



Report on New Teacher Induction

Submitted Pursuant to the Budget Act of 2015, Item 6360-001-0407

September 2015

This report was developed by the Professional Services Division of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. For more information about the content of this report, contact Karen Sacramento at ksacramento@ctc.ca.gov.

September 2015

This report, like other publications of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution is requested.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95811

This report is available at
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports/>

Commission on Teacher Credentialing



1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95811

(916) 322-6253

Mary Vixie Sandy
Executive Director

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------|
| Barnes, Kirsten | Non-Administrative Services Representative | 2016 |
| Blackburn, Constance | Teacher Representative | 2016 |
| Cooney, C. Michael | Public Representative | 2017 |
| Darling-Hammond, Linda | Faculty Member | 2017 |
| Gonzalez, Jose | Administrative Services Representative | 2015 |
| Harris, Kathleen | Teacher Representative | 2017 |
| Hinde, Alicia, | Teacher Representative | 2016 |
| Klatt, Bonnie | Teacher Representative | 2017 |
| Rodriguez, Haydee | Teacher Representative | 2016 |
| Rodriguez, Ref | Public Representative | 2016 |
| Tiffany-Morales, Juliet | School Board Member | 2016 |
| Zumot, Michelle | Designee, Superintendent of Public Instruction | Ongoing |
| Vacant | Teacher Representative | |
| Vacant | Public Representative | |
| Vacant | Public Representative | |
| Ex-Officio Members | | |
| Aguerrebere, Joseph | California State University | |
| Browne, Kathryn | California Community Colleges | |
| Martin, Shane | Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities | |
| Sloan, Tine | University of California | |

Vision Statement

All of California's students, preschool through grade 12, are inspired and prepared to achieve their highest potential by well-prepared and exceptionally qualified educators.

Mission Statement

To inspire, educate and protect the students of California.

Report on New Teacher Induction
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
September 1, 2015

The Budget Act of 2015, (SB 69, Item 6360-001-0407, Provision 8), requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to submit a report on beginning teacher induction to the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the budget and policy committees by September 1, 2015. Specifically, the provisional language reads as follows:

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) shall work with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Board of Education, legislative staff, the Department of Finance, and beginning teacher induction stakeholders that the CTC deems appropriate to evaluate any burdens of the existing induction requirements and identify options for streamlining and reforming beginning teacher induction. The CTC shall submit a report that discusses the identified options, findings, and funding recommendations, including state, local educational agency, and teacher candidate responsibilities, to the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the budget and policy committees of each house of the Legislature, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the Department of Finance by September 1, 2015.

This report provides background information detailing the evolution of funding and program requirements for induction, surfaces challenges facing the program currently, and identifies programmatic and funding options that would strengthen new teacher induction. In developing this report, the Commission consulted with many stakeholder organizations and individuals. The recommendations provided in this report are in alignment with the recommendations from an Induction Task Group that has been meeting as part of the Commission's larger effort to strengthen and streamline preparation standards, assessments and accreditation practices.

Summary of Recommendations

1. Focus Induction Standards on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.
2. Focus induction primarily on high quality mentoring, with an emphasis on meeting the new teacher's immediate needs and supporting long-term teacher growth through ongoing reflection on and analysis of teaching practice.
3. Determine the nature and scope of each new teacher's induction program through an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) that is guided by the candidate's current assignment, career aspirations, and local and state initiatives.
4. Streamline the Commission's accreditation system to eliminate unnecessary and time-consuming documentation activities and increase reliance on outcome data to determine the quality and effectiveness of programs.
5. Ensure that the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) prioritizes the induction of new teachers.
6. Conduct surveys of employers, new teachers and induction program sponsors on the mentoring services made available to new teachers they have hired.
7. Ensure that new teachers receive appropriate support and mentoring in their first years of teaching regardless of the type of contract — temporary or probationary — on which the individual is employed, and that this mentoring be without cost to the new teacher.

Background

California has led the nation since 1988 when it initiated a pilot effort to identify strategies that would support new teachers as they entered the teaching profession. Over the years, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program has had a demonstrable impact on teacher quality, effectiveness and retention in the profession.¹ While much of the education landscape has changed in the more than 25 years since new teacher induction came into being, the idea that the state should protect its investment in a high quality teaching force has endured.

The California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA) was established in 1992 by the Legislature and the Governor following the success of the California New Teacher Project, a pilot study authorized by the Legislature (Chap. 1355, Stats. 1988) and jointly conducted by the Commission and the California Department of Education (CDE) that focused on increasing retention rates of beginning teachers. The findings from the California New Teacher Project indicated that new teachers who participated in an induction experience that included intensive mentoring, support, and assistance were not only more successful in their first two years of teaching, they were also less likely to leave the profession within the first five years of teaching.² Findings from the study also suggested that beginning teacher success, effectiveness, and retention could be improved by thinking of teacher preparation and induction as a “learning to teach” system. This system begins with teacher recruitment, continues with initial teacher preparation, and moves into supporting new teachers in the beginning years of professional service in the classroom. In 2008, the Commission collected retention information from Induction programs that showed over [87% of new teachers who participated in BTSA Induction](#) were still in the teaching profession after five years. National studies confirm what we have learned in California, that overall, between 30 and 50 percent of teachers leave teaching within the first five years, but that teachers who receive multiple forms of support tend to stay in the profession.³

The Marion Bergeson Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Act (Chap. 1245, Stats. 1992) was enacted to provide an effective transition into the teaching career for first and second year teachers through intensive professional development and assessment. The BTSA program was established as a state-funded grant program to support beginning teachers in their first two years of teaching. The program was funded through Prop 98 and administered jointly by the CDE and the Commission. In 1998, the Budget Act provided \$66.0 million, which funded over 12,000 beginning teachers. The state funding allocation was set each year in the annual budget act and it only funded new teachers participating in a BTSA program sponsored by a local education agency (LEA). Funding was awarded on a per-participant basis initially with \$3,000 from the state and a required \$2,000 match by the employing LEA. By 2007-2008, the last full year of categorical funding, the Budget Act provided \$128 million, which supported 30,118 beginning teachers.

In 1998 SB 2042 (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998) formally incorporated the completion of an Induction program into the teacher preparation and licensure process, making Induction one of the routes for earning a clear teaching credential. The other route to the clear credential was through a coursework-based Clear Credential program offered by an institution of higher education. The primary difference between these programs is how the local context—class, school and district—is addressed. In an Induction program where the work is between a new teacher and his or her mentor at the school site, the local context can more easily be addressed whereas when a new teacher is enrolled at a college or university it maybe more challenging for the support and mentoring to

¹ Smith, T.M.; Ingersoll, R.M. (2004) *What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover?* American Educational Research Journal; Olebe, M. (2001). *A decade of policy support for California's new teachers: The beginning teacher support and assessment program.* Teacher Education Quarterly; Ingersoll, R.M., Strong, M. (2011) *The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers a critical review of the research.* Review of Educational Research.

² Pearson, M.J. & Honig, B., 1992, *Success for Beginning Teachers: The California New Teacher Project 1988-1992.* Commission on Teacher Credentialing and California Department of Education.

³ Ingersoll, R., 2003, *Is there a Shortage of Teachers?*; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004, *Do Teacher Induction and Mentoring Matter?*; Ingersoll, R., 2014, *What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teacher attrition?*

truly be job-embedded. With the inclusion of BTSA Induction programs as one route to the clear credential, BTSA became both a categorical program administered by the CDE as well as an educator preparation program leading to a credential that was monitored by the Commission. In 2004 emergency legislation, AB 2210 (Chap. 343, Stats. 2004), was enacted making Induction the preferred path for earning the clear general education teaching credential and limiting access to Clear Credential programs. This measure allows the completion of a Commission-approved Clear Credential program offered by an institution of higher education only when a teacher's employer verifies that an Induction program is not available. The Commission reviewed and modified its accreditation system in 2006 and made the policy decision that any program leading to a credential should be included in the accreditation system. BTSA Induction programs were transitioned into the Commission's accreditation system beginning in 2010-11, tightening the linkage between induction and credentialing. Following California's lead, 22 states have built induction into their credentialing system although only 10 of the states require an induction program to be a minimum of two years⁴.

Beginning in 2009-10, the State moved several categorical programs, including BTSA, into a large flexible block-grant in order to provide LEAs with greater flexibility to respond to budget reductions brought about by the recession. From 2009-10 through 2012-13 LEAs were allowed to use these funds for any educational purpose. Fewer than five Commission-approved Induction programs closed during the time of flexible funding.

Beginning in 2013-14 California restructured its funding for education, consolidating revenue limit and categorical program funding into a Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). With LCFF, each LEA that sponsored a Commission-approved Induction program continued to receive the funding it had been receiving. The Commission conducted a survey of approved Induction programs in January 2015. The survey data indicate that approximately 88.5% of new teachers were not being required to pay for Induction services in 2014-15. A summary of findings from the survey is provided in the Appendix of this report.

The Commission's Induction Program Standards are used to accredit Induction programs leading to the Clear Credential and are the State's only vehicle, currently, for monitoring program quality. The standards incorporate the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and define what a program must provide to candidates and what each candidate must know and be able to do at the conclusion of the Induction program prior to earning the clear teaching credential. The Commission's standards do not specify how programs should meet the requirements, which allows for regional and local variation. Programs vary in terms of structure, specific program requirements and local employer participation and expectations. Over the past 20 years the number of Induction programs operating in California has grown from 15 pilot programs to over 150 accredited programs.

The Commission's standards for Induction programs have evolved over the last twenty years as the program has expanded and contracted. The most significant change in recent years was driven by Senate Bill 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats 2006) which directed the Commission to "...eliminate duplicative requirements between teacher preparation and teacher induction programs..." As a result, the twenty BTSA program standards that called for advanced preparation for new teachers during Induction were substantially revised and replaced with six Induction program standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/Induction-Program-Standards.pdf>, 2009). These 6 Induction standards were updated in 2013 to strengthen requirements related to teaching English learners (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/Induction-Program-Standards-2013.pdf>). The Commission is currently considering needed revisions to Induction standards to bring them into alignment with other changes in preparation, assessment, accreditation, and conditions in local schools and districts.

⁴ NTC Policy Brief: Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction (2012) <http://www.newteachercenter.org/sites/default/files/ntc/main/resources/brf-ntc-policy-state-teacher-induction.pdf>

In 2015 there are 156 Commission-approved General Education Induction programs (2 CSU, 1 UC, 4 private colleges and universities, and 149 LEAs) in California. There are 17 Commission-approved Clear Credential programs (2 CSU, 3 UC, and 13 private colleges and universities). In addition, there are a total of 105 Special Education Clear Induction programs (20 sponsored by IHEs and 85 sponsored by LEAs). Induction continues to be the primary route for new teachers to complete requirements for and earn a professional teaching credential.

To continue to have the kind of induction programs California became famous for, the Commission is in the process of strengthening both the standards that guide and govern induction programs and the accreditation procedures that guarantee a consistent level of quality in this system statewide. These upgrades will help ensure, to the extent possible, that candidates have access to effective mentoring and induction during their first two years of teaching, and that public schools and the students they serve are taught by teachers who have had every opportunity to learn and become highly effective teachers.

Current Challenges Facing New Teachers and Induction Program Sponsors

The Commission has annually surveyed participants in induction, support providers, and school administrators since 2001. The data show that the relationship between the new teacher and the mentor has the highest positive impact, that mentors need to be well prepared for their role, and that new teachers and mentors need dedicated time to work together. When programs provide well trained mentors and time for teachers and mentors to work together, all participants report that Induction is very effective at supporting new teachers and that the new teachers develop more quickly than teachers who are not supported through induction.

The Budget Act directed the Commission to evaluate any burdens of the existing Induction requirements. Over the past 20 years, teacher, employer and program experiences have guided needed revisions and updates to the state's policies governing new teacher induction. In 2013 a study was undertaken by Julia Koppich and Dan Humphrey focused on new teachers. The report, [California's Beginning Teachers: The Bumpy Path to a Profession](#), details findings from a case study of eight districts where new teachers were not all being supported in their first years of teaching and where some programs were not providing activities and experiences that addressed the needs of new teachers. The findings from this study shed light on issues that need to be addressed in the state's review of induction policies and procedures. Five key issues are identified here and discussed below:

- Induction is in some cases a repeat of the preliminary preparation program
- Induction is a sequential process that does not apply to the new teacher's assignment
- Induction has too much required documentation that detracts from supporting the new teacher in his or her teaching assignment
- Some districts have difficulty prioritizing their induction responsibilities
- Ensuring quality in all Induction Programs

Repeat of Preliminary Preparation: While the Induction program is intended to advance the skills learned in the credentialing program, some teachers reported that significant parts of the Induction curriculum duplicated portions of their teacher preparation program. Because both programs are structured around the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)*, it is inevitable that some topics will be revisited during induction. When done well, repetition can reinforce newly learned skills in ways that are beneficial. When done

superficially, this can lead to frustration as new teachers feel either that they are “running in place” or that their limited time is being misused in re-covering recent ground. The goal of induction is to apply the knowledge gained during preliminary preparation in ways that take that learning deeper and help the new teacher to be more grounded and effective.

Sequential Process not Individualized to New Teacher: Some programs are organized in a manner that delivers a common set of experiences for all participants, with inadequate personalization based on the new teacher’s particular context. The Induction program was designed to serve multiple purposes. It helps to retain new teachers by encouraging and equipping them with basic classroom skills. It also provides support in the form of an experienced mentor. And finally, it serves to advance a teacher’s practice by helping them develop their skills. However, while all beginning teachers need some mentoring in all aspects of the CSTP, each teacher needs more or less help in particular areas based on their skills and the specific circumstances of their classroom. The tension between common and individualized experiences can lead to frustration if a teacher and mentor feel that time is being wasted on unnecessary activities.

Excessive Documentation: Concerns about excessive documentation have long plagued induction programs. A certain amount of documentation on each candidate was considered necessary when induction became linked to the credentialing system. In prior years, the formative assessment system used by new teachers and their mentors was the vehicle that documented new teacher development and demonstrated completion of tasks and activities. When Induction programs were integrated into the accreditation system, programs were counseled to document that each participating teacher or candidate completed all program requirements and provide that documentation for review during accreditation site visits. Teachers interviewed by Koppich and Humphrey in 2013 reported that many of the program’s paperwork requirements continue to be onerous, duplicative, and do not contribute significantly to their development as effective teachers. Induction programs have been seen as being too focused on measurable inputs, such as written assignments and documentation of actions, rather than focusing on the mentoring and support of beginning teachers. This presents a challenge to both participants and mentors in balancing the tasks required by Induction with the responsibilities of being a classroom teacher.

Difficulty in Prioritizing Induction Responsibilities: Some program sponsors have been challenged in their prioritization of Induction responsibilities with other educational priorities of the LEA. Many sponsoring districts argue that their primary responsibility is to their K-12 students, rather than the adult population of teachers in their Induction program. This can lead to challenges in allocating resources, focusing the work of administrators, and prioritizing of the needs of the Induction program. As a consequence, some districts have failed to provide mentoring and coaching to all of their novice teachers, and some teachers are not receiving induction services until their third, fourth or fifth year of teaching. In addition, the responsibilities of sponsoring a Commission-approved educator preparation program include participation in the Commission’s accreditation system. Some LEAs have shared that developing, submitting and participating in the biennial reports, program assessment, and accreditation site visits is burdensome.

Ensuring Quality in All Programs: As a credential program that was initially developed as a grant program, Induction has been subject to multiple quality oversight strategies since its inception. Grant funding requirements in the early years of BTSA focused on compliance issues, like budget management, resource allocation, and staffing. Accreditation standards, on the other hand, focused on the selection and training of mentors, the content of professional development, expectations for new teacher development, and tended not to be as compliance oriented as grant conditions. Recently, the accreditation review process has revealed variations in program quality and the experiences that new teachers have across different programs. The current standards do not adequately address the amount of mentoring, support, and assistance, which are the

most essential features of high quality induction programs. The Commission's standards and accreditation system can and should be adjusted to strengthen oversight of program features that are known to be critical to effective induction programs, like the amount of protected time mentors and new teachers have together.

Four options for strengthening and reforming teacher induction are presented in the next section of this report. These analyses and options were developed in concert with a broadly representative Task Force consisting of teachers, employers, induction stakeholders and higher education faculty.

Options for Streamlining and Reforming Beginning Teacher Induction

The Commission has identified a variety of changes that could strengthen, streamline and reduce the identified burdens of an Induction program for both the new teacher and program sponsors. The primary vehicle for enacting these proposed changes is the Commission's soon to be revised standards for induction programs and the accreditation system. These changes provide the broad framework to support induction as a statewide priority, and will guide needed changes in regulation. These options do not require new statutory authority to enact.

1. The Commission's Induction Standards should be focused primarily on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CTSP).

The CSTP represent the knowledge and skills that individuals must master in order to be effective teachers. These include cycles of inquiry, engagement within a professional community, integration of elements of the professional knowledge base in the service of learning, growth, and development of diverse students across varying contexts and a common set of professional and ethical obligations that includes a profound and fundamental commitment to the growth and success of the individual students. While the CTSP have always been a component of California's induction standards, this recommendation would ensure that Induction programs are built on the foundation of the CSTP. The draft revised Induction standards focus on the CSTP.

2. Mentoring should be the primary focus of the Induction program with an emphasis on meeting the new teacher's immediate needs and supporting long term teacher growth through ongoing reflection on and analysis of teaching practice.

There is wide consensus across all stakeholder groups that strong and effective mentoring is one of the primary factors contributing to teacher retention and classroom performance and is the most important aspect of induction. Ensuring adequate time for teachers and mentors to work together and providing robust tools to support the mentoring relationship are critical features of effective induction programs. The mentoring should include the new teacher observing experienced, effective teachers as well as the mentor observing and providing feedback to the new teacher. These priorities and qualities of effective induction need to be addressed in the Commission's accreditation standards and regulations guiding and governing induction programs. The draft revised induction standards put mentoring as the focus of Induction.

3. An Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) should serve as the primary method for determining the nature and scope of the new teacher's induction program. The ILP should include a cycle of inquiry guided by the candidate's current assignment, career aspirations, and local and state initiatives.

Induction participation should be based on inquiry wherein teachers use evidence and analysis of students' academic progress, and the teacher's performance, goals and context to guide their practice

in support of student learning. Based on teacher concerns that their programs did not always apply directly to their specific circumstances, the Commission has determined that Induction, while meeting certain generalized requirements, should be customizable, in order to appropriately reflect and build upon the experiences of the individual teacher. The draft revised Induction standards require an Individualized Learning Plan that will serve as the primary method for determine the nature and scope of the new teacher's induction program.

4. Streamline the Accreditation System to eliminate unnecessary and time consuming documentation activities and increase reliance on outcome data submitted by each program to determine the quality and effectiveness of programs.

Currently all Commission-approved program sponsors participate in the Commission's accreditation system in the same way. The Commission is revising the accreditation system to reduce and streamline the amount of documentation needed and relied upon to determine program quality, and shifting its focus to a more thorough examination of program outcomes as a key indicator of quality. Induction programs differ in some fundamental ways from preliminary preparation programs, and the revised accreditation system needs to be sensitive to and appropriately structured to accommodate these differences. The Commission is strengthening and revising its accreditation system at this time and expects to have the revised system fully implemented in 2017-18.

Funding Considerations

Beginning teachers are required to complete Induction to earn a Clear Teaching Credential. The value of this requirement, in terms of grounding new teachers in their practice and retaining them in the profession, has been well documented and is widely understood in the policy, K-12 and higher education communities. California has had a long tradition of supporting new teacher participation in an induction program, recognizing it as an investment in the overall quality of our public schools. When teachers leave the profession districts incur expenses to hire replacements. These costs vary but have been estimated to be between \$15,000 and \$20,000 per teacher who leaves.⁵

In support of the state's move to local control over funding decisions, the Commission believes that new teachers should continue to receive high quality induction at no cost to the teacher, a goal that has been achieved by most school districts in the state as indicated in the attached survey results. Providing an effective and supportive induction experience for beginning teachers ensures a high quality workforce for California's diverse student population. The 2015 Budget includes \$490 million for activities that promote educator quality and effectiveness, including beginning teacher and administrator support and mentoring, support for teachers who have been identified as needing improvement, and professional development that is aligned to the state academic content standards. These funds will be allocated to school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and the state special schools in an equal amount per certificated staff and are available for expenditure over the next three years. The Commission will continue to monitor new teacher access to mentoring services, and, through its revised induction standards and updated accreditation system, ensure a high level of quality in the state's induction programs.

Induction into the teaching profession is not unique to teachers in California's credentialing system. The lessons learned from new teacher induction have informed changes in other credential areas as well. Special

⁵ Charlotte Advocates for Education, (February 2004). *Role of Principal Leadership in Increasing Teacher Retention*; Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B. (2007). *The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts: A pilot study*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Retrieved March 30, 2009 from <http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/NCTAF-Cost-of-Teacher-Turnover-2007-full-report.pdf>

education teachers and administrators are also expected to participate in a well- designed, mentoring-centered induction program that moves them from novice to experienced and effective educators. The “learning to teach” and “learning to lead” systems are a hallmark of licensing and certification in California, and have yielded significant benefits in terms of developing a well prepared workforce for the schools. As local education agencies continue to develop and refine their capacity to exercise local control in ways that strengthen and improve public education, the state monitoring system could be refined to ensure that educator induction remains a priority for local education agencies.

Appendix

Induction—Information on PTs paying for Induction

A survey was conducted to gather information from Commission-approved teacher induction programs. The information requested included 1) the number of participating teachers in 2013-14, 2014-15 and the expectation for teachers in 2015-16, 2) if participating teachers are charged to participate in the induction program and the amount and 3) if there are eligible teachers who were not accepted into the program in 2014-15. Of the 165 Commission-approved induction programs, 7 are sponsored by IHEs and 158 are sponsored by LEAs. 126 programs, all LEAs, provided information in response to the survey. Of the 126 programs responded to the survey, 82 of the programs are single district programs and the other 44 programs are consortium programs. Not all institutions provided responses to all questions in the survey.

Commission-approved induction programs accept and support teachers on preliminary teaching credentials and then recommend the completer for the Clear Teaching credential: general education teachers-Multiple Subject and Single Subject (GE), special education teachers (SpEd), including teachers who work in Charter schools and private schools. Not all induction programs are approved to work with Special Education teachers (There are a total of 105 SpEd Induction programs-20 sponsored by IHEs and 85 sponsored by LEAs).

1) Number of Participating Teachers

| # Districts in Program | # Programs | 2013-14 | | 2014-15 | | 2015-16 |
|------------------------|------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 1 | Year 2 | |
| 1* | 82 | 3525 | 2835 | 3735 | 3380 | Asked if significantly fewer (1), slightly fewer (2), about the same (3), slightly more (4) or significantly more (5) Mean response was 3.65—the programs are expecting to grow slightly in 15-16 |
| 2-5 | 15 | 433 | 381 | 672 | 440 | |
| 6-10 | 6 | 283 | 233 | 301 | 254 | |
| 11-20 | 10 | 906 | 791 | 1035 | 1036 | |
| 21-50 | 9 | 1559 | 1165 | 2178 | 1616 | |
| 51-100 | 1 | 19 | 26 | 29 | 31 | |
| 101-200 | 3 | 1415 | 1071 | 1702 | 1498 | |
| TOTALS | 126 | 8140 | 6502 | 9652 | 8255 | |
| | | 14,642 | | 17,907 | | |

*Single district programs. All other programs are consortium programs

2) Programs Charging the Participating Teacher and the Fee

| # Programs | Average PT Fee and # of Programs Charging PTs in 2014-15 | | | | | | | | General Ed Induction | |
|------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|--|--|
| | GE | | SpEd* | | Charter* | | Private* | | % Programs Charging a Fee by # Districts | # PTs Paying Fees in 2014-15/Total # PTs for the Group of Pgms |
| | Avg Fee | # Pgms Charge | Avg Fee | # Pgms Charge | Avg Fee | # Pgms Charge | Avg Fee | # Pgms Charge | | |
| 82 | \$1,640 | 5 | \$1,750 | 3 | \$2,180 | 9 | \$2,358 | 12 | 6 % | 373/7,115 |
| 15 | \$1,750 | 1 | \$1,750 | 2 | \$3,266 | 3 | \$3,350 | 7 | 7 % | 109/1,112 |
| 6 | \$2,500 | 1 | \$2,000 | 1 | - | 0 | \$2,250 | 2 | 17 % | 60/555 |
| 10 | \$390 | 2 | \$390 | 2 | \$1,093 | 3 | \$2,430 | 6 | 20 % | 205/2,071 |
| 9 | \$1,667 | 3 | \$1,500 | 2 | \$1,667 | 3 | \$2,380 | 5 | 33 % | 1,256/3,794 |
| 1 | \$2,000 | 1 | - | 0 | \$2,500 | 1 | - | 0 | 100 % | 60/60 |
| 3 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | \$3,000 | 3 | 0 % | 0/3,200 |
| 126 | 14 (11 %) | | 10 (8 %) | | 19 (15 %) | | 35 (28 %) | | 2,063/17,907 | 11.5 % |

*the program may not have SpEd, charter school or private school teachers enrolled

3) Are there eligible new teachers that the program is NOT serving in 2014-15

| # Districts in Program | # Programs | # Programs NOT serving <u>all</u> eligible teachers in 2014-15 | Notes |
|------------------------|------------|--|--|
| 1 | 82 | 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many programs report that if there is a PT fee, the teacher has declined to enroll this year, and is hoping to complete through the Early Completion Option and pay less to the program. Other programs report that teachers hired after November or December have been put on a waitlist until the 2015-16 school year. A few programs report that there have insufficient SPs to work with all new teachers. |
| 2-5 | 15 | 1 | |
| 6-10 | 6 | 0 | |
| 11-20 | 10 | 1 | |
| 21-50 | 9 | 1 | |
| 51-100 | 1 | 0 | |
| 101-200 | 3 | 0 | |
| TOTALS | 126 | 12 | |

Consortium Programs

Many consortium programs report that the fee varies if the district is a partner in the consortium or if the PT is joining ad hoc. In some consortia the fee varies depending on what services each district wants the consortium to provide to the district.

Stipends paid to Support Providers (SP)

Programs report a range of SP stipends-- \$1,000-\$3,000 per year per PT, the average SP stipend is around \$2,000

Average Cost to run an Induction program

The survey also asked each program to calculate the **Total Cost per PT** for a **Year in Induction** (2014-15; 75 programs responded). Responses ranged from \$1,000 to \$9,468 per PT with a mean of **\$4,249**. For the programs that provided both the number of participants and the cost per PT, the following scatter plot was developed.

