Initial Program Review Submission Instructions for Proposed Induction Programs

Initial Program Review Submission Instructions
For Proposed Induction Programs

When a Commission-approved institution that sponsors educator preparation programs decides to offer a new type of induction program leading to a clear credential in California, they must complete the Initial Program Review (IPR) process. Initial Program Review provides the Commission, Committee on Accreditation and the Board of Institutional Reviewers with evidence that an institution is prepared to meet the adopted program standards. Trained reviewers from the Commission's Board of Institutional Review (BIR) will review the induction documentation, including program-specific Precondition responses, the Common Standards Addendum and provide a *Preliminary Report of Findings* on the alignment of proposed induction program activities with the adopted induction program standards. The BIR members will review the submission and provide feedback to the institution. Then, the institution must provide additional information and documentation to address the questions asked by the readers.

There are 6 required elements made of up 17 specific exhibits. All elements and exhibits must be included Initial Program Review submission. Additional Information may be found by viewing the Induction Initial Program Review Webcast.

The feedback provided to the institution will be aligned with the adopted program standards for the proposed educator preparation program.

1. Program Summary

Two exhibits are required:

1.1 : This 2-4 page **Program Summary** provides the context for the Initial Program Review team and will also be used by the site visit team. A template for completing the summary is available here. The Initial Program Summary provides a brief overview of the structure, course of study, and assessment of candidates for the planned program. A clear description will also help the reviewer to understand the remaining evidence submitted Initial Program Review but is not repetitive for exhibits that can stand on their own. It might, however, be important to provide the reviewer with information as to whether activities will occur as part of a cohort, can be done out of order, or other pertinent information that provides a clear picture of how the program is being designed. The guiding philosophies for the program or specific mission should be included to help reviewers better understand the program.

1.2. : The program summary must also include a **table** showing proposed delivery models (online, in-person, hybrid) and other options/pathways (ECO, traditional, etc.) available for each location (if more than one). A sample follows.

Location	Delivery Model	Pathway
Main Campus	In-Person	Traditional
	In-Person	ECO
	Online	ECO
Location 2	In-Person	Traditional
Location 3	In-Person	Traditional

- ✓ *Required Exhibit:*

  1.1 Program Summary (2-4 pages) using this template.

  1.1.1 Table depicting location, delivery models, and pathways

2. Organizational Structure

One exhibit is required:

2.1 : Provide **an organizational chart or graphic** to show how the program leadership and instructional personnel/staff will be organized within the program and how the will program fit into the education unit, including personnel serving in non-teaching roles, including the roles and responsibilities of those involved in assigning and placing mentors/coaches. The graphic should depict the chain of authority and include individuals up to the dean or superintendent level. If the program will operate as a consortium with shared leadership, the graphic must include individuals who will serve in induction administrative roles in entities within the consortium.

- ✓ *Required Exhibit:*

  2.1 Organizational Chart/Graphic

3. Qualifications of Mentors/Coaches and Professional Development Personnel (Instructional Personnel)

Three exhibits are required. One additional exhibit is only required if there are vacancies.

3.1 : Submit a **table** that provides the proposed list of mentors/coaches and professional development personnel. The table must include numbers of full time, part time, and retired annuitants. Vacancies should also be noted.

3.2 : Programs must also submit a proposed **annotated list of instructional personnel** (mentors/coaches). This should include full time and part time instructional personnel, including retired annuitants. The annotated list must include the mentor/coach's name, degree, status (fulltime, part time, retiree), and the mentoring/coaching assignment. The mentor/coach's name should link to his/her resume. It should note the type of educator they mentor (single subject content, multiple subject, mild/moderate, administrator, etc.). See example that follows:

John Smith
Fulltime Mentor
Single Subject Math
Single Subject Science

3.3: Link to **published documentation** (e.g. job descriptions, online advertisements, contract language) regarding the experience and qualifications used to select instructional personnel for any additional personnel including part time personnel in the proposed program.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits:*
  - *3.1 Instructional Personnel Table*
  - *3.2 Annotated Personnel List with links to Mentor/Coach and Professional Development Providers' Resumes*
  - *3.3 Published Experience and Qualifications Requirements*

- ✓ *Other Exhibits, if applicable:*
  - *3.4 Instructional Personnel Recruitment Documents (if vacancies exist)*

4. Program Sequence

Clear information about the sequence in which candidates will complete the induction program must be submitted. This should be a link to website, program brochure, handbook, or other document that will be readily available to candidates and prospective candidates. If the program will be offered via more than one pathway or model, a link to the **program sequence** should be provided for each pathway or model.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits:*
  - *4.1 Link to draft or published sequence of induction activities required for program completion (candidate handbook, website, or other widely distributed documents)*

5. Job-embedded Induction

Seven exhibits are required.

Programs must provide specific evidence of meeting the requirements of job-embedded induction as described in the Commission standards for that program. The required documentation is:

1) **A Timeline or Table** that denotes at what point after being hired in a position requiring a teaching or administrative services credential that each candidate will be assigned a mentor/coach and how those support hours will be broken out across the preliminary

teaching or administrative experiences. For teacher induction programs, this table must also include ECO candidates.

2) **Employer Agreement or MOU** that clearly delineates the number of coaching hours that will be provided to each candidate; expectations and criteria for veteran practitioner selection (coach/mentor), training and evaluation; and support and assessment roles and responsibilities for the program and the employer.

3) Training Materials that will be used to train mentors/coaches**.**

4) Documentation such as a **spreadsheet or table** that will be used to verify appropriate coach/mentor matches for all candidates (no names are needed at this time) that align with the program standards and design (refer to program standards for additional information). For example, in a teacher induction program the spreadsheet would show that each candidate will be assigned a mentor that appropriately matches the candidate's credential and setting.

5) Links to **Published or Draft Manuals or Handbooks or Advising Materials** that provide information to the district and candidates about expectations of the Induction program including appropriate job sites, veteran practitioner support (coach/mentor), and information about completion requirements

6) **DRAFT Individual Learning Plan (ILP) template for Teacher Induction or Individual Induction Plan (IIP) template for Clear Administrative Services and related program documents**. These should include information regarding how the candidate will be assessed during induction. Copies of blank **assessment instruments** should be included.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits:*
  - *5.1 Timeline or Table denoting planned timing of mentor/coach assignment for candidates*
  - *5.2 Signed or Draft Employer Agreement or MOU for each Employer*
  - *5.3 Proposed Coach/Mentor Training Material*
  - *5.4 Documentation (spreadsheet or table) to track Candidate Job Sites*
  - *5.5 Induction Program Handbook/Manual/Advising Material-Draft is acceptable*
  - *5.6 ILP/IIP Template and Related Documents –Draft is acceptable*
  - *5.6.1 Assessment Instruments*

6. Credential Recommendation

Two exhibits are required.

Provide a **brief description** (300 words or less) of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates will be recommended for the credential. The description should include a

link to the program's planned **candidate progress monitoring document or other tracking tool** that will be used to verify that candidate has met all requirements for the program prior to recommendation**.**

- ✓ *Required Exhibits:*

  6.1 Description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation

  6.1.1 Planned Candidate Progress Monitoring Document

Finalizing the Initial Program Review

Initial Program Review should be organized in a clear and easily accessible manner. The most efficient is to label each exhibit by number and title (e.g. 6.2 Memorandum of Understanding) and the title should link to the evidence being provided for that exhibit. Some numbered exhibits may have more than one link—this is acceptable, especially when there is more than one pathway or delivery model for a program. Institutions are reminded **not** to submit narrative unless it is asked for -- reviewers will not be reading them. Keep in mind that you are "showing" (exhibits) rather than "telling" (narrative).

Prior to submitting the Initial Program Review, the evidence provided should be reviewed against the program standards to ensure that what has been provided is aligned to the requirements of the standards. It is the institution's responsibility to ensure that the exhibits provided demonstrate that the program will meet the standards.

Institutions should test all links to make sure they are working and do not require any additional permission to access. It is strongly suggested that the links be tested from outside your institution to ensure that they will work beyond your institution's network. If the URL requires a password, the password should also be tested. It is not acceptable to require reviewers to create or use personal gmail accounts for google access. Reviewers must be able to access submission anonymously.

Submitting the Initial Program Review

Initial Program Review submissions are due on the date specified in the Intent to Submit.

Initial Program Review submission must be posted to the institution's website and the URL submitted to IPR@ctc.ca.gov. If the website is password protected, the password must also be submitted. Google docs, pdfs, and linked documents will not be accepted. When submitting the URL, please also include a contact person if there are issues with access or broken links.

Questions related to Initial Program Review submission should be addressed to IPR@ctc.ca.gov. Other questions should be directed to the content area consultant for the specific type of educator preparation program.

Review of the Initial Program Review Submission

Once submitted, Initial Program Review submissions are checked by staff for completeness and accessibility. Initial Program Reviews with missing exhibits and/or issues with access will be returned to the institution.

Pairs of reviewers with program expertise are convened for the program proposed by your institution. These reviewers examine all exhibits presented by the program, looking first at the program holistically and then standard by standard. Reviewers will reach consensus as to whether a program standard is *Aligned* or *Needs More Information* and provide the institution with the IPR Report of Findings. If a standard is deemed to *Need More Information,* reviewers will provide guidance as to what additional information is required. Commission staff will review the IPR Report of Findings and forward to the Unit Head at the institution.

Institutions must provide additional information and documentation for any standards that the readers did not find to be Aligned. This process is iterative until the readers find all Commission-adopted standards for the specific type of educator program to be *Aligned* in the proposal.

Once the Proposed Program Completes the BIR Review

The program will be placed on the agenda for the next COA meeting once all documentation has been received at the Commission. All required documentation must be provided to staff a week before the deadline to post the COA agenda (see the IPR webpage for dates for this year.) The COA agenda item will include the link that contains the following information for each program for which the institution is seeking approval:

1. Preconditions Response for the proposed program
2. Common Standards Addendum for the proposed program
3. Final Program Proposal
4. All reviewer feedback for items 1-3 listed above must be made available on the institution's website.

A representative from the proposed program must be available (either through technology or in-person) during the COA meeting in which the program is being recommended in order to answer any questions asked by the COA.