Discussion of the Process to Include Induction Programs in the Commission's Accreditation System
Professional Services Division
October 2008

Overview of this Report
At the August 2008 COA meeting, a discussion was begun on how to transition the BTSA Induction Programs into the Commission's Accreditation System. The August COA item <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2008-08/2008-08-item-14.pdf> presented information about the BTSA Induction Program Review (IPR) process. IPRs and Peer Reviews (PPR) processes took place during the 2006-07 and 2007-08 years and are on a scheduled hiatus during the 2008-09 year.

This agenda item summarizes the conversation from the August COA meeting and presents additional information on the Induction Annual Improvement Plan (AIP) that BTSA Induction Programs submit to the Cluster Region Directors (CRDs), the California Department of Education and the Commission.

Staff Recommendation This is an information item.

Background
The August COA agenda item posed some important questions about the transition of induction programs into the Commission's accreditation system. As explicated in the following chart from the item, there are currently many similarities between the Commission's accreditation system and Induction's IPR and PPR processes.

Type of activity	Induction Accountability	Commission's Accreditation System
On-going data collection	PPR (AIP)	Biennial Report
Submission of data, analysis and plans to modify the program	AIP	Biennial Report
Review of the program against the program standards	PPR and IPR, documented in AIP	Program Assessment
Review of the institution against the Common Standards	PPR and IPR, documented in AIP	Site Visit
Follow-up to the findings on standards	IPR Follow-up, documented in AIP	Work with CTC Consultant and the 7th Year Follow-up Report

The following questions were posed in the August COA agenda item. Two BTSA Cluster Region Directors (CRDs) were at the table with Commission staff and contributed to the discussion of the agenda item. Following each of the questions is a summary of the discussion from the August meeting and of the work staff has completed to date on the topic:

1. *Should the evaluation activities for induction programs move to a 7 year evaluation cycle to coincide with other Commission approved credential programs? If yes, should the process begin in 2009-10 or 2010-2011*

   There was support expressed by both the COA members and the CRDs for moving induction programs to a 7 year accountability cycle. Staff will begin to develop a draft 7 year schedule for the BTSA Induction programs that takes into account the program's accountability activities in the 2006-08 years and the other credential programs the LEA offers, if applicable.

2. *Currently Induction Programs participate in Peer Program Review (PPR) and submit an Annual Improvement Plan (AIP). Should these procedures be utilized in lieu of the Biennial Reports? If yes, what current BTSA Induction procedures, if any, would need to be modified to meet the needs of the Commission's accreditation system?*

   There was support expressed by the the COA members and CRDs to continue to use the BTSA induction procedures for the Biennial Reports where possible although the discussion did not address the specific procedures. To support additional discussion on this issue, the BTSA Induction Annual Improvement Plan (AIP) documents are included in this agenda item. (Appendix__)

3. *Currently the site visit for Induction Programs addresses the concepts in the Commission's Common Standards and the Program Standards. The site visit in the Commission's revised accreditation system focuses primarily on the Common Standards and confirms the preliminary findings from Program Assessment. There is no process independent of the site visit for induction programs that satisfies the purpose of the Program Assessment activity in the Commission's accreditation system.*

   * *Should the induction site visit continue to focus on both the Common and Program Standard issues? If yes, what current BTSA Induction procedures, if any, would need to be modified to meet the needs of the Commission's accreditation system?*

   * *Or, should the program review for induction programs be separated from the site visit? If yes, would induction programs participate in Program Assessment as is currently designed?*

   The CRDs expressed interest in having the accreditation site visit for induction programs continue to focus on both the Common and Program Standards. The COA did not discuss this proposal in depth at the August COA meeting. It is still somewhat unclear how all site visits will be conducted in the revised accreditation system. The site visits in the 2009-10 year will be the first ones where the Program Assessment process will have been completed prior to the site visit. Staff is still working out the procedures for the team members to focus on the Common Standards while corroborating the Preliminary Findings from the Program Assessment process.

4. *Should the report from the induction site visit team be presented to the COA with an accreditation recommendation, allowing the COA to make an accreditation decision?*

   There was support expressed by both the COA members and the CRDs that the report from a site visit team would go to the COA and the COA will make the accreditation decision. Clearly the presentation of site visit reports to the COA will have an impact on the workload of the Committee.

The following issues were also presented in the August COA meeting.

* *Adding additional sponsors to the Commission's accreditation system has implications for the scheduling of accreditation activities, the number of educators necessary to participate in the accreditation activities, and the fiscal resources necessary to operate the accreditation system.*

The Commission is budgeting to financially support accreditation site visits to induction programs beginning in the 2009-10 or the 2010-11 year. Clearly the addition of induction programs to the Commission's accreditation system has implications for the workload for staff and in the scheduling of Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR).

* *Developing a transition plan to move Induction Programs into the Commission's accreditation system.*

The transition plan is work the COA would need to complete by spring 2009 and this agenda item is an important step in addressing this work.

Annual Improvement Plan (AIP)

With the prior Induction Standards and in the PPR/AIP process, each BTSA Induction program addressed a minimum of 5 Induction Program Standards annually. The state identified two standards that all programs would address—for the 2007-08 year these standards were Standard 11: *Roles and Responsibilities of K-12 Organizations* and Standard 13: *Formative Assessment Systems.* The BTSA State Leadership Team (composed of staff from the CDE and CTC with the 12 CRDs) selected specific program standards based on identified programmatic needs. The local program selects the three additional standards on which the program will focus.

The Annual Improvement Plan (AIP) is composed of a number of documents that the BTSA Induction program utilizes to address the selected induction standards.
* Annual Improvement Plan Cover Sheet
* Program Abstract
* Reflective Summary of Program Implementation
* Self Study Standards Worksheet

With each program focusing on five of the 20 induction standards on an annual basis, the programs reviewed themselves on the standards and then every fifth year, an Induction Program Review site visit would take place. The AIP documents, presented on pages 4-9, have been submitted on an annual basis.

In many ways, the current AIP process fulfills some of the Biennial Report and the Program Assessment's goals. It is a question for the COA to consider if the AIP process sufficiently addressed the goals of the two accreditation activities, if the AIP process should be modified, or if BTSA Induction Programs should participate in the Biennial Reports and Program Assessment processes.

BTSA Induction Program – Peer Program Review
Annual Improvement Plan for 2007-08
Cover Sheet and AIP Components Checklist

BTSA Induction Program Name	
Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name	
LEA CD Code	
PPR Partner Programs for 2007-08	• • •

Annual Improvement Plan Components
❑ **BTSA Induction PPR Program Abstract (B)**
❑ **Program Narrative for Program Design- Standard 10** (Updated with **bold text** to show modifications since last review.) (Replaces Program Description)
❑ Consortiums add Consortium Partner Information Sheet/s (BB)
❑ **Reflective Summary of Program Implementation (C)**
Standards Worksheets including **Action Plans** and revised **Program Narratives** (use **bold text** to show modifications since last review) Use check boxes to indicate the two standards to be looked at during the external review.

❑ Standard <#>	
❑ Standard <#>	
❑ Standard <#>	
❑ Standard 11 (Required)	Roles and Responsibilities of K-12 Organizations
❑ Standard 13 (Required)	Formative Assessment Systems

Signatures	
LEA Superintendent Signature	BTSA Induction Director Signature
Superintendent Name (Printed)	BTSA Induction Program Director Name (Printed)

Program Information
(Consortiums or Multi-District programs – Also complete PPR Form BB)

Local Educational Agency		Number of Schools		Type of BTSA Program		Support Provider Model/s Used (Check all that apply)		Formative Assessment System	
K-12		Elementary		Single District		Classroom-based		CFASST	
Elementary		Middle		Consortium		Full-time Released		SCNTC FAS	
HS		High		Multi-District		Part-time released		Local or Other	
COE		Other		Other:					

Program Description
Attach updated Program Narrative for Standard 10
Attach Organizational Chart.
Modifications or changes made to program design since last year's review (IPR or PPR) should be noted by **bold text.**

IHE Partners (Include Contact Names, titles and Institutions)	**Advisory Board Members** (Include titles or roles)

Internal Program Data Analysis and Preliminary Action Plan
Phase 1 of 3

Evidence: *Record local and state evaluation results that relate, directly or indirectly, to the elements in this standard. Include current and prior years' data as relevant. Data should be recorded in quantitative format- not be a list of artifacts.*		**Internal Program Analysis:** *Record the findings from your self-study, in bullet, phrases or narrative form, as they relate to the elements of this standard. Include areas of strength and challenges. Align your findings with the data in the evidence columns. For state data, include comparisons to state mean in your analysis if appropriate for program improvement purposes.*
Local Data *(May include **results** from surveys, informal discussions, professional development evaluations, leadership team meeting notes, etc. Please cite the data source.)*	**State Survey Data:** *(Please include **results** from this year and last year. Include standard deviation if relevant.)*	**Please use your analysis of program evaluation results to respond to the following:** *Results that illuminate program **strengths or successes.*** *Results that illuminate program **challenges or possible areas for refinement or growth**. This may include description(s) of barriers that exist which impede the ability to implement the intended or desired program design:* *What **key challenges** do you intend to investigate with your external partners during the External Peer Program Review process? These will guide your partners' focus. If this is a standard you will NOT be focusing on during the External Review Day, your partners will provide written feedback in the form of ideas, questions you may consider, etc. for this standard. Include partners' written feedback in your final AIP.*

Update and attach the Program Narrative for this standard to the Self Study prior to submitting it to your external PPR partners. Use **bold text** to denote updated program components, including modifications that have already been made since the last review, and/or which program has proposed prior to the external review, based on an analysis of data.

Use the Action Plan Worksheet to record preliminary steps program will take to accomplish program modifications/refinements that are identified in the Program Narrative in **bold text**.

External Peer Review - Analysis, Findings and Feedback
Phase 2 of 3

External Analysis and Feedback:
- *The purpose of evidence presented during this phase is to demonstrate that this standard is implemented in a way that continues to align with the program's state-approved plan (including previously documented program modifications).*
- *Capture key ideas, suggestions and questions recorded during the external review phase. If this is a standard reviewed during the External Review Day, record the information charted or notes taken during the process. If not, include key responses from the external team. Use bullet, phrases or narrative form.*

Evidence and Data Reviewed by External Partners. *List 3-5 artifacts that illustrate how this standard is implemented. (Only for standards examined on External Review Day) Do not attach artifacts to the AIP.*	**Findings:** *Pertinent questions* posed by partners related to Self Study: **What key ideas, suggestions, and feedback from Review Partners** were gathered during the external review phase?

Internal Synthesis and Final Action Plan
Phase 3 of 3 – Analyzing Feedback and Developing Final Action Plan
(To be completed in collaboration with Program's Leadership Team, Advisory Board, etc.)

Based on the feedback from your PPR partners, refine and prioritize the actions needed to implement the proposed changes or modifications on the Action Plan for this standard.

Make final revisions to the Program Narrative to record all modifications **in bold text,** and include it with your AIP.

Action Plan for 2007-2008

Action Plan Steps:
1. *Following the Self Study, identify* **PRELIMINARY ACTION PLAN** *program MIGHT take to accomplish the goals and implement the program modifications noted in the program narrative in* **bold** *font. Add additional rows if necessary. Submit the Preliminary Action Plan with the Self Study to your External Review Partners.*
2. *Following the External Review and, in collaboration with Leadership Team, if appropriate,* **FINALIZE the ACTION PLAN**, *by deleting, editing or adding to the preliminary ideas and prioritizing the actions program WILL take.*

Action Plan Steps	Timeline

• What information might be gathered from CRD, learning partners, or other sources that will assist the program to accomplish this plan? • What support, including professional development, resources or technical assistance, might you need to meet your goal(s)?	
Information, Resource or Support Needed	**From**

Participant Information *Complete by indicating numbers of PT or SP for each category for 2007-08, except where noted.*				
Total PT in Program (funded)		**PT** assigned to Program Improvement settings	Yr. 1	
Total SP currently supporting PT			Yr. 2	
PT: SP Ratio		**Support Providers** assigned to Program Improvement settings		
Participating **SB 2042** teachers.				
Participating **Special Education** teachers.			Yr. 1	

Ryan teachers to be recommended for Clear MS or SS Credential.		hours) *during* induction	Yr. 2	
SB 2042 teachers to be recommended for Clear MS or SS credentials.		PT that completed **SB472 or AB 466 Practicum** (80 hours) *during* induction	Yr. 1	
			Yr. 2	
Ryan teachers to be recommended for Clear MS or SS Credentials via **Early Completion Option** (SB 57).		**Support Providers** that are serving PT-1 or PT-2 that have completed **SB472 or AB466 Training** (40 hours)		
SB 2042 teachers to be recommended for Clear MS or SS Credentials via **Early Completion Option** (SB 57).		**Support Providers** that are serving PT-1 or PT-2 that have completed **SB472 or AB466 Practicum** (80 hours) (Any year)		

Next Steps
The BTSA CRDs have continued to meet and discuss the transition of BTSA Induction Programs to the Commission's accreditation system. They are meeting again at the end of September 2008 and will most likely have a proposal to share with the COA as an infolder item.

The COA's discussion will guide staff in developing an item to bring back to the COA at the January 2009 meeting.