subject credential and that should be to focus on that area.

And, according to some of the support providers, “Having to do all of these twelve events robs us of the time to come up with the innovative strategies which have made our schools so high performing.” In addition, “We talk about the standards – how are you going to make your lesson fit this child that doesn’t fit in the norm. And then we turn around and say to the PTs, ‘all of you fit in the norm.’”

The amount of paperwork required to document completion of CFASST events and induction standards was considered, by many, as both redundant and busy work. Some PT comments were,

I understand why you have to have the paper work, because they need evidence. That’s one of the least valuable parts, you know documenting everything.

I think the idea behind it is great. But the process has been buried in paperwork.

They would say, ‘don’t worry you are not going to be doing any extra work because it’s just going along with what you are doing in the classroom,’ and that’s just garbage. The paperwork on top of the lessons is just busywork.
and

Even though it helps, BTSA is very time consuming. It’s difficult enough trying to find out who I am as a teacher, with the help of all the activities, without all the paperwork.

Still another teacher declared, “I think it is very helpful to have a support provider, because I find myself drowning in paperwork,” and “The BTSA paperwork is too much. I don’t think it helps me necessarily to write these things down.”

And a PT wag responded, “Paper work can be tedious. Paper work is something required by the State. I blame the State for the paper work, but that’s the nature of politicians.”

The BTSA completers believed that,

The first year should be less of a burden to the teacher and have less paperwork. The first year should involve more hands-on things with their BTSA providers, grade level collaborations, observations and learning how to be a teacher.

The second year the paperwork becomes less burdensome because it actually was something that I was doing. During the first year, it just seemed like these random questions, and why am I filling out this sheet for the 500th time.

The intention of those seminars is to retain new teachers, and that’s great and they give a lot of work to them to take home which is not helpful to the new teacher. It’s just administrative work so they can stamp off and say, we told them this, this and this.

One administrator said, “Sometimes the volume of paper work and the volume of meetings they need to go to, can really be like the giant pack on top of an already full pack.” Another said, “I want to see a Performance Component to BTSA. Some teachers are ‘natural born teachers’ and could forego some of the busy work. They’re already meeting the goals of the events.”

Finally, participating teachers are asked to reflect on their teaching practice and they acknowledge that both it is a good exercise to do and they have learned from it. Some, however, have also reflected on the practices of the BTSA program and “feel that the way the program is set up is opposite to what good teaching actually is.” “Even the manner in which we’re instructed too. It’s not really instruction, it’s more lecture, and we’re to sit and absorb; which is everything we’ve been taught not to do as teachers.” Support providers alluded to that and a director believed, “a lot of our new teachers, especially, feel they are losing that
which we all love about teaching – the ability to be creative and think outside the box and plan lessons - so that approach is driving our teachers away as well.”

The two areas where redundancy and duplication are generating the most frustration on the part of BTSA participating teachers are the recording of formative assessment data in response to CFASST events and efforts to train new teachers in the application of technology to their instructional practices. Beginning teachers are the most vocal in venting this frustration, but support providers, site administrators and program staff are all well aware of the issues. With regard to the CFASST assessment process, there are few complaints about the assessment events themselves; the point of frustration is the nature of the recording and documenting of those events. There are two related complaints about the required documentation: that the same questions and even the same forms are used repeatedly and that a significant portion of the support provider/participating teacher interaction time must be devoted to completing the “paperwork” associated with this documentation. In part, these complaints arise because educators, unlike professional in law, architecture, medicine and accounting are simply not used to creating reliable records of their activities for later review and analysis. And, to the extent that this is the source of the complaints, BTSA leadership might want to consider making a serious and sustained effort to persuade teachers that good record keeping is a key component in the development of any professional service. To do so, however, much more needs to be done with showing the novice teachers how they can learn from this record keeping activity so that they do not persist in feeling that the records are just documentation of compliance with program requirements. To a significant degree, the frustrations and complaints about paperwork and record keeping voiced by the participating teachers, and recognized by all of the other stakeholder groups, are the result of the fact that much of the CFASST documentation is, in fact, being used to monitor compliance rather than fuel professional development. This is not how the CFASST designers intended this assessment system to be used, of course, but there has been a tendency to slide into a mentality of compliance documentation that avoids tough questions about teacher competency and sharply reduces the amount of time and attention that needs to be given to the recording process and its interpretation.

The other significant area of redundancy is in efforts to help beginning teachers with the utilization of technology in their instructional practices. The problem is twofold. On the one hand, recent graduates from university pre-service programs are getting a lot more exposure to technology and have much less need for the relatively low level instruction and application exercises most BTSA programs are providing. Indeed, many support providers report that they learn more from their participating teachers than they teach to them on this topic. On the other hand, technologies are changing rapidly and most local school systems have employed
full time staff to assist with technology support. Hence there are other sources of technology support that can be expected to outstrip the training and support BTSA provides.
VII. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

This section summarizes the findings of this broad ranging study, and then sets forth several administrative and policy recommendations that arise from an analysis of these findings. The summary is presented within the context of the answers to the eight study questions. Policy and administrative recommendations are developed in a separate subsection focused on recommended actions that spring from this summary. Some of the most important recommendations are couched in terms of the need to balance practical and substantive considerations, and some are accompanied by a brief description of how choice options will necessarily be guided by professional, political and civic values as much as by the dictates of this, or any other, research study.

Summary of Study Findings

We begin our summary of study findings with a brief reprise of the critical insights to be garnered from our review of previous research into the problems of teacher induction and alternative certification. The review of prior research detailed in Section III of this report delineates well established facts about induction and alternative certification programs, but it also highlights central issues that remain controversial and unsettled. The evaluation study reported here addresses some, but not all of these unsettled and controversial matters.

On Prior Research

The reviewed prior research reveals a fairly broad consensus about the goals and objectives of new teacher induction and alternative certification programs. In both cases, California policies are unique, but they also share, to a considerable degree, the broad purposes being investigated in professional discussions and in scholarly research and analysis.

The California BTSA Induction program, like other new teacher support and induction programs rests on two broadly supported research findings. First, it is widely believed that the performance level of teachers throughout the public school system is in need of significant improvement. The need for improvement is seen as substantially beyond what can be expected from university-based pre-service training programs. There are diverse explanations for why this substantial improvement is needed. Some observers look upon the schools as a protected publicly supported monopoly which has been a haven for relatively low performance personnel. Others see the need as arising from the globalization of economics and politics which puts us in direct competition with other national education systems – and a number of studies have indicated that we are substantially behind other, more competitive, national
systems. Still other observers see the need for improvement as arising from the dramatic growth and cultural and economic shifts in our school age population. Whatever the reason, these concerns converge to produce substantial pressure to improve school and teacher performance.

A second broadly supported research conclusion that lies behind the creation of BTSA, and other induction programs across the nation, is the proposition that there is an unacceptably high level of teacher turnover at the school level and attrition rate from the occupation. This high turnover and attrition rate, research tells us, can be significantly ameliorated by programs that provide substantial direct personal support to new teachers through experienced teachers who serve as mentors, coaches, trainers or, as the BTSA program calls them, support providers.

The goals of alternative certification programs are also broadly agreed upon and supported. These programs are intended to attract individuals from usually under-represented social, academic and occupational groups into the teaching workforce. In part this is to provide access to teaching for individuals who would otherwise not be able to move into this occupational group because they lack the time or resources needed to pursue the standard, university-based teacher pre-service programs. Also, in part, the motivation is to get individuals who have leadership, subject matter or social skills needed by the schools to consider this occupation. And, in part, the motivation is to build a teaching workforce that is far more representative of the diverse students they must teach than is currently the case.

Alternative certification programs are also being created as a means of bringing much needed teaching staff into hard to staff schools and hard to fill teaching specialties. Science and math teachers, special education teachers, and to a lesser extent English teachers are most needed at the present time, but when California was hard pressed to implement its massive class size reduction program in the 1990s, the need for alternative certification was focused on the multiple subject credential programs that prepare teachers for elementary school classrooms.

Not all analysts agree that either the BTSA Induction or an alternative certification approach are the most effective ways to meet school needs for staff and program improvement. While almost all authors are enthusiastic about the potential of some form of new teacher induction to enhance teacher skills and career commitments, the alternative certification approach to recruiting from different pools of potential teachers and prepare them to solve a significant teacher shortage problem is much more controversial. Analysts with a positive view see the potential for stronger, more practical and more substantial teacher training, but critics see the potential for abuse and emphasize the ways in which children are put at risk of receiving an inadequate education from inexperienced and potentially ill-trained teachers.
Induction programs also face some significant critics, though they tend to be fewer in number and less strident in their criticisms. Two criticisms of induction programs give some pause for reflection, however. First, the issue of teacher retention may be less serious than previously thought as more recent research finds that, in part because the workforce is predominantly female, teachers tend to take child bearing and family nurture leaves after which they return to teaching and thus are not lost to the occupation in the way early studies had concluded. Second, some questions have been raised about whether new teacher effectiveness is as substantially improved as the early advocates expected. The most critical reviewers insist that there is little really reliable evidence that expected improvements in student achievement are actually forthcoming from new teachers who have undergone induction programs.

The alternative certification programs are succeeding in bringing new populations into the workforce – more minorities and a significant number of career changers. The largest number of individuals pursuing intern programs are recent college graduates, teachers’ aides and substitute teachers moving up in the school systems’ internal labor markets, and first generation college goers who cannot afford to resist the lure of a full-time teacher salary while they are in training. In creating a market-driven response to teacher shortages, however, the alternative certification programs are often tempted to make training less rigorous and to concentrate on “filling classrooms” rather than training teachers. California policy makes it quite clear that the intern programs are expected to produce better teachers by capitalizing on prior experience and building rigorous training components. In the market environment, however, lowering the cost to applicants and facilitating the placement of teachers in hard to fill classroom can easily squeeze program quality.

On the Study Findings

Findings related to each of the eight study questions guiding this evaluation are presented in detail in the sub-sections identifying each question. By way of summary, we present a few highlights that underscore the most important findings and lead to the formulation of recommendations for policy and administrative actions.

Before reviewing the salient findings, however, we need to address two important aspects of this question which could not be answered through this study because there were only a few months to locate needed data, persuade those who control the data to share it, and then to gather it and then analyze and interpret the findings. Some important questions would, of necessity require more than a full year of data collection in order to reliably link program expenditures, activities and outcomes to changes in teacher and student behavior. Thus, for
example, no data linking teacher support services to changes in their teaching behaviors or to student achievement could be assembled. While one large district did provide the research team with student achievement data linked to anonymous teacher identifiers, it was impossible to secure needed BTSA teacher identifiers for these files and thus impossible to discern whether BTSA participation is in any way correlated with student outcomes.

It was also impossible to assemble fiscal data in a way that would make a definitive study of either BTSA or intern program cost-effectiveness workable. The gross amounts per teacher provided by the state are effectively identical for each teacher across all local programs. And it is universally recognized that recorded local program expenditures that result from “in-kind” contributions to either program bear very little relationship to the actual costs incurred as programs coordinate activities with other professional development services, or see their resources encroached upon by high priority school or district needs. It was possible to document the overall distribution of funds for BTSA and local intern programs, and to clearly identify the need for greater investment in the work of coordination and support staff groups such as the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors and the statewide BTSA Task Force. But even here, the study conclusions rest more on qualitative interpretation of staff and program participant interview data than on any hard evidence regarding exactly what is being purchased with the funds that are available.

It was quite evident that staff leadership and program monitoring by California Department of Education and Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff fall substantially short of the resources needed to keep the BTSA and intern programs moving forward in thinking, planning and coordinated action. The BTSA program is in much better shape than is the intern program because BTSA has managed to build into its design both the Cluster Regional Directors and, to a lesser extent, local BTSA program budgets some resources to be used for planning and program development. The intern program relies very heavily on the entrepreneurial motivations of local intern programs to stimulate innovation, but this stimulation, as we describe more fully below, leads to substantially divergent forms of the intern programs – forms that may not always be aligned with state interests.

Although the inability to tie BTSA induction to student outcomes or to adequately document cost-effectiveness (issues that will be taken up in our recommendations below) has frustrated the effort to answer some important questions, there are important theoretical and practical findings to be summarized and to be used as the basis for developing recommendations for program improvement. The following points summarize conclusions, supported by the data, which should be carefully considered in framing policy and administrative decisions.
Question #1: Is BTSA meeting Education Code objectives?

The first study question focused attention on how well the Beginning Support and Assessment programs are meeting legislative expectations. Though much more detail is provided in the body of this report, six observations provide a broad overview of how to answer this question.

1. Senior BTSA staff are competent, enthusiastic professionals who display substantial loyalty to the legislative intent and the standards and guidelines for BTSA.

Morale is high, cooperation with statewide and regional leadership is generally quite fulsome, and turnover among program directors is modest. There are some local programs in which the program directors do not appear to have sufficient administrative authority or status to secure full cooperation from local schools and school district executives, and this issue could well be addressed as a program development priority.

2. Commitment to and implementation of explicit training activities aimed at fulfilling the requirements of the new teacher induction standards (program standards 15 through 20) can be easily recognized in both the case study transcripts and the statewide survey data.

While commitment to this training is obvious, so is the fact that some aspects of the training programs need to be reviewed and improved. To a significant degree, the places where BTSTA training is not working well have arisen because university-based pre-service programs have been significantly revised in compliance with the expectations of SB2042. These university programs are now providing training that was not being provided with BTSA began. With the emphasis in university programs moving toward the same conceptions of high quality teaching as those underlying BTSA training objectives there has emerged a significant level of push back from participating teachers. Resistance to current BTSA training programs is most noticeable in the areas of technology, special populations and support for English language learners. In the case of technology utilization, participating teachers urge significant improvement or abandonment of this as a training component. Participating teachers frequently report that they have already had experience with most of the technologies being addressed in BTSA training programs. In the cases of work with special populations and support for English language learners, we find a lot of interest in the topics, but substantial concern that the training activities are repeating work already covered in the pre-service training programs and not providing the new teachers with the depth of understanding or effective applications needed to turn their fledgling knowledge into professional skill. The challenge for BTSA is to provide more and more sophisticated training in these areas without substantially increasing
the overall participating teacher workload which is perceived as creating serious problems of stress and to be intruding on needed time for day-to-day instructional planning.

3. There is strong evidence that retention among mid-career teachers in California has improved every year since about 2000. The interpretation of this improvement is far from straightforward, however.

Although they cover only the last four years or so, the BTSA Induction program tracking system shows high rates of retention among new teachers entering the occupation through this program. And a longer term analysis of average tenure relying on the CBEDS/PAIF data confirms that teachers with 3 to 12 years of teaching experience are staying in teaching longer (raising the average tenure of this group by about six-tenths of a year since 2000).

It is, however, not possible to know with certainty that the improved retention among these younger teachers is the result of the BTSA or intern training and support activities. Broad trends in the CBEDS files are found well before these programs were adopted and implemented. These data indicate that California teachers in the mid-1980s had at least as good a retention rate for the younger professionals in the workforce as those found since 2000. Deeper demographic analysis of workforce trends is needed. The “baby boom” generation was well represented in the teaching workforce by the mid-80s. Many have accumulated 25 or 30 years of experience and are starting to retire in relatively large numbers. During this period, student populations have also fluctuated substantially. And policy changes, like California’s class size reduction initiative, the high stakes high school exit examination, enforcement of the No Child Left Behind “highly qualified teacher” requirements, and above all, the vicissitudes of the state budgeting process have contributed to substantial volatility in the teacher labor market. Potential teachers appear to get the picture of job opportunities and requirements for entering the occupation quickly and to respond accordingly. The process of scaling up for the mid-90s class size reduction initiative, followed by a retreat from full implementation due to budget crises quickly led to a sharp reduction in the number of candidates seeking multiple subjects credentials, dramatically shifting the composition of intern programs. At the same time, the California State University system experienced a sharp decline in applicants for their pre-service programs.

Thus, while retention is up, it is difficult to attribute this fact to any particular program, policy or demographic trend. BTSA Induction programs have been, and remain, committed to improving teacher retention, and they have documented high levels of retention among their participating teachers. One caveat regarding relying on BTSA tenure tracking data to assess teacher retention needs to be kept in mind. About 40 percent of BTSA participating teachers
report that they earned their California teaching credentials a year or more before entering this program (presumably as long term substitutes, on emergency permits, waivers, etc.). And another modest portion of the BTSA participating teachers were fully credentialed in other states for one or more years before enrolling in BTSA. Researchers studying the retention of regional or national samples of teachers do not take this filtering into account, and can be expected to see substantially higher attrition rates because they are studying a different population of teachers.

4. BTSA programs are structured to provide intensive individualized support for new teachers. While the structure is broadly effective, some important areas for improvement were identified.

Every participating teacher has an assigned support provider. The majority of the support providers are full time teachers who care for from one to four new teachers, typically ones with similar grade level or subject area teaching responsibilities and often located in the same school. A substantial number of BTSA programs rely on full time support providers who carry case loads ranging from a dozen to more than thirty new teachers.

At least three factors influence the working relationship between support providers and their participating teachers. Teacher personalities vary widely, and some are much better suited to the care, nurture and support of new teachers than others. This consideration has become increasingly important as local BTSA programs have encountered difficulty recruiting and retaining the number and quality of support providers that are needed for the more than 20,000 new teachers entering the profession each year. The recruitment of highly motivated and sensitive support providers might be facilitated by adding more money to the stipends or salaries paid. It is more likely, however, that increased encouragement and support from district and site administrators — particularly in the form of relief from other school level duties == would be more helpful.

A second area of potential improvement for the BTSA personal support system involves the time available for communication, observation, consultation and counseling. The BTSA program is quite busy with structured activities, completion of required documentation, training seminars and formative assessment procedures. Time for responding individually and uniquely to new teacher developmental needs can sometimes be hard to find. One reason that this time is hard to find is that California school are very busy places. Everyone’s activity schedules are tightly packed. Support providers who are themselves full time teachers typically have to take time from their own teaching if they are going to observe their participating teachers. Some have suggested that giving secondary level support providers the same
preparation period as their participating teachers would allow more time for collaboration and conversation. While this would help with opportunities to talk, it would also make cross-observation of each other’s teaching very difficult to schedule.

The third area of concern has to do with support provider training and development. The skills needed to mentor and guide novice teachers are quite different from those required to manage one’s own classroom. It was fairly easy to observe a range of support provider skill and to recognize that the best providers have undergone a rigorous and extensive developmental process of their own. Supporting professional growth requires commitment to the process and ample time, but it also requires complex and subtle skills that can be learned and practiced if the support providers are given the opportunity to do so. Every BTSA program observed in this study has a support provider training program, but more resources and more time devoted to this purpose would probably pay off in better and more successful support for new teachers.

Making heavier investments in support provider training would, in turn, focus attention on the question of how long support providers should remain in this role in order to allow a substantial investment in their training to pay dividends. Some BTSA program leaders see the support providers as a cadre of school program reformers and want this aspect of the BTSA program to involve a broad range of rank and file teachers who will return to regular classroom service and continue to identify with and forward the professionalization agenda that BTSA seeks to support for all teachers. This view leads naturally to the belief that supporting new teachers should be something many experienced teachers learn to do on a part-time basis. Others see the need for intensely training a much smaller cadre of full time support providers who may or may not return to routine classroom instructional duties once their service in this role is ended. Indeed, some see becoming a support provider as a transition position leading to other school leadership roles.

5. BTSA programs, across the board, display a strong commitment to adoption and utilization of formative assessment systems based, in principle, on the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP). This commitment has been substantially moderated in the last three or four years, however, by the emergence of the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs (Program Standards) as a potent set of guidelines for BTSA program operations and evaluation. The commitment to the CSTP principles has also been substantially reified in the relatively stable formative assessment system activities and data recording forms used in each local program.
The two BTSA core documents (CSTP and Program Standards) articulate both the target for new teacher development – high performance on the CSTP – and the program operations expected to produce the desired outcomes – the 20 Program Standards. Although many observers see these two documents as mutually supportive of a common framework for facilitating movement along a learning to teach continuum, case study data make it clear that in day-to-day BTSA program operation they play very different roles. The CSTP document provides much of the rhetorical and theoretical grounding for discussions of new teacher progress toward professional competency, but the Program Standards document, combined with key elements in each program’s formative assessment system are, by far, the most potent control elements – pushing the CSTP into a more philosophical and apologetic role.

Formative assessments come in three flavors. The most widely used is the state developed California Formative Support and Assessment System for Teachers (CFASST). A few local programs use, instead, the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project’s Formative Assessment System (SCNTP/FAS), and a handful of other programs use state approve locally developed assessments. Since developing and implementing a comprehensive formative assessment system is a time-consuming and relatively expensive process, once adopted they tend to remain relatively stable in format and substance. The SCNTP/FAS system is relatively expensive for local programs to license and is therefore not likely to become widely used without significant state level investment in making it available to local BTSA programs. The state developed CFASST system has been the object of continuing pressure for modification and simplification as users tend to feel that it is too prescriptive, relies too much on filling out forms, and is not thoroughly integrated with the Program Standards that are driving program evaluation and accountability. Local formative assessment system users have been heard to complain that the tightly structured Program Standards are not synchronized with the approved assessment systems they have been using and thus they are forced to change the local assessment system for compliance rather than substantive reasons.

As this report is being written, the state is at work revising both the CFASST system and preparing to review and revise the Program Standards, so complaints about these structural elements have not fallen on deaf ears. It is too soon to try to assess whether revisions of either CFASST or the Program Standards will resolve the issues described in various sections of this report.

6. The BTSA Induction program at both the state and local levels is making a continuing effort to generate program improvements. The basic framework for this evaluation and improvement process is appropriately described as a Standards Based Accountability (SBA) model. And the standards that predominate in this
model are the Program Standards which specify in substantial detail what evidence needs to be presented by local BTSA programs to show that they are meeting the SBA goal of systematic documentation, review and revision of program activities.

The SBA framework is given substantive meaning through the development of a new program review and evaluation process call an Induction Program Review (IPR). The IPR involves a process of self-study and program narrative preparation by the directors of local BTSA programs. These self-study documents are submitted to a team of four experienced BTSA program leaders who review this self-study document and then come to the local program site to examine documentary evidence and interview program directors and all key stakeholder groups regarding the fulfillment of the 20 Program Standards.

Close observation of the IPR made it clear that this standards based accountability model not only identifies local program strengths and weaknesses, it also has a number of not always anticipated consequences. Details of the observed consequences of the IPR process are described in the body of this report. For this summary, the following are the most important to be reminded of:

- Because the IPR examined fulfillment of most program standards by examining fulfillment of each specific standard element the process required assessment of local program evidence regarding a total of 104 standards and elements. Trying to competently review all of these 104 standards and elements targeted for review tended to fragment the process.

- Adoption of an adjudication model for evidence evaluation tended to narrow the focus of assessment to observable data rather than its substantive meaning leaving some participants in the process unclear as to whether they were missing expected performance or only required documentation.

- A heavy emphasis on meeting the induction standards has led to a shift in local program emphasis away from the interpersonal work of the support providers, toward courses, seminars and other organized activities conducted by professional development specialists or third-party marketed services.

- As implemented, the IPR process tends to elevate the definition of “Standards Based Accountability” to mean meeting implementation guidelines through compliance, rather more than teaching performance or teacher capacity development. That is, the
evidentiary emphasis in this model of accountability led the review teams to concentrate on documentation of actions taken rather than evidence of growth in teacher performance or professional capacities.

Question #2: Are University and District intern programs meeting the purposes set forth in Education Code Sections 44382 and 44386?

On the whole, evidence regarding the recruitment and placement of intern credential teachers is making significant progress toward fulfilling legislative goals for this program. The match with legislative goals regarding recruitment and placement of credential candidates is not perfect, but there is room for some pride of accomplishment. As described in much more detail in the body of this report, intern programs have moved nimbly from a concentration on helping meet the demand for more multiple subject teachers to staff schools undergoing class size reduction to a point where about half of all interns are working toward education specialist credentials to meet a crushing need demand for more special education teachers. Moreover, when the requirements of the No Child Left Behind law calling for “highly qualified” teachers in every California classroom came on line, the intern programs expanded their enrollments substantially to facilitate the acquisition of clear credentials by emergency permit holders and long term substitute teachers. The data even indicate that there was a sharp spike in the number of teachers being prepared for single subject credentials in art when the so-called f-requirement for admission to California universities was added to insist that at least one high school arts course be provided for all university-bound students.

With regard to recruiting candidates from diverse population groups into the intern programs the results are a bit mixed. The largest group of intern credential holders report that they came into the program right after finishing their college degrees and without substantial prior work experience. Nevertheless, second-career candidates do represent a significant proportion of the intern population and represent individuals who would probably not be seeking careers in education without this program.

Though not spelled out in the legislative intent, there are two other groups of individuals for whom the intern programs represent career opportunities that would probably be denied them without this avenue of access to teaching credentials. The first is the large group of candidates who have become upwardly mobile in the school systems’ internal labor markets – the paraprofessionals and the substitute teachers. These groups come with substantial relevant work experience within the public school system and are using the intern programs to pursue full professional credentialing. By providing advanced training for significant numbers of these committed but underprepared educators the intern programs are providing career
opportunities to groups otherwise largely cutoff from advancement. This pool of candidates has the added advantage of containing relatively large numbers of multi-lingual and ethnically diverse individuals. The other substantial group that would probably have a much harder time entering this occupation without the intern program are the first-generation college goers whose families are not prepared to bear the cost of post-baccalaureate training.

It is not possible to tell from the record whether interns moving into education from other careers have substantial or relevant work experience. No doubt, many do, but it is not possible to know whether these applicants are seeking to leave careers where they have failed rather than moving into education from prior successes without undertaking a substantial number of individual case studies. Intern program staff are well aware that not all second career recruits have successful or relevant prior experience, but it was not possible for them to say what proportion of the total second career group this might be.

On the placement side of the equation, evidence of compliance with legislative intent for this program is quite strong, but this success has also become the focus of criticism and even a public interest law suit against federal regulations accepting California intern teachers as meeting the criteria for “highly qualified.” Interns are working in schools with substantially more non-white students, greater poverty, more English language learners, lower average parent education and substantially lower Academic Performance Index scores than other teachers of record. This exactly what the legislature intended, but it is an open question as to whether students being taught by these intern teachers are securing equal access to a quality education. Some site administrators interviewed for this study are convinced that interns are superior teachers, and expressed a preference for hiring them over other new teachers if possible. Systematic data covering multiple years of student achievement is needed to test the real consequences of staffing classrooms with intern teachers, and that data could not be assembled for this study.

On the question of incentive funding, it is just too soon to tell what will happen with the recruitment and training of interns enrolled in these financially and substantively enhanced programs. The current years’ funds for this enhancement came too late for serious program planning and adaptation to their requirements to have much effect, so the funds had to be distributed to programs that had already met the minimal qualifications for enhancement funding without regard to the specific purposes for which the funds would be used. Moreover, current fiscal records for this and most other state program initiatives are too sparse to allow an adequate review of expenditures without an on-site audit level study of cash outlays.
By and large, intern skill levels are being assessed using the same tests and measurements used for pre-service credential candidates – course grades, supervisor evaluations, CBEST passage prior to admission and PACT assessments prior to completion. Perhaps a more appropriate assessment of intern competency than any currently available tests or assessments is to examine their retention rates over time. Since school administrators can generally exercise their discretionary authority to terminate intern credential holders without triggering teacher union involvement or creating a basis for legal redress, they are probably more stringent in renewing contracts for these teachers than for most others.

The question of how interns are being trained produced what is probably the most interesting and important set of insights in the study of this program. We found four distinct approaches to training interns distributed across the case study sites examined in this study – approaches that appear to be dictated by the alternative ways in which intern program sponsors orient toward and answer two basic marketplace questions.

The intern programs are local training agencies -- each fiscally managed by a sponsoring public school agency (local district, county office of education). In offering to fund these programs the state has established a nominally competitive market structure for offering teacher training services. When local program sponsors enter the subsidized and regulated market for teacher preparation services, they must answer two fundamental questions: 1) to what extent should the service (teacher preparation) be redefined and restructured, and 2) should marketing alternative certification programs be directed primarily toward the school districts needing staff or toward the intern candidates seeking entry to the occupation. Data show that program sponsors have answered these questions in very different ways. Some local programs give primary emphasis to redefining pre-service training, others concentrate on new marketing strategies, and some devote substantial attention to doing both. The table below summarizes the alternatives generated by answering these questions.
No, the issue is efficiently producing more teachers to meet pressing needs | Yes, this is an opportunity to change the whole culture of preparation

Teacher Employers

Focus on marketing to:

Intern Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A</th>
<th>Type B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Oriented Traditional Programs</td>
<td>School Oriented Local Culture Emphasis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type C</th>
<th>Type D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Oriented Traditional Programs</td>
<td>Candidate Oriented Intensified Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally Type A programs are well represented among the CSU campuses. They tend to emphasize using their traditional pre-service courses and supervision system, together with a declaration that they are “market driven” responses to district staffing needs.

Type B: tends to be found in single district and county office of education programs where training is undertaken primarily by experienced teachers and not by university faculty, where emphasis is placed on working with districts and on keeping close to issues of professional practice rather than theoretical concept development.

Type C: tend to be private and entrepreneurial programs that emphasize multiple, convenient locations and direct candidate recruitment efforts.

Type D: is illustrated by one program with restrictive enrollment, limited aim of providing science, math and English single subject preparation and insistence on substantial pre-program preparation.

The important point here is that intern program designs are in substantial part structured by managerial decisions regarding the marketplace where these services must be bought and paid for. State funds are incentives for program development, but to become operational institutional resources must also be tapped and therefore the programs have to be seen as wise investments by intern applicants and school districts as well as the sponsoring agencies. This motivates program operators to cooperate closely with school districts and with candidate
training institutions, but it also limits their willingness to see program priorities in terms of state interests.

**Question #3: What policy or program management decisions are needed to insure adequate direct support from experienced teachers?**

There are, no doubt, many different ways to tweak the management of the BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification Intern programs that would facilitate the development of more adequate direct support by experienced teachers for the development of their novice colleagues. Most of the good management practices are probably untouched by this evaluation study. There are, however, three domains in which data collected and analyzed for this study do suggest likely ways to improve overall support provider performance.

**Focus on the support providers themselves**

First, focus on the support providers themselves. The provision of support for new teachers can be no better than the recruitment, training and motivations of the support providers selected to work with them. As previously mentioned, a number of BTSA programs are facing a significant shortfall in their efforts to recruit support providers for their new teachers. The problem is even worse for intern programs who often find that the best support providers have been retained by the district’s BTSA program which is offering higher stipends for this sensitive and time consuming work. Resources matter, and none of the support providers who are also serving as full time teachers are being over compensated for the work they are expected to do. In the absence of increased funding, however, management can do some other things that will make the support provider role more attractive. Arranging for better released time to do this work, securing more reliable substitute teacher assistance to make absence from their own classes more palatable, providing more obvious recognition of the important work support providers are doing, maintaining direct contact with the support providers and letting them know their efforts are understood and endorsed, providing support providers with state of the art communication hardware and software so that they can stay in touch with their beginning teachers more easily are but a few of the things that might be done by managers who see support provision by experienced teachers as a high priority part of their overall professional support and development program.

At least as important as stronger recruitment and incentives for engaging in this vital work is the provision of training in adult learning, counseling, observation and analysis of teaching performances, professional role development and other dimensions of the adult development process that support providers are expected to provide would enable the support providers to
enjoy their work more and to do it more efficiently and effectively. This is not a new idea in the BTSA program, but it is relatively foreign to the intern support providers. And in the BTSA environment, much more could be done to raise the sophistication and effectiveness of the support providers.

Because of the importance of acquiring and using the subtle and complex skills associated with the provision of support for novice professionals, our research team did reach the conclusion that full time support providers have a better chance of realizing the goals of quality support provision than do full time teachers who are carrying support provider responsibilities as an overload. This conclusion is not unequivocal, however, the benefits of close to the work site of the novice teacher are real, and the positive influence that a large cadre of support providers can have on schools and districts is potentially quite important.

In part our embrace of the full time model for support providers, despite the fact that this a marginally more expensive approach lies in thinking about the third dimension of quality support provision – the creation of the time needed by support providers to do their support work. There needs to be enough time and at the right time for support work to have the needed impact. There are too many stories of low frequency contacts between support providers and novice teachers for this issue to go unaddressed. Moreover, as our statistical modeling of intern and participating teacher survey responses evaluating the effectiveness of their program experiences amply demonstrates, providing quality and timely support is probably the most significant factor in determining whether these novice teachers feel that their program experiences have been successful.

Focus on distractions to quality support provision

Once management has secured motivated and trained support providers who have the time needed to assist the new teachers, attention should be given to aspects of the BTSA and intern programs that are tending to distract support providers from attending to this important work. Here the two programs are quite different, BTSA support providers report being distracted by an accountability program that focuses heavily on providing evidence of program implementation which leads to too much paperwork. The intern program goes too far in the other direction, there is often too little accountability and too little direction for support providers to really understand what is expected of them. Planning support work is just as important to this activity as lesson planning is to classroom support.

Focus on program management
There are several management decisions that would help secure high quality support provision in the intern programs. First, prevent late enrollment in the intern program by pre-service teachers who are pressed into service because districts have not accurately estimated staff needs or have not managed their recruitment and hiring processes well enough to get teachers on contract in time to allow them to prepare for this role by completing pre-service work in a timely way. Second, insist on timely appointment of support providers – perhaps by insisting that the granting of an intern credential is contingent upon providing the CTC with the identity of the person who is accepting responsibility for providing district support, then monitoring the adequacy of that support and preventing support providers who have been that in name only from being used in support of future intern credentials. Third help school districts overcome the weak planning and late hiring processes that make raiding pre-service programs for intern teachers necessary.

BTSA program management is generally quite streamlined. There are, however, some programs and some school districts within consortium programs where the BTSA program managers do not have the status and respect needed to secure cooperation for the new teachers and their support providers. This is concern is expressed in the Program Standards guidelines and has been reviewed where appropriate in the Induction Program Review process, so it is not entirely clear what more needs to be done, but this issue is important enough to deserve further study.

**Question #4: What policy or program management decisions are needed to ensure that induction and intern teachers are prepared to address the needs of special populations of student?**

Issues associated with addressing the instruction of special needs populations are quite clear in the BTSA program, and were described in this summary in answering question #1. To make the implications of that discussion explicit, we would make the following recommendations.

First, it seems appropriate to simply eliminate the technology standard as a standalone component of the BTSA program standards. We make this recommendation not because technology utilization is unimportant, but because it keeps changing faster than formal programs of preparation can cope with and school systems are moving at their own pace to incorporate new technologies and technology support into their routine management processes. Additionally, BTSA participating teachers are reportedly doing more to assist their support providers with new technologies than they are receiving help from them. By weaving appropriate use of technology into the other program standards, BTSA would be acknowledging that technology utilization is not an end in itself, but a vehicle for meeting other standards.
Second, there is a need to review and upgrade curricula and other methods for meeting the special populations and English learner standards. In their present form these standards are being met through training seminars that too often seem to the participating teachers to be a repetition of their pre-service training experiences.

Third, there is a need to differentiate training in meeting the needs of special populations and English learners based on the participating teachers actual classroom assignments. Rather than packing the entire training into the first two years, it would make sense to allow BTSA program completers to secure appropriately sophisticated and updated training as their teaching assignments bring them into contact with new language groups, ethnic sub-cultures or special needs students.

In the case of the intern programs, the issue of addressing special needs populations is particularly difficult to tackle. These teachers are getting much of the same training provided to pre-service teachers who do not have full classroom responsibilities, and they have very basic needs that BTSA participating teachers have already addressed. Nevertheless, without adequate preparation interns are often required to face a full range of student needs. For them the important thing is to be able to get help addressing the special needs they are facing on a daily basis, and must perforce let larger issues be put off until later. And with half the interns in the state working with special education students, their need for training and support is focused quite tightly. For this group of new teachers one can only recommend that more help be made available to them and that they be empowered to insist on having that help when it is needed most.

**Question #5: What if any changes in state, regional or local administrative structures could improve support for induction and intern teachers?**

Two program structures found in the BTSA program are models of effective program organization and improvement that are to be commended to for use in the intern programs and probably for a number of other state-sponsored program initiatives. The first is the development of a series of Cluster Regional Directors located within six geographical regions of the state for the purpose of providing guidance, direction and support to local BTSA programs.

The BTSA Induction program’s Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) constitute a program management and consulting group comprised of a dozen experienced BTSA leaders that are funded separately from the local BTSA programs and serves as an intermediate governance structure – separate from the state Task Force which consists of official representatives from
the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education (the state agencies jointly responsible for overseeing BTSA funding, policy and regulations). Because they are hired by local education agencies, they see themselves as responsible for supporting local programs, facilitating their improvement, and representing their interests to local school districts and to the state BTSA Task Force. Moreover, because they are separately funded, and do not work for the same local district officials that manage the various local BTSA programs, these Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs) are also able to critically appraise the appropriateness and effectiveness of the local programs with whom they work.

Over time, the CRDs have become the primary working group for monitoring BTSA program performance, developing new procedures, mechanisms, materials and guidelines for program improvement, and studying how issues affecting program success should be conceptualized and dealt with. There are two primary reasons why this governance mechanism looks like a very promising way of successfully joining state policy priorities with local program designs and implementation processes. First, and most importantly, by separately commissioning and funding the CRDs, the state has succeeded in creating a group of professionals who are neither caught up in the complexities of state level politics nor captured by the aims and interest of local program operators.

The second reason why the CRD structure has become important to BTSA and represents a promising strategy for state program governance rests in the size of the group and the method of selecting its leadership. With only twelve individual CRDs, strategically located throughout the state, with sufficient resources and autonomy to meet together regularly, and with the knowledge that their influence rests on their capacity for intellectual rather than political leadership, the CRDs have become an important Professional Learning Community.

The CRD structure for BTSA is underfunded and a significant augmentation to their funding is highly recommended. Additionally, if adequately funded, a similar structure would serve the Alternative Certification intern programs very well.

The second BTSA administrative structure which represents a powerful tool for program accountability and improvement is the Induction Program Review (IPR). The IPR process is both intensive and broad ranging. The central ingredient in the process is a 4-day visit by an IPR team consisting of four experienced BTSA participants (typically program local administrators and lead support providers from around the state). The IPR team is supported by one or two facilitators (typically one of the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors) whose job it is to facilitate team deliberations, remind team members of IPR guidelines, and work with the leadership of the program being reviewed to facilitate accumulation of the evidence to be reviewed by the
IPR team. The IPR team members have participated in a one-day IPR training session during which they learn about how local program administrators are asked to assemble evidence regarding their program performance, and are briefed on guidelines for the conduct of the 4-day review.

Our evaluation team was quite impressed by the consistency and depth of commitment to the Induction Program Review process by local BTSA directors, the IPR review teams, cluster regional directors, local school officials, state level BTSA Task Force members and the various stakeholder groups involved in BTSA programs. While we had a number of observations about the limitations and diverse understandings of this mechanism that are found in the field (these observations are described in detail in the report section covering the IPR process), we concluded that this mechanism is valuable and should continue to be supported. Moreover, we felt that a similar process should be generated for the Alternative Certification intern programs whose operations are currently facing much too little review or pressure for improvement.

**Question #6: What would be a sufficient level of funding for teacher induction and intern programs?**

All conclusions regarding the adequacy of current funding levels for either the BTSA Induction or the Alternative Certification intern program are extremely tentative as fiscal data are not easily accessed and are not organized in ways that make it possible to readily connect expenditure patterns with important program outcomes. That said, for the BTSA programs, resources do seem to matter in relation to the BTSA participant experience – programs that record greater expenditures also tend to report higher participant satisfaction. But recorded budget amounts are so little regulated as to have relatively little meaning and other factors are so important in mitigating the relationship between how much is invested and perceptions as to how much is available. Such factors would seem important to understand from an efficiency perspective, but are not well captured through current reporting or program monitoring and evaluation processes.

Given these limitations, the qualitative perceptions of local BTSA providers are that program resources are generally sufficient to allow them to implement the program in ways they deem effective. Hence, we have concluded that current data provide no basis for suggesting that current BTSA allocations are fiscally inadequate. With one important exception, data provide no basis for deciding whether future funding should be substantially different from what is currently being provided.
With regard to using intern program fiscal data to estimate funding sufficiency, we must emphasize that the data currently collected are insufficiently defined and are not measured with enough accuracy to reliably address this question. Some estimates of funding levels and fund usage are developed in the body of this report, but they are quite speculative and the primary focus of our recommendations here is to take steps to improve data uniformity and recording accuracy.

From a practical standpoint, it is very difficult to conduct a reliable fiscal analysis or to interpret historical budget shifts when the only available budget records are found in paper files at the BTSA and intern program offices at the state capital. The lack of budget data with uniform reporting categories, in sufficient detail to track the consequences of alternative expenditure patterns for each local program, and in electronic data file formats that can be economically utilized for analysis will continue to stymie useful fiscal analyses until better financial data systems are developed. Both the intern and BTSA program directors need clearer instructions with regard to identifying and recording in-kind and local financial contributions to these programs. At a minimum, all programs need to accurately report the actual value of matching resources provided by the local program agency. Clearer instructions are needed on what can and cannot be counted as eligible matching contributions. Moreover, program reviews like the IPR need to request and analyze fiscal data in order to insure that it is maintained in understandable formats. Both intern and BTSA directors need clearer direction in the preparation of budgets, particularly in the allocation of program costs to standard accounting categories that will allow comparison of program expenditure patterns that can be linked to program outcome measurements.

**Question #7: What revisions in Program Standards would facilitate increased teacher competency and reduce unproductive activities?**

The program standards for both the BTSA Induction and the Alternative Certification intern programs are clearly stated, thoroughly vetted by professional educators and grounded in a fairly widely supported body of research. The issues we found in reviewing the use of these standards had much more to do with how they are incorporated into program reviews and management decisions than with how they are conceptualized and written. There is one important exception to this generalization and that concerns the technology utilization standard in the BTSA Program Standards. After reviewing the text of the standard and the complaints about its use in the field we concluded that this standard should be abandoned as a standalone standard and be woven into the operationalization of other standards as appropriate. There are two reasons for this recommendation. First, the BTSA program staff are frequently behind rather than ahead of the technology needs of the participating teachers.
Second, the utilization of technology is both being better taught in pre-service training programs and being better supported by local school districts than was the case when this standard was originally developed. The BTSA induction training programs are very tightly packed and the participating teachers are feeling much more need for advanced training in how to work with English language learners and special education certified children than for more technology training as a subject independent of these core instructional issues.

In implementation, there are two problems with the use of program standards that should be addressed through management and training within the BTSA program. First, there is too little attention to accounting in the accountability usage of these standards. That is, standards reviews are generally aimed at securing evidence of program attention to them with too little attention given to whether this attention is securing the desired outcomes. The second problem, seen vividly in the Induction Program Review process is the tendency for subordinate elements in each of the standards to emerge as needing the same level of attention and evidence of compliance as the overarching standard. When local BTSA programs are asked to submit evidence of meeting more than a hundred discrete elements and standards, the result is an explosive disaggregation of their programs into a search for bits of evidence that have lost coherence as indicators of overall program quality. The BTSA programs should adopt the view that any program service or activity that deserves independent review is, but that decision to be called a program standard. Or to put the point in the other way, that no standard should be judged to have not been met because evidence on one of its elements is not forthcoming.

We think that both of these weaknesses in the use of program standards could be fruitfully addressed if evidence were solicited in a matrix format, rather than on the standards one at a time. That is if the assessment of evidence for meeting program standards were placed in a framework like the table below, it would invite an accounting of why submitted evidence should be considered appropriate to each standard.
### Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Program Activity 1</th>
<th>Program Activity 2</th>
<th>Program Activity 3</th>
<th>. . . et cetera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 1 is met</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 1 is met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 2 is met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 3 is met</td>
<td>Accounting for how Standard 3 is met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . Standard N</td>
<td>. . . etc.</td>
<td>. . . etc.</td>
<td>. . . etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this format, the evidence of enacting appropriate activities would be presented just once for each activity while the interpretation of how that activity meets diverse program standards would be presented in the appropriate cells of such a matrix of accountability data.

For the Alternative Certification intern programs, the program standards are equally clear, but there is very little in the way of accountability for meeting those standards built into the intern program management and policy systems. Such a system is strongly recommended, but in building an accountability system for the intern programs it will be important to remember that these programs are market driven and must maintain a level of service to both intern candidates and school districts that will allow this program to continue to broker intern teacher placement and supervision.

**Question #8: What changes in law, regulations and/or policies would help eliminate duplicative requirements and streamline support services?**

Redundancy and duplication of requirements are arising largely within the BTSA Induction program. Intern teachers feel a need for just about all the help they can get and rarely complain about any redundancies prior to encountering BTSA program requirements. The issues of redundancy and duplication are concentrated in two areas: completing training activities associated with meeting the induction standards (Program Standards 15 through 20), and finding activities associated with BTSA formative assessment systems repetitive, particularly repetitive with regard to recording the completion of various required activities.

Several of the problems of duplication and redundancy can be solved through updating the BTSA training curricula, particularly in the domains of work with special education students and English language learners. If the technology standard is maintained as a standalone program
standard it should be possible for participating teachers to challenge requirements by showing that they can apply technologies appropriately within their classroom responsibilities and be excused from training on matters they have already mastered. Indeed, it would probably if a system of challenge exercises were developed to allow participating teachers to challenge a number of program training activities.

At a more conceptual level it is important that BTSA program staff come to recognize that the distinction between skill development and skill application that is frequently used to justify requiring participating teachers to engage in activities that they feel they have already mastered in more mystique than reality. Pre-service teacher trainers simply do not believe that they are providing skill development in the absence of skill application, and the BTSA program staff are finding that they must be just as concerned about skill development as about application because incoming participating teachers are often not able to learn applications because they lack needed skills and must learn them as well as apply them. In the final analysis a skill that cannot be applied is not yet learned. It may be important to impress this truth more forcefully in pre-service training programs, but the question of how important that might be is beyond the purview of this evaluation study.
Policy Recommendations

This section develops policy and administrative recommendations summarizing the study team’s judgments regarding how best to enhance and improve California’s BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification intern programs. The recommendations are organized according to the topics that each addresses.

Recommendation #1: Improve Data Management

Program evaluation and improvement can be only as effective as the comprehensiveness, reliability and accessibility of the data upon which they are based. Data must not only be accessible and reliable it must also be structured in ways that allow both comparisons across program functions and local program sites and across time and levels of analysis. The data required need to include program resources, operational characteristics and attainment of outcomes. For the California BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification intern programs, present data systems are desperately inadequate. Fiscal data are difficult to access, inconsistently categorized and inadequately reported. At the state level, student achievement data are only available in aggregated files that preclude tracing the effects of teacher efforts, program designs, contextual constraints or longitudinal change. Teacher retention data that could be utilized to address this issue are inaccessible from state data files and must be collected by hand by individual BTSA programs. Program operational data are reasonably well developed but cannot be connected to fiscal inputs, contextual constraints or outcome data measuring student achievement or teacher performance. For all these reasons:

It is recommended that the California Department of Education and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing create a joint task force that includes individuals with substantial program evaluation expertise, support this task force with adequate resources, and commission the task force to develop a comprehensive and systematic data management plan for the BTSA and intern programs. With this plan in hand, staff with data management expertise should be mandated to provide the recommended data elements and linkages.

Recommendation #2: Improving BTSA and Intern program designs

There are a number of steps that can be taken to improve the design and operation of these two programs. Hence this recommendation comes in eight parts:
Recommendation 2A: Strengthen focus on performance and capacity building

There has been a drift toward defining program quality in terms of compliance with program standards that threatens the intended aim of raising teacher performance and professionalism. This is exacerbated by a not entirely convincing assertion that BTSA training focuses on skill application while pre-service training focuses on theory and abstract skill development. Program standards should urge more documentation of teacher performance and less recording of program implementation practices.

Recommendation 2B: Support Provider training

Careful matching of support providers with beginning teachers in both the BTSA and intern programs is an appropriate first consideration. Of equal importance, however, and not always adequately supported in either program, is providing support providers with the skills needed to make their work with new teachers effective. Support providers need significant training in such skills as: observation and analysis of instruction, peer coaching, adult learning theory, trust building, reflective conversations, diagnosis of instructional practices, conflict management, teacher legal rights and obligations, etc. It is recommended that local programs give preference to the employment of well trained full time support providers in order to assure that beginning teachers have access to high quality assistance. It is also recommended that the cost-effectiveness of this approach be given careful review once data management systems make monitoring impact on student achievement possible.

Recommendation 2C: Enroll interns in the BTSA early completion option

Interns who have acquired their preliminary credential enter BTSA with significantly different prior experiences than those of other preliminary credential holders. They should routinely be given access to a BTSA early completion option. Beyond that, because issues of practice are paramount during their training period, interns can easily end participation in this program without some of the theoretical and conceptual foundations that power professional innovation in the classroom. Consideration should be given to providing graduates of intern programs with access to advanced conceptual and theoretical training as part of their BTSA experience.

Recommendation 2D: Reduce BTSA paperwork and documentation

Too many BTSA program participants (at all levels, but especially the participating teachers and their support providers) see documentation of program participation as requiring repeated filling out of forms that have little or nothing to do with the quality of the participation experience itself. A concerted effort needs to be made design program participation activities
that are self-documenting so that the artifacts of participation, rather than separate documents reporting participation, become the evidence used to evaluate program compliance.

**Recommendation 2E: Evaluate alternative Intern program designs**

Intern programs having evolved in diverse ways now display designs that serve different purposes and provide quite different services to the interns and to the public school system. It is important to recognize these differences and formulate policy guidelines regarding which ones deserve continued funding. This report describes four distinct types of intern programs. While more detailed study would be required to make strong recommendations, the data collected in this study suggest that the program designs aimed at filling classrooms as quickly as possible and those aimed at lowering the effort and financial costs for teacher candidates are probably much less valuable to the state of California than are those that emphasize fitting teacher trainees to the needs of the district where they are being trained and those that see internship as an opportunity to dramatically intensify the amount and quality of teacher pre-service training. Our study team was particularly impressed by an intern program decision to limit interns to substantially less than full-time employment so that their training could be given highest priority. On the basis of the case studies conducted for this report, we would recommend that this option be considered for all interns.

**Recommendation 2F: Control Intern enrollment options**

Children are put at risk, teacher training is undermined and California is not well served when intern credentials are sought and granted on or after the opening day of school. Except for special cases where intern credentials are given to individuals who have been enrolled for some time in a pre-service program, this practice should be forbidden. If it is not, the arguments of those who are challenging the federal decision to consider intern credential holders to meet the No Child Left Behind requirements of “highly qualified” are likely to become persuasive.

**Recommendation 2G: Strengthen support provider commitment to interns**

Stronger local school and district commitment to providing interns with trained and capable district-based support providers is needed. It would probably help if the local support provider had to be identified by name and qualifications at the time the intern credential is awarded. Part of the problem is financial, the BTSA program is better funded and can afford to out bid intern programs for the services of quality support providers.

**Recommendation 2H: Strengthen intern program accountability**

Intern programs have been far less seriously evaluated than the BTSA programs and have hardly been evaluated at all since the CTC had to discontinue accreditation in 2002. In addition
to the much anticipated revitalization of the accreditation process, however, it is recommended that the intern program adopt the BTSA model and create a system of regional staff (e.g. Cluster Regional Directors) who can provide ongoing coordination, support and program evaluation.

**Recommendation 2I: Assure formal training for intern support providers**

Support provider training for local intern support providers is important and typically neglected. Although interns have faculty based supervision from the sponsoring agency, their needs are legion and the local district support provider, if properly trained and motivated, can provide invaluable assistance. Formal training for district support providers should be included along with their explicit identification as part of the sponsoring agency’s responsibilities – adequately funded, of course, or neglect of this duty can be expected.

**Recommendation 2J: Complete work already underway to revise formative assessment instruments**

It is already clear to BTSA program staff members at all levels that some aspects of the state approved formative assessment systems are cumbersome and focused too much on documenting activities. Completion of the revised formative assessment system underdevelopment will be much appreciated by staff and participating teachers alike.

**Recommendation #3: Program Standards Modifications**

Although program standards are part of the overall program design, they are important enough to be treated separately here. We make four recommendations related to the content and use of program standards.

**Recommendation 3A: Delete the standalone technology standard**

It is recommended that BTSA do away with the technology standard as a standalone program standard and, instead, incorporate appropriate references to technology utilization into other program standards. As argued above, these technologies change rapidly and new teachers often have leap-frogged past their support providers. This approach recognizes that technology utilization is not an end in itself; it is a means to realizing other program goals.

**Recommendation 3B: Revise and upgrade the content of the English Learner and Special Populations BTSA standards**

Testimony from BTSA participating teachers makes clear the importance of revising and upgrading training associated with these two standards. They are recognized as addressing
fundamental classroom needs and new teachers feel the need for more sophisticated training in both areas. Present content too closely parallels pre-service training.

Recommendation 3C: BTSA needs to re-think the relationship between program standards and the elements that compose them

It should be recognized that any element aspect of BTSA program operations that needs to be independently evaluated constitutes a program standard and should be characterized as such. Any interpretive element that is intended to convey to program managers the underlying character or the multiple dimensions of a program standard is appropriately characterized as an “element” within the standard it elaborates. Standards should be embedded within the program review and evaluation process in ways that lead them to be reviewed holistically. When this principle is applied, BTSA leadership should quickly recognize that identifying more than a hundred standards for program reviews will undermine program integrity and lead to a “check off” approach to program accountability. Twenty or so standards is about all that can be independently monitored and held in mind as benchmarks for program implementation.

Recommendation 3D: Intern program standards need more careful monitoring

Intern program standards, designed as they are to parallel the standards for all pre-service programs are clear enough, but there are inadequate mechanisms for determining whether they are being met. Intern programs need more routine review and assessment of the adequacy with which standards are being met.

Recommendation #4: Adjusting program recruitment and participation

Several issues regarding participation in both the BTSA and Intern programs should be considered.

Recommendation 4A: Encouraging second career and internal promotion for intern programs

Although there has been notable success in the recruitment of second career candidates into the intern programs, more should be done to bring this opportunity the attention of potential candidates. This can best be done through a statewide public awareness program; local programs have a hard time getting media attention or access to the places where second career decisions are being made.

Intern programs have been particularly successful in providing promotion opportunities for individuals already engaged in public education as paraprofessionals or substitute teachers. Again more could be done to encourage this group to see internship as an opportunity for
promotion. And this group is a particularly rich source of individuals from diverse backgrounds. Here districts are the target for recruitment efforts and state level support for reaching out to his group would be productive.

There is one group that is well represented in the intern programs that would probably be better served through scholarships or other forms of assistance to participate in full time teacher preparation programs. That is the group of recent college graduates who are coming from families with limited ability to support them through the teacher preparation process. These students, often from the first generation in their families to graduate from college and typically more ethnically diverse than other pools of teacher candidates are likely entering the intern programs out of financial need rather than preference for this kind of training. It is in the interest of the state and of the children they serve to provide access to teaching in ways that are less stressful for this group.

**Recommendation 4B: Providing better support to the interns not in funded programs**

One of the surprises in this study was the discovery that more than 25 percent of California intern credential holders are not supported in funded intern programs. While some members of this group are, no doubt, functioning comfortably and at a high level of success, most of the group is nearly invisible to state officials and their effectiveness is uncharted. It is quite likely that many of these interns are in need of support at a level similar to that being provided in the funded programs. The state should commission a careful study of this intern group and develop appropriate mechanisms for insuring that they receive the support they need.

**Recommendation 4C: Providing better support to new teachers not eligible for BTSA**

Another surprise in the data collected for this study is that a substantial proportion of the teachers entering the BTSA program have already worked for a year or more in California schools before becoming eligible for this program. State policy makers need to take a careful look at this cadre of new teachers and develop mechanisms to provide them with appropriate support as they earn the credentials needed to become BTSA participants.

**Recommendation #5: Improving program management and governance**

There are several adjustments to program governance and management that could improve overall effectiveness.
Recommendation 5A: Make sure program managers have needed status with district officials

To assure that new teachers get the support they need and are given the opportunity to benefit fully from participation in BTSA or intern programs the managers of these programs need to be seen as important executives in the districts or universities that employ them. In working with sponsoring agencies, it would be helpful if stronger efforts were made to assure that program managers are given the status and authority they need to coordinate support, integrate BTSA and intern program activities into the school systems’ overall professional development efforts and maintain control over budgets and resource allocations. Difficulties with status are not frequent, but when they arise they are important.

Recommendation 5B: Expanding the Regional Coordinator concept to the intern program

As detailed in the body of this report, the Cluster Regional Director structure for BTSA has had important positive benefits for this program. A similar structure should be created for the intern programs.

Recommendation #6: While overall funding levels appear adequate, three important adjustments are needed

In addition to creating a much more useful fiscal record keeping system, there are two relatively simple adjustments in financing that would help improve program operations.

Recommendation 6A: Increase funding for the BTSA Cluster Regional Directors

These key individuals are obviously under resourced to the extent that funding limits their effectiveness. It is not easy to say how much additional funding would be cost effective, but a 50 percent increase in funding for this group is probably justifiable. Although detailed budgets were not studied, it appears that the state BTSA Task Force is also significantly underfunded.

Recommendation 6B: Equalize support for interns and BTSA teachers

One of the negative consequences of lower level per-teacher funding for intern teachers is that it puts this program at a disadvantage in recruiting and compensating support providers. Both programs are reporting significant difficulty in recruiting support providers, but the intern programs seem to be losing out in the competition for needed talent.
Recommendation 6C: Raise compensation for support providers

While money should not be the most important consideration in becoming a support provider for new teachers, it is becoming increasingly clear that the amount of compensation provided is not enough and programs are having a hard time securing talented professionals to do this important work. Increased compensation will be particularly important when steps are taken to substantially improve support provider training.

A Framework for Policy Analysis and Recommendations

We conclude with a kind of postscript on the need for new administrative and policy decisions to enhance support for California’s large and growing cadre of BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification Intern teachers. Formulation of policy recommendations like those presented in the paragraphs above is always grounded in a set of basic assumptions about the appropriate and effective roles governmental action might play in the creation, organization, operation and improvement of social service programs. Policies that seem sensible and even ideal from one perspective might seem harsh, ineffective or even immoral in the eyes of those who hold different views about such important factors as cultural or political versus economic motivations for acting, the nature and extent of private versus public responsibility, the proper balance between centralization and decentralization of political power. In thinking about the policy options that follow from the findings of this study it would be appropriate to consider a couple of the more important assumptions made in developing these policy recommendations.

First, we have assumed that in education, even more than in most other arenas of public policy, policy makers must struggle to find a proper balance among competing public values. There are few education policies that can be pursued to their logical limit without it becoming obvious that they are sacrificing one public value for another. Perhaps the most obvious example of this need to balance competing values springs from the recognition that teachers, like their students, are individuals with diverse skills, motivations, interests and experiences. Hence it is essential for any teacher training or development program to recognize these individual differences and not create procrustean beds onto which diverse individuals are forced to lie painfully and unproductively. At the same time, recent educational history has made it abundantly clear that respect for individual differences must be balanced against the need for public schools to meet common expectations for children – expectations upon which are based the future viability of our political democracy and our economic well being.
Our research team has come to recognize that a value balancing act needed to intelligently design teacher training and induction programs involves a number of important tensions. Tensions that, so far as we can see, no policy framework will ever completely transcend. Within our data, the following tensions appear to define the central issues to be addressed in policy deliberations:

1. Public education is inherently a “program structured” rather than a “case managed” public service, but children bring unique backgrounds, individual needs, diverse interests, and unpredictable blends of aptitude and ability. Hence policy must balance the requirements of effective program structures with the need for individualization of instruction.

In recent years there has been a substantial growth in the ongoing struggle to embed individual student case work into the program structure of school classrooms and standardized curricula. The high water mark for this effort is the development of Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for certified special education students. Here, under the color of law, individual goals, instructional strategies, curricula and support service plans are developed and have become a routine, if not always comfortable, part of nearly every public school. And this emphasis is echoed in several of the BTSA Induction standards as well as the formation of Individual Induction Plans (IIPs) for BTSA participating teachers. At the same time, pressures reinforcing the program structured character of public schooling have also been substantially increased in recent years. The uniform outcome goals specified for all ethnic groups in the Academic Performance Index targets, the insistence on a uniform high school exit examination, and the adoption of sweeping curriculum standards for all grades and subjects insure that educators are forcefully reminded of the need for a uniform programmatic approach to planning and delivery of educational services. The policy recommendations outlined in the previous sub-section of this report recognize that this tension between program implementation and case management cannot be entirely overcome and that there will be an ongoing need for assessing whether there is too much emphasis on one or the other horns of this dilemma.

Our second basic assumption is that standards based accountability as the primary vehicle for achieving public policy goals is a relative newcomer to the world of educational program development and improvement. As a central theme in program design and improvement, standards based accountability has been only around for about a decade and even during this period of high profile support, standards based accountability systems have been competing with political decentralization of power (through charter schools, vouchers, home schooling, site-based management and other mechanisms) and with raising professional skill (through
National Board Certification, demands for “highly qualified teachers” in every classroom, etc.). Thus, it is important to keep in mind that:

2. Public schools are places of cultural enrichment, child care and nurture, individual development and community identity formation as well as institutions where children and teachers are to be held accountable for academic achievement.

Thus, it is important as policy and management initiatives are being considered to constantly ask about their impact on the larger civic and cultural missions of the school as well as their impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of the BTSA Induction and Alternative Certification induction programs.
Appendices

Focus Group Introductory Statement
Focus Group Introduction for BTSA Teachers

Good [morning/afternoon]. My name is ______________; I’m a member of the University of California, Riverside study team that is working to document the strengths of the State’s BTSA Induction and Intern programs and to see if there are any ways in which these programs could be improved. This focus group session is one of a series of interviews we’ll be doing with new teachers, experienced support providers, school site administrators and support program staff all across the State. Let me begin by thanking you for taking time from your busy schedules to participate. If you don’t mind, I would appreciate it if you would put your first name on one of these tent-cards [hold yours up] so we can address each other by name.

At the request of the governor’s office and the Department of Education we are examining the overall operations of the BTSA and Intern Alternative Certification programs. No individual programs are being evaluated. State officials are very confident that these programs make important contributions to the effectiveness of California’s schools. We are asked to help explain how the programs work – to examine whether they have appropriate resources and whether there are ways to improve policy guidelines or program operations. We are commissioned to review how these programs are being experienced by the participants – whether program activities are working well to facilitate improved teaching, whether resources are adequate to support the programs, and whether policies are appropriately formulated and implemented in ways that produce the best possible results. While data are being provided by individuals like you all across the state, every precaution is being taken to assure that no individuals, and no local programs will be identified by name, or described in ways that would let readers of our report to figure out individual or program identities. Results of the study will be reported directly to policy makers at the state level, but they will also be available to local Induction and Intern program participants who want to use them to improve program effectiveness. Detailed data are being collected from thirty BTSA Intern programs and ten Intern programs throughout the State. Participants in approximately ten each, of the BTSA programs and Intern programs are participating in focus groups like this one.

Since you have been directly participating in a BTSA program, your thoughts and insights are especially important to us. Please be as candid as possible – feel free to speak bluntly when that is needed to make your point. Though I am recording this session in order to be sure that I can understand your intent, your responses will remain confidential. Nothing you say will be shared in any way that would allow it to be traced to you personally. Our confidentiality guarantees are printed on the 3 x 5 card in front of you. If at any time you want to say something that you do not wish to have recorded, just let me know and I’ll turn the recorder off. And, please, if at any point you do not wish to continue participation in the discussion, just excuse yourself and leave the room.

We have set aside $100 for each of you to compensate you for your time. A check in this amount will be sent to you by UCR. Details about how to file for your compensation are on the back of the confidentiality card. Our discussion will take about an hour and a half.

A rough agenda for our discussion is on the sheet of paper in front of you. As you can see we have eight topics we would like to cover.

Do you have any questions before we begin?
Interview Protocols
Questions for BTSA Director Interviews

**Introduction:** Thanks for taking the time to help us get started on the BTSA/Intern program review process. I think you know that UCR has been awarded the contract to undertake a statewide review of these programs with the hopes of increasing their effectiveness. I’ve printed up a card here saying how we intend to assure confidentiality and avoid any risk of embarrassment or damage to BTSA/Intern program staff and participants (if you have any questions about our purposes or procedures I’ll be happy to answer them).

If you don’t mind, I’d like to record our interview. If, at any point, you want to say something that you’d rather not have recorded, just say so, and I’ll turn the recorder off.

If you are ready, there are five general questions I’d like to ask:-

1. Could you tell me a little about the BTSA (or Intern) program for which you have responsibility? Maybe we could start with the history – how long has your program been operating? Who are the major partners and collaborators? How long have you had a role in the program? Tell me a little about your professional background.

2. Tell me a little about how your program is designed. Are there unique features? Special challenges? In what ways do you feel most of the BTSA (Intern) programs are pretty much alike? Do you have to deal with any regulations or requirements that you feel are unnecessary or wasteful, or create distractions or duplication?

3. How do you assess the adequacy of the resources provided to the program? Space? Materials? Staffing? Funding? Does this program encroach on school or district funds? Does the program leverage resources for the school or district making it possible to do more than would otherwise be possible?

4. How should we be trying to assess the level of BTSA/Intern program cooperation and support from administrators, other teachers, the board, other stakeholders?

5. We’d like to get your help setting up focus group interviews with [Participating Teachers (1st & 2nd Year), Support Providers (for 1st & 2nd Year)] or [Supervising Teachers, University Faculty] and School Site Administrators. How is the best way to do that?

6. There are a number of documents that we need:
   
   Program budgets       Annual Reports       Formative Assessments
   Retention Data         IPR Evidence Documents

   If needed, we can compensate you for any reproduction costs that you incur. Can you provide that information?
Intern Program Director
Interview Schedule

1. Could you tell me a little about yourself – the place where you work and your experience with the Intern program?

2. Tell me about how your Intern program is organized – How do Interns move through the program?
   What is the conceptual framework (or vision of teacher professionalism) that has guided the design of the program?
   Who has responsibility for program leadership and content?
   How does the Intern formative assessment system work?

3. What sort of criteria are there for recruitment and selection of Interns?  How are they applied?

4. What are the major elements of the program with regard to: Developing Subject Matter expertise?
   Teaching special needs children?  Responding to English language learners?  Technology?  How does your program link theory with classroom application?

5. How does the program respond to the Teacher Performance Expectations published by the state?

6. Tell me about how interns are supervised and supported while in the program.

7. How adequate are the resources available for implementation of the program:  Funding, Space, Materials, Time?

8. Tell me a little about program management and governance:  What is the working relationship between university and district staff?  Is there teacher union involvement?  What are the procedures for program self-evaluation and improvement?  What sort of outside evaluations does the program experience?

9. Tell me about the relationship between this Intern program and other programs affecting beginning teachers:  The relationship to BTSA?  To ongoing district professional development?  To University pre-service training?

10. Tell me about placement and retention of the Intern teachers once they finish the program.

11. We’d like to get your help setting up five focus group interviews with:  a) current interns, b) teachers who have completed their intern programs, c) supervising teachers, d) university faculty who teach intern courses, and e) school site administrators where interns are working.

12. There are a number of documents that we need:  I have a list here.  If needed, we can compensate you for any reproduction costs that you incur.  Can you provide this information?

Thank you very much for your cooperation, your input is most valuable!!
Participating Teacher and Support Provider Discussion Agenda

1. I’d like to begin by getting to know a little bit about each of you. Tell me a little about your school and your job.

2. Lets talk about your BTSA program. Could you describe for me how your program is organized? Is there a reasonably clear conception of good teaching that guides the program? Has it helped both Participating Teachers and Support Providers become more confident and comfortable as teachers?

3. Could you tell me a little about the activities of the program? What are the most important things that happened this year? How do you feel about the impact of these activities?

4. Are there any program activities or requirements that you feel are unnecessary, distracting, or duplicate other activities that work better?

5. How do you assess the adequacy of the resources provided to the program? Space? Materials? Staffing? Funding?

6. Schools today are under a lot of pressure to improve student achievement, and to deal with the needs of special education students and English language learners – how are these issues being addressed in your program?

7. Are there important teaching issues that are not being addressed adequately?

8. If we haven’t already covered them, I’d like to ask you about a few of the specific elements of your program – could you tell me quickly how well each is being implemented and how valuable they are?

   a) Classroom observations   b) Individual Induction Plans
   c) CFASST/FAS or local assessment   d) Seminars/Organized activities
   e) New teacher contact with support providers

Is there anything else I should have asked you about?

Thank you very much for helping with this study!!!!!!

Don’t forget the instructions for getting your reimbursement check!
BTSA and Intern Program Graduate
Discussion Agenda

1. I’d like to begin by getting to know a little bit about each of you. Tell me a little about your school and your job.

2. Let’s talk about your BTSA/Intern experience. Could you describe what participation in this program was like for you? Did it help you to become more confident and comfortable as teachers?

3. What do you feel were the most important activities in the program? How do you feel about the impact of these activities on your professional growth?

4. Were there any program activities or requirements that you feel were unnecessary, distracting, or duplicated other activities better served your needs?

5. How do you assess the adequacy of the resources provided to the program? Space? Materials? Staffing? Funding?

6. Schools today are under a lot of pressure to improve student achievement, and to deal with the needs of special education students and English language learners – how were these issues addressed in your program?

7. Are there important teaching issues that were not addressed adequately?

8. If we haven’t already covered them, I’d like to ask you about a few of the specific elements of your program – could you tell me how well each was being implemented and how valuable they were to you?

   a) Classroom observations
   b) Individual Induction Plans
   c) CFASST/FAS or local assessment
   d) Seminars/Organized program activities
   e) New teacher contact with support providers

Thank you very much for helping with this study!!!!!
Administrator Discussion Agenda

1. I'd like to begin by getting to know a little bit about each of you. Tell me a little about your school and your job.

2. Let’s talk about the BTSA/Intern program in your school district. How long have you been involved with the BTSA/Intern program? How does this program work at your school? In your district? Has it significantly helped the participating teachers to become more skilled and confident as teachers? How so?

3. Could you tell me a little about the program activities with which you are familiar? What are the most important things that happened this year? How do you feel about the impact of these activities?

4. Are there any program activities or requirements that you feel are unnecessary, distracting, or duplicate other activities that work better?

5. How do you assess the adequacy of the resources provided to the program? Space? Materials? Staffing? Funding? Does this program encroach on school or district funds? Does the program leverage other resources for the school or district making it possible to do more than the BTSA/Intern budget regularly provides?

6. Schools today are under a lot of pressure to improve student achievement, and to deal with the needs of special education students and English language learners — how are these issues being addressed in your program’?

7. Are there important teaching issues that are not being addressed adequately?

8. If we haven't already covered them, I'd like to ask how familiar you are with a few of the specific elements of your program. If you know could you tell me briefly how well each is being implemented and how valuable they are?
   - For BTSA:
     a) Classroom observations
     b) Individual Induction Plans
     c) CFASST/FAS or local assessment
     d) Seminars/Organized program activities
     e) New teacher contact with support providers
   - For Interns:
     a) Teaching supervision
     b) Intern course work
     c) Intern classroom efforts
     d) Integration with BTSA

Thank you very much for helping with this study!!!!!!

Don't forget the instructions for getting your reimbursement check
Intern Supervising Teacher Discussion Agenda

1. I’d like to begin by getting to know a little bit about each of you. Tell me a little about your school and your job.

2. Let's talk about your Intern program. What is the role of this program in your school and district? To what extent is it succeeding in helping the interns to become more confident and comfortable as teachers?

3. Could you tell me a little about the activities of the program? What are the most important things that happened this year? How do you feel about the impact of these activities?

4. Are there any program activities or requirements that you feel are unnecessary, distracting, or duplicate other activities that work better?

5. How do you assess the adequacy of the resources provided to the program? Time for working with the Intern teachers? Space? Materials? The adequacy of the staffing? Program funding? Does this program encroach on other school or district programs or funds? Does the program leverage resources for the school or district making it possible to do more than would otherwise be possible?

6. Schools today are under a lot of pressure to improve student achievement, and to deal with the needs of special education students and English language learners – how are these issues being addressed in your program?

7. Are there important teaching issues that are not being addressed adequately?

8. If we haven’t already covered them, I’d like to ask you about a few of the specific elements of your program – could you tell me quickly how well each is being implemented and how valuable they are?

   a) Teaching supervision       b) Your course work
   c) Your classroom work       d) BTSA integration
   e) How the progress of Intern teachers is being assessed

Is there anything else I should have asked about that didn’t come up?

Thank you very much for helping with this study!!!!!
Don’t forget the instructions for getting your reimbursement check!
Confidentiality Pledge
BTSA/Intern Study Confidentiality Guarantees

We have taken steps to assure complete confidentiality for all participants in this study, including:

1. Securing approval of the UC, Riverside Human Subjects Review Board for all procedures used.
2. Keeping all data in a locked laboratory and in password protected computer files.
3. Limiting access to the data to authorized staff.
4. Preventing identification of individuals or local programs in all study reports.
5. Assuring that any participant can withdraw at any time in the process without any penalty.

Thank you for participating in this important study!
Sample BTSA Consent Form

(version used by RIMS BTSA Program, 2005-06)
RIMS Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) 
Participating Teacher and Support Provider Application 2002-2008 Program Year

BTSA is a state-funded program of support for credentialled public school teachers in their first or second year of the profession or teachers new to California. By completing this form, you will join your local BTSA program. Participation in BTSA will require regular interaction with a support provider. Activities will be arranged by your site administrator during classroom release time or after school. The local BTSA Program receives funds to support your induction into teaching in Submission of this form is an agreement to participate in the local BTSA Program. It is important to collect information on new public school teachers (nonteachers new to the profession or new to California) as we so work to address the teacher shortage, provide support for new teachers, and promote teacher retention. The California Information Practices Act and the Federal Privacy Act provide that agencies requesting information indicate the principal purposes for which that information is used. Your name and social security number are used to provide proper identification of your file and to determine with the exception of your GDR and home address, information disclosed in this filing will not be released. In addition, pursuant to Education Code Section 44001 the Commission may disclose to post, lost, or prospective employers or institutions of higher education all information provided with applications submitted by you through these agencies. Information may also be disclosed to other State or Federal authorities as required by law. Personal information may be disclosed to the public only with your permission or in accordance with the law. The information is necessary for the Commission to perform its duty under Education Code Sections 44001-44005, which authorize this work. If not furnished, your application may be denied, delayed, or returned for completion. You are required to provide a social security number or federal tax identification number on your application pursuant to title 2 USC 6101(d) and California Revenue Code §17701. You have a right to request personal information maintained by or on behalf of you by our agency unless access is exempted by law. The Administrator of State Funded Programs, Professional Services Division, 1500 Capitol Ave., Sacramento, California 95814, (916) 327-2800, is responsible for the maintenance of this information. Through the BTSA program, I will participate in local induction program support and assessment activities.

The CTC requires that ALL questions be answered.

What is your Social Security Number? (REQUIRED to confirm your credential status and eligibility for BTSA induction)

Last Name: 
First Name: M.I. 
Previous Name(s)/Nicknames: 
Home Address:
City, State, Zip: 
Home Phone Number: 
E-mail address: 

1. School County: School District: 
School Name: 
School Phone Number: Ext. 

2. What is your gender? 

3. What is your birth date? (REQUIRED for credential verification)

4. What grade level(s) are you teaching this year? (Mark all that apply)

5. What is your BTSA role?

6. Support Provider (SP) (A BTSA mentor to Participating Teacher)

7. What is your ethnicity? (Choose only ONE)

8. If you were in a university induction program, what year did you receive your initial California Intern Credential?

9. For PTE: Where did you receive your Teacher Preparation?

10. Which California credential(s) do you currently hold?

Please make sure that you have answered ALL of the above questions.

Signature: Date: }
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Sample BTSA Annual Survey Form
Participating Teacher Version
BEGINNING TEACHER SUPPORT AND ASSESSMENT (BTSA) INDUCTION
Program Evaluation Survey
2005-2006

This survey asks questions about your experience in BTSA during the 2005-2006 school year. Your program will use the responses collected from all participants as one source of evidence to identify strengths and needed improvements in the program. Similarly, the sponsoring state agencies will use aggregated data to identify strengths and needs for improvements in state policies concerning BTSA induction.

Your response is confidential and will not be shared with anyone in such a way that you can be identified individually. Your name and eight digit ID are requested to match your responses with the demographic data you completed on the consent form and to let your program director know that you have completed the survey. Your name and identifying information will then be removed from your survey responses prior to analysis. No file of your responses will be maintained in your name. Thank you for taking the time to provide data needed to understand and support the improvement of BTSA induction.

Every BTSA program assigns each participating teacher an experienced educator who is responsible for seeing that the participant receives individualized support and assessment. This role is named differently across projects: support provider, coach, advisor. In this survey, that person is referred to as a "support provider."

Please answer the following questions with respect to your experiences in the current school year only.

What is your name (as entered on your BTSA Consent Form)? First: ___________________ Last: ___________________

What is your unique eight digit ID # from the BTSA Consent Form? ___________________

I. School Site Orientation: For teachers with one year or less in BTSA ONLY, teachers with more than one year in BTSA, please begin with Question 2.

1. Did you receive an orientation to your school site? □ No □ Yes

If yes, how satisfied were you with the school site orientation on the following topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Was not addressed</th>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Site Resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Personnel</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Working with your Support Provider

2. Is your SP □ Full-time release (currently not teaching) □ Part-time release (teaching less than full time) □ Full-time classroom teacher (teaching full time)

3. In what month did you begin teaching this school year?
   □ July 05 □ August 05 □ Sept. 05 □ Oct. 05 □ Nov. 05 □ Dec. 06 □ Jan. 06 □ Feb. 06 □ Mar 06 □ April 06

4. In what month did you begin working with your support provider this school year?
   □ July 05 □ August 05 □ Sept. 05 □ Oct. 05 □ Nov. 05 □ Dec. 06 □ Jan. 06 □ Feb. 06 □ Mar 06 □ April 06
5a. About how often did you communicate with your support provider (e.g., in person, by phone, e-mail) about issues related to your teaching practice (e.g., curriculum and instruction, students, assessment, materials?)

☐ Less than once a month   ☐ Once a month   ☐ Twice a month   ☐ Weekly

5b. On the average, how long were meetings with your support provider?

☐ 15 minutes   ☐ 30 minutes   ☐ 60 minutes   ☐ 90 minutes

6. How well matched are you with your support provider in terms of:

Not at all matched   Somewhat matched   Fairly well matched   Well matched

a. Grade level:

b. Your subject matter or course emphasis:

c. His/her knowledge of the student populations you teach:

d. Geographic proximity: same school, nearby school

7. In the context of all of the demands on your time, was the meeting time with your support provider adequate to meet your needs for support?

☐ Not adequate   ☐ Somewhat adequate   ☐ Adequate   ☐ Very adequate

8. Overall, how often were the following types of formal and informal support offered through BTSA timely in meeting your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does Not Apply</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Work with your support provider</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Work with other teachers/specialists</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Workshops/seminars/courses</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Formative Assessment (CFASST, FAS, or local assessment system)

9. Please indicate approximately **how often** you engaged in the following activities and **how valuable** these assessment activities were for your professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>How often?</th>
<th>How valuable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Support Provider formal or informal observation of my teaching</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Not valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Collection of evidence of my teaching practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Analysis of student work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Observation of experienced teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. In-depth inquiry into my teaching practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Reflection on my teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Examination of my teaching against specific criteria (that may be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>called a Continuum or Descriptions of Practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Most teachers find their beginning years challenging. However, certain teaching assignments, e.g., multiple course preparations, combination classes, large numbers of underperforming students, many extra-duty activities, are recognized as being challenging because of their structure.

a. According to this definition, was your teaching assignment **more challenging than other teachers** at your site?
   - ☐ No
   - ☐ Somewhat
   - ☐ Yes

b. If you answered 'Yes' or 'Somewhat' to 10a, did you receive additional support that was helpful?
   - ☐ No support
   - ☐ A little support
   - ☐ A moderate amount of support
   - ☐ A great deal of support

11a. In which formative assessment system did you participate?
   - ☐ CFASST
   - ☐ FAS
   - ☐ Local Assessment System
   - ☐ Don’t know

11b. In your BTSA experience, by the end of the school year which CSTP will you have investigated through your formative assessment system? *(Mark all that apply)*
   - ☐ Engaging and Supporting all Students in Learning
   - ☐ Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments
   - ☐ Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter
   - ☐ Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences
   - ☐ Assessing Student Learning
   - ☐ Developing as a Professional Educator
11. c. If you used CFASST, which event did you last complete? If you did not use CFASST, please go onto Question 12.

**Year 1**  □ 1: CSDC  □ 2: Inquiry  □ 3: POP  □ 4: Inquiry  □ 5: POP  □ 6: Colloquium


12. In reflecting upon the Individual Induction Plan (Individual Learning Plan) you developed over the year, on average, how strong was the connection between the goals and activities on the IIP (ILP) and:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of your teaching practice collected through your formative assessment process?</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your professional development activities?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with your support provider?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. To what extent were the areas of strength and the areas identified for growth by your district’s formal evaluation process (usually conducted by a site administrator) consistent with those identified in your formative assessment?

□ Not consistent □ Somewhat consistent □ Consistent □ Very consistent

14. How clear were the following aspects of the BTSA Program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements and expectations for BTSA participation</th>
<th>Not clear</th>
<th>Somewhat clear</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Very clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to use formative assessment (CFASST, FAS, or local system) to improve your teaching practice</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your BTSA plan for professional growth, e.g., Individualized Induction Plan (IIP), Professional Growth Plan</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. To what degree did your BTSA Induction activities lay a foundation for your own plans for ongoing professional growth in the future?

□ Not at all □ A little □ Moderately □ Greatly
IV. BTSA Program Outcomes

16. To what degree did your BTSA Induction activities build upon the knowledge, skills and abilities your developed as part of your university, college, or intern work (AKA Teacher Preparation Program)?

- [ ] Not at all  
- [ ] A little  
- [ ] Moderately  
- [ ] Greatly

17. When did you receive advice and assistance in understanding the completion requirements of Induction

- [ ] NA--Not participating in Induction  
- [ ] Did not receive any advice or assistance  
- [ ] At point of hire  
- [ ] During BTSA Program Orientation  
- [ ] At individual advisement

18. To what extent do you believe that your BTSA Induction program’s formative assessment and professional development activities helped you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Improve your teaching knowledge and skills</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Improve your ability to use standards-based instruction</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improve your ability to use standards-based assessment</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Meet your students' differing needs</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Understand performance levels for students</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Use technology to support student learning</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Teach English learners</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Create a supportive and healthy environment for student learning</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Address equity and diversity in your teaching</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Teach special student populations</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Classroom management</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Analyze student work</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Work with families of students</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Subject matter pedagogy</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Improve student achievement</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. How satisfied are you with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teaching in your current district</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teaching at your current school site</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Your current teaching assignment</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. In five years, how confident are you that you will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Somewhat confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Very confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In the teaching profession?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teaching in the same district?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teaching at same school?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered ‘Not confident’ or ‘Somewhat confident’, what factors have influenced your decisions?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

21. Why did you participate in BTSA Induction this year? (mark all that apply)

- [ ] To earn my Professional Clear Teaching Credential
- [ ] It was the expectation of my employer
- [ ] For professional development
- [ ] To have a support provider
- [ ] Other (please state) ____________________________________________
Sample Intern Consent Form
Intern Program Consent Form, 2005-2006

The Intern Program is a state-funded program of support and preparation for public school teachers to earn a teaching credential. By completing this consent form, you will join your local Intern program.

It is important to collect information on new public school teachers as we work to address the teacher shortage, provide support for new teachers, and promote teacher retention. The California Information Practices Act and the Federal Privacy Act provide that agencies requesting information indicate the principal purposes for which that information is used. Information gathered on this consent form will be used to determine funding for your Intern program.

I agree to participate in the Intern Program during the 2005-2006 school year.

School Name __________________________

School District _________________________

Intern Program _________________________
Type of Intern Program  ☐ MS  ☐ SS  ☐ Sp Ed

1. First Name __________________________
   Last Name ___________________________

   email address
   (If available)_________________________

2. What is your gender?  ☐ Male  ☐ Female
   What is your birthdate?  _____/_____/

3. Is this your first year in the Intern Program?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   If No, is this your 2nd ☐ or 3rd ☐ year in the Intern program?

4. For the year immediately preceding entering the internship credential program, please indicate which one of the following career categories best defines your experience:
   ☐ Military (Armed Forces)  ☐
   ☐ Aerospace & Defense related industries  ☐
   ☐ Other business or Industry (e.g., sales, legal, clerical)  ☐
   ☐ Social Services (e.g., medical, government)  ☐
   ☐ College/University (recent graduates)  ☐
   ☐ Paraprofessionals  ☐
   ☐ Pre-Interns  ☐
   ☐ Emergency Permit Holders**
   ☐ Other teaching (e.g., private school, college)  ☐
   ☐ Other ___________________________

   (list job)

4b. If you held an Emergency Permit or Pre-intern Certificate the year prior to entering the Intern Program, please indicate by filling the circle (○) after the career category listed above that best defines your experience for one year prior to teaching on an Emergency Permit or Pre-intern Certificate.

5. What is your ethnicity?
   ☐ African American or Black
   ☐ Asian American/Asian/Indian (e.g. Chinese, Japanese)
   ☐ Latino, Latin American, Puerto Rican, Mexican American, Chicano or other Hispanic
   ☐ SE Asian American/SE Asian (e.g. Cambodian, Hmong)
   ☐ Pacific Islander, Filipino
   ☐ Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
   ☐ Native American/Alaskan Native
   ☐ Other ________________________________

Questions 6-10 are on the back of this page
6. When & where did you receive your undergraduate degree?
   Year graduated college ______
   □ In California  □ Outside California
   □ UC  □ Which state? __________
   □ CSU
   □ Private Institution  □ Or Country? __________

Please indicate campus ________________________________

7. Please indicate the credential you are working toward:
   □ Multiple Subject

   □ Single Subject (Mark all that apply)
   □ Agriculture
   □ Art
   □ Business
   □ English
   □ Languages other than English
   □ Health Science
   □ Home Economics
   □ Industrial & Technology Education
   □ Mathematics
   □ Music
   □ Physical Education/Dance
   □ Science (Biological, Chemistry, Physics and Geo Sciences)
   □ Social Science (History, Economics, Government, other)

   □ Education Specialist
   □ Mild Moderate
   □ Moderate Severe
   □ Deaf/Hard of Hearing
   □ Visually Impaired
   □ Physical Health Impairments
   □ Early Childhood
   □ Other ________________________________

8. What grade level(s) do you teach this year? (Mark all that apply.)
   □ Pre K  □ K  □ 1  □ 2  □ 3  □ 4  □ 5
   □ 6  □ 7  □ 8  □ 9  □ 10  □ 11  □ 12

9. What subject(s) are you assigned to teach this year?
   (Mark all that apply—select the options that best describe your assignment)
   □ Multiple Subjects
   □ Elementary, self contained
   □ Middle School Core
   □ High School

   □ Single Subject
   □ English (e.g., writing, literature, journalism, yearbook, drama, speech)
   □ Mathematics (e.g., general, algebra, geometry, statistics, trig, calculus)
   □ Science (e.g., general, biology, chemistry, physics and geology)
   □ Social Science (e.g., history, economics, government, geography, civics)
   □ Physical Education & Dance
   □ Languages other than English
   □ Art
   □ Music
   □ Agriculture
   □ Business (e.g., computers, data processing, business law, bookkeeping)
   □ Health
   □ Home Economics
   □ Industrial Arts/ROP
   □ AVID, or other similar assignment

   □ Special Education
   □ RSP (e.g., Collaborative, push in/pull out)
   □ SDC
   □ Itinerant
   □ Transition
   □ Assistive Technology
   □ ECSE

10. What is your Social Security Number?  -    -

Please return this form to your Intern Director
Sample Intern Program Annual Surveys
Alternative Certification--Intern Program
Program Evaluation Survey
2005-2006

Intern Teacher Survey

This survey asks questions about your experience in your intern program during the 2005-2006 school year. Your program will use the responses collected from all participants as one source of evidence to identify strengths and needed improvements in the program. Similarly, the sponsoring state agencies will use aggregated data to identify strengths and needs for improvements in state policies concerning intern programs.

Your response is confidential and will not be shared with anyone in such a way that you can be identified individually. Your name and eight digit Intern ID are requested to match your response with the demographic data you completed on the consent form and to let your program director know that you have completed the survey. Your name and identifying information will then be removed from your survey responses prior to analysis. No file of your responses will be maintained in your name. Thank you for taking the time to provide data needed to understand and support the improvement of intern programs.

Every Intern program assigns each Intern teacher an experienced educator who is responsible for seeing that the participant receives individualized support and assessment at the site school. This role is named differently across projects: support provider, coach, buddy, advisor. In this survey, that person is referred to as a "site support provider." In most cases support/assessment is also provided at the program/university level, that person is referred to as the "university/program supervisor."

Please answer the following questions with respect to your experiences in the current school year only.

What is your name (as entered on your Intern Consent Form)? First: ______________ Last: ______________

What is your unique eight digit ID # from the Intern Consent Form? ______________

Are you completing your Intern program (earning your Preliminary Credential) this spring/summer? O Yes O No

I. Recruitment/Selection/orientation

1. Why did you choose an Intern program for your teacher preparation? (Mark all that apply.)
   O Being able to go through the preparation program as a cohort
   O Being able to teach while getting certified
   O Convenience of course scheduling
   O Guidance from a site support provider teacher
   O Intern program fits my lifestyle
   O Length of program
   O Organization of the intern instructional program
   O Out of pocket cost
   O Program links college faculty and schools
   O School based program (linking theory and practice)

2. Please indicate your main reason(s) for entering a teacher preparation program  (Mark all that apply.)
   O Desire to work with young people
   O Employment mobility
   O Financial rewards
   O Influence of a teacher or adviser in college
   O Family member was a teacher
   O Interest in subject-matter field
   O Long summer vacation
   O Never really considered anything else
   O Want a change from other work
   O Preparation program in college appealed to me
   O Sense of freedom in my own classroom
   O Influence of a teacher in elementary or secondary school
   O Need a second income in the family
   O Job security
   O Value or significance of education in society
II. Preservice--For teachers serving in their **first year** as an Intern ONLY. If not a first year Intern, please continue with **Question 7** on page 3. The term “Preservice” refers to those activities, instructions or teaching experiences that occur prior to taking over your class as the paid teacher (aka teacher of record)

3. Did your instruction/coursework completed **prior to entering the classroom as the teacher of record** include the following? If yes, please rate the effectiveness of the instruction. If no, please mark “Did not receive.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>All First Year Interns</strong></th>
<th>Did not receive</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Assessing student learning &amp; student progress monitoring</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Child/adolescent development</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Classroom management</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Creating effective learning environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Instructional planning and delivery</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Professional, legal, ethical aspects of teaching</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Reading and literacy strategies</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Subject specific pedagogy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Supporting equity, diversity and access to core curriculum</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Teaching English Learners</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Teaching special populations (e.g. student w/special needs, gifted and talented students)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Teaching strategies</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Understanding and using student academic content standards and curriculum frameworks</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Using computer technology to support student learning</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Working with families and paraprofessionals</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ONLY First Year Education Specialist Interns</strong></th>
<th>Did not receive</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. Assessment and instructional accommodations</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Adaptive technology</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Collaborative and Co-teaching strategies</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Disability specific content</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Positive behavioral support</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Transition and IEP’s</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. In some programs, interns have a **field experience** (see list below) prior to taking over their own classroom.
   a. Did you have such an experience?  O Yes  O No  If no, please continue with **Question 7** below
   b. If yes, how many total hours? _____ and 
   c. indicate the types of experiences. (Mark all that apply.)
   O Observation  O Whole class instruction
   O Planning instruction/designing lessons  O Assessing student learning
   O Tutoring/teaching single or small groups of students
   O Other ________________________________

5. During the **preservice field experience** were you supported/supervised by any of the following? (Mark all that apply.)
   a. O Program/university supervisor  b. O Start-up coach, interim support provider
   c. O Site support provider  d. O Master, cooperating teacher
   e. O Other site or district personnel  f. O Other program/university personnel

6. How well did the **preservice instruction/experience** prepare you for your first day as teacher of record?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all well</th>
<th>Somewhat well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III: Preparation and Support while serving as Teacher of Record**

An intern program includes both preparation (coursework/seminars/modules of content instruction) and support for the intern’s status as a new teacher.

The term “Teacher of Record” refers to the time when you are working as a paid teacher in your own classroom. The following questions ask about the activities, instruction or teaching experiences that occur while you are the teacher of your own class as a paid teacher (aka teacher of record.)

7a. About how often did you communicate with your site support provider and university/program supervisor (e.g., in person, by phone, e-mail) about issues related to your teaching practice (e.g., curriculum and instruction, students, assessment, materials)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site support provider</th>
<th>University/program supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>O O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>O O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7b. On the average, how long did you meet or communicate with your site support provider and university program supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site support provider</th>
<th>University/program supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O 15 minutes</td>
<td>O 15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 30 minutes</td>
<td>O 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 60 minutes</td>
<td>O 60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 90 minutes</td>
<td>O 90 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How well matched are you with your site support provider in terms of:

- a. Grade level
- b. Your subject matter or course emphasis
- c. His/her knowledge of the student populations you teach
- d. Geographic proximity- same school, nearby school

Which of the following characteristics above is the **most important** to you in a site support provider match? Select **ONLY one** response!

- Grade level
- Subject matter knowledge
- Student population knowledge
- Geographic proximity

9. In the context of all of the demands on your time, was the meeting time with your site support provider and university/program supervisor adequate to meet your needs for support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site support provider</th>
<th>Not adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Very adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University/program supervisor</th>
<th>Not adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Very adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Overall, how often were the following types of formal and informal support offered **timely in meeting your needs**?

- a. Work with your site support provider
- b. Work with your university supervisor
- c. Classes, courses, seminars
- d. Work with other teachers/specialists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not timely</th>
<th>Somewhat timely</th>
<th>Timely</th>
<th>Very timely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please indicate if you received the following support **this academic year**. If yes, please rate its usefulness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not receive</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Onsite observation, consultation, demonstration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cohort support seminars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. On-line one-on-one support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Chat room support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. “Hot” phone line to support provider</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Specialized support by individuals or teams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Alumni support by former graduates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Informal “teacher down the hall” support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Access to community persons for non-classroom support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Program coordinator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only answer Question 12 if you are completing your Intern Program this spring or summer. If you will be participating in the Intern program in 2006-2007, please continue with Question 13 on page 6.

12. Did the instruction/coursework you completed during the time you were in the classroom as the teacher of record include the following? If yes, please rate the effectiveness of the coursework. If no, please mark “Did not receive.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interns completing the program this year</th>
<th>Did not receive</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Applying effective teaching strategies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Assessing student learning &amp; student progress monitoring</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Child/adolescent development</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Classroom management</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Creating effective learning environment</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Instructional planning and delivery</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Professional, legal, ethical aspects of teaching</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Reading and literacy strategies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Subject specific pedagogy</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Supporting equity, diversity and access to core curriculum</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Teaching English Learners</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Teaching special populations (e.g. student w/special needs, gifted and talented students)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Understanding and using student academic content standards and curriculum frameworks</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Using computer technology to support student learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Working with families and paraprofessionals</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONLY Education Specialist Interns completing the program this year

| p. Assessment and instructional accommodations | ○             | ○            | ○                 | ○         | ○             |
| q. Adaptive technology                        | ○              | ○            | ○                 | ○         | ○             |
| r. Collaborative and Co-teaching strategies    | ○              | ○            | ○                 | ○         | ○             |
| s. Disability specific content                 | ○              | ○            | ○                 | ○         | ○             |
| t. Positive behavioral support                 | ○              | ○            | ○                 | ○         | ○             |
| u. Transition and IEP’s                        | ○              | ○            | ○                 | ○         | ○             |
IV. Intern Program Outcomes

13. To what extent do you believe that your Intern program helped you:
   a. Improve your teaching knowledge and skills
   b. Plan and deliver instruction
   c. Improve your ability to use standards-based assessment
   d. Meet your students’ differing needs
   e. Understand performance levels for students
   f. Use technology to support student learning
   g. Teach English learners
   h. Create a supportive and healthy environment for student learning
   i. Address equity and diversity in your teaching
   j. Teach special student populations
   k. Manage classroom behavior
   l. Analyze student work
   m. Work with families of students
   n. Provide subject specific instruction
   o. Improve student achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Improve...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Plan and...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improve...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Meet...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Understand...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Use technology...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Teach English...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Create a...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Address...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Teach special...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Manage...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Analyze...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Work with...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Provide...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Improve...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. In five years, how confident are you that you will be:
   a. In the teaching profession?
   b. Teaching in the same district?
   c. Teaching at same school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Somewhat confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Very confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. In the...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teaching...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teaching...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered ‘Not confident’ or ‘Somewhat confident’, what factors have influenced your decisions?

15. How long do you plan to stay in teaching after you earn your preliminary credential?
   - 0 1 year
   - 0 2 years
   - 0 3 years
   - 0 4-5 years
   - 0 6-9 years
   - 0 10-14 years
   - 0 15 or more years
   - 0 As long as I’m able
   - 0 Undecided at this time

16. Would you recommend this intern program to others?
   - O Yes
   - O No
   - O Maybe

17. If you had the choice, what type of school would you choose as your school site?
   a. Socioeconomic class (SES) O Low SES  O Mid SES  O High SES  O No opinion
   b. Academic Performance Index (API) Score
      - O decile 1, 2, 3 school
      - O decile 4, 5, 6 school
      - O decile 7-10 school
      - O No opinion
   c. Percentage of students that are English learners
      - O Under 10%
      - O 11-30%
      - O 31-50%
      - O over 50%
      - O No opinion
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