

Program Standard 4: Evaluation

The induction program has a comprehensive system of formative program development and evaluation that addresses all standards, involves program participants and other stakeholders, and leads to substantive improvements. The program provides meaningful opportunities for professional practitioners and broadly representative community members to become involved in program revision, development and evaluation activities. Program sponsors participate in accountability processes designed to ensure quality and effectiveness of the program.

Program and Implementation Plan

Standard 4 requires that induction programs include a comprehensive formative program development and evaluation system. This standard requires regular evaluation of the program to ensure consistent, high quality implementation.

4(a) Local program goals and the induction program standards are the criteria for program evaluation. These criteria include an examination of participating teachers use of standards-based instructional strategies based on state-adopted academic content standards and performance levels for students.

Our external evaluator, Dr. Lois Rolland* of the Sinclair Research Group, worked collaboratively with us to design our program evaluation based on our Induction Program goals and the Induction Program Standards. We began planning our formative program assessment based first on the program standards. Each year we seek evidence of attainment and growth in these standards.

How will local assessment be revised to gain feedback on new induction standards, especially standards 15 - 20 and participating teacher's use of standards-based instructional strategies and content?

Dr. Lois Rolland, our external evaluator, along with the BTSA Director and Assistant Director, work collaboratively to design all feedback instruments. In the past, all evaluation instruments were based on the BTSA Program Standards. Currently, all evaluation instruments are being completely rewritten to focus on and reflect the new Induction Standards. This process began in May, 2002. Qualitative and quantitative survey questions are being developed around Standards 1 - 14. These are already developed for the Fall surveys. Interview protocols and evidence collection guidelines are being developed around Standards 15 - 20. All tools will be ready by midyear.

The new Fall survey was administered in October and November during our S3SuperStrategies.Sat (Super Saturdays) to Participating teachers and Support Providers. Our feedback will be available for program use in early December.

See Evidence # of Element (a) at the end of Standard 4: Resume of Dr. Lois Rolland

Philosophical Perspective

The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program seeks assessment to generate useful information collected in a variety of formats and contexts and analyzed with statistical rigor that can be used to improve the program. The program evaluation framework takes as its model the organizational work of W. Edward Deming. This adapted process of “Formative Program Assessment” involves four steps:

Plan – The Formative Program Assessment model is standards-based and ongoing, uses multiple qualitative and quantitative assessment measures, solicits information from all stakeholders, and is valid, reliable and objective.

Implement – The Formative Program Assessment model seeks to make efficient use of valuable time. Assessment instruments focus on program specifics, and elicit and collect feedback in a thorough and systematic way. Rigorous analysis of data then signals the extent to which the program models the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness of Professional Teacher Induction Programs.

Reflect – This process closes the feedback loop. To identify vital areas of strength and areas for improvement, participants should allot time to think deeply about the implications suggested by the data.

Improve – The goal of assessment is to improve the program to enhance the skill, confidence, and competence of Participating Teachers. When areas for improvement have been identified, program leaders can quickly – and frequently – improve the system. Program improvements need not wait till the end of the year; rather we can respond to needs as they become evident.

The day-to-day challenge of participation in the BTSA Induction Program may leave little time or inclination to consider whether the program is working well. However, one criterion of the Induction Program Standards (Standard 4, “Evaluation”) is to evaluate the program itself. Remembering this point serves to empower us: we are not merely subjects of the study, but are its authors as well. As participants in the process, participating teachers know that their views on the BTSA Induction Program carry real weight in improving every one of the other Program Standards.

Evaluation Design

In principle, BTSA Induction Program evaluation is straightforward. The Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs and the requirements for program accountability outline the goals of this assessment. The introductory section of the Standards specifies: "Program evaluation methods and activities should be used to ascertain how well the Program Standards are being implemented." Therefore, this program evaluation system employs "Goals Assessment Model" (GAM), a structure developed by Dr. Lois Rolland in 1999. The steps in it are: (1) set standards, (2) collect data, and then (3) analyze the extent to which the program is attaining the expected standard. BTSA program leaders use this analysis to plan for program improvement.

The goals of the BTSA Professional Teacher Induction Program itself, and standard professional practice in program evaluation, dictate design of this assessment. The assessment structure:

- Systematically elicits feedback from all participants;
- Tracks a variety of indices of program success through the year;
- Balances quantitative & qualitative measures of participants' engagement in the process;
- Examines both strengths and needs of participating teachers;
- Gauges the relevance and effectiveness of professional development activities and other support for participating teachers;
- Conscientiously seeks feedback to improve the program; and
- Seeks in all cases evidence of attainment of Induction Program Standards.

This assessment design satisfies the legislated criteria of BTSA Professional Teacher Induction assessment, and at the same time, bears in mind the local program goal to retain and nurture ever-better teachers. Therefore, in all aspects, it is truly a system of formative program assessment.

Evaluation Questions

The simple but vast overarching question for this program evaluation is:

To what extent is our program achieving the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for BTSA Professional Teacher Induction Programs?

More particularly, evaluation questions include:

1. Are participating teachers growing in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)?
2. Are BTSA participating teachers increasing in competence and confidence?
3. Are participating teachers maintaining consistently high levels of morale and enthusiasm for teaching?
4. Do program participants perceive that they are being effective?
5. What are the perceptions of participants regarding program strengths and areas for growth?
6. What is the impact of the BTSA program on its participants?

These questions cover broad areas; to generate more useful data and practical feedback that participating teachers and support providers can put to use immediately, they can be further focused on particular skills and practices.

Evaluation Tools

Surveys were kept simple and short so that respondents would not lose interest and focus while plodding through a tedious list of questions. Most instruments were designed to take no more than 3 minutes to complete. Instruments included the following:

Interest Inventory of Participating Teachers - A series of 36 statements that seek to identify areas of “interest” for beginning teachers, which can serve to focus plans for program professional growth activities. Based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), with a Likert-type scale from which participating teachers could choose one response, this instrument has been standardized in use with over 8000 participating teachers across California in the last 5 years.

(1) Mid Year Surveys of Participating Teachers and Support Providers - Approximately 15 quantitative and qualitative questions assessing the working relationship among participating teachers, support providers, and the program, using categorical and interval ratings.

(2) Year End Surveys of Participating Teachers and Support Providers - A brief survey soliciting participants’ opinions as to areas for program improvement, this instrument uses both quantitative and qualitative questions with categorical and interval ratings and open-ended questions.

(3) CSTP Impact Assessment - A series of 36 statements seeking evidence that BTSA Induction Program participation fosters growth in teaching skills and abilities. Based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), it employs a Likert-type scale from which participating teachers choose one response.

(4) Site Administrator Survey - A series of statements assessing administrators’ views of the relationships of teachers and support providers, the structure and scheduling of the BTSA Induction Program, and the administrator’s view of their place in the program. With 6 forced-choice Likert-type response categories and “don’t know,” mainly quantitative with some qualitative questions, this instrument was designed for easy completion by busy site administrators and has been widely used for BTSA program evaluation over the last three years.

(5) District Leadership Survey - This survey presented quantitative questions similar to those in the Site Administrator Survey seeking district leaders (the leadership team, assistant superintendents, steering or advisory committees, union representatives, IHE leaders, etc.) views on general Induction Program Standards. To maintain the validity and reliability of the results, it was essential that only

those with a deep understanding of the BTSA program and its components completed this survey.

Methodology

Statistical rigor in data analysis can yield surprisingly subtle and useful conclusions. Likert-type responses were quantified and analyzed as “quasi-interval” in line with common practice in descriptive statistics. Survey reliability itself is analyzed, by comparing variability of individual responses with the total responses by calculating Cronbach’s Alpha and the item-total correlation coefficients. Data were disaggregated by demographic categories and compared and rank ordered. In cases where participating teachers and support providers were asked the same question, results were compared. Tables, clustered-column, line and pie charts were used to best illustrate results.

Qualitative questions were open-ended, allowing participants all possible answers and to gather a wide range of responses. They were focused on collecting as much data as possible regarding participant perceptions of program strengths and area for growth and program impact. Salience of opinion was also foremost in question design; those items that stand out in a respondent’s mind are often mentioned first. Responses were reduced and sorted into specific categories that allowed for observations about trends.

See Appendix Evidence #1: The Summative Program Evaluation Report, 2001-2002, for the Sacramento BTSA Consortium.

The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program has an interactive web-based database. John Fleischman’s Technology Services Division at the Sacramento County Office of Education created and designed this database in collaboration with the BTSA director and BTSA staff. It will be operational July of 2002. Each Participating Teacher and Support Provider will have his or her own “My BTSA” page. All of the Professional Teacher Induction Program Standards have been embedded into this web site. This will allow the program to track and evaluate how our participating teachers address the state adopted academic and performance standards for students and the types of standards-based instructional strategies they choose to engage in within their inquiry process.

4(b) *Ongoing program evaluations include information from multiple internal and external sources, such as participants, employers, partner(s), recent graduates, professional development providers, site administrators, and program staff.*

The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program secures data from the following sources.

Time Line	Instrument	Audience
July-December	State Consent Forms	Participating Teachers and Support Providers
August/September	CSTP Interest Inventory	Participating Teachers
October-November	How's It Going? Survey	Participating Teachers and Support Providers
November	Site Administrator Survey	Site Administrators
January-February	How's It Going? Mid-Year Survey	Participating Teachers and Support Providers
March-April	How's It Going? End of Year Survey	Participating Teachers and Support Providers
May	State Survey	Participating Teachers Support Providers Administrators BTSA Staff
April	District Leadership Survey	District Advisors and District Coordinators
May	CSTP Program Impact Survey	Participating Teachers
On-going	Professional Development Event Feedback	All Participants
On-going	Advisor and Coordinator Meetings	Advisors Coordinators
Spring	Informal or Formal Program Reviews	Representatives from all Stakeholder Groups

On-going	Trainer/Presenter Feedback	Professional Development Providers
On-going	Phone calls, emails, letters, etc.	Program participants
August, December, March	Teacher Association Feedback	Association Presidents or Representatives
August, September, December, March	“Learning to Teach” collaboration and feedback	Teacher Recruitment Center Pre-Intern Intern IHEs (CSU-Sacramento, National University, University of Phoenix) Representatives

See Evidence #2 for Element (b) at the end of Standard 4:

1. *External Program Evaluation Alignment Chart to BTSA Program Standards and Induction Standards;*
2. *State Survey Alignment Chart to BTSA Program Standards and Induction Standards;*
3. *BTSA Program Standards Aligned to Induction Program Standards*

4(c) *The program regularly collects feedback about program quality and effectiveness from all participants, using both informal and formal measures. The program leader(s) analyze the data, share them with program sponsor(s) and others in a systematic way, and use the data as a source for improving the induction program. At a minimum, the program leader(s) conduct an annual internal program evaluation.*

Please see the attached summary analysis from these three sources at the end of each standard:

- State Survey Information
- External Evaluations
- Informal Program Review

All data is collected over time from multiple sources. Informally, the data is reviewed as it comes in. If immediate changes need to be made, they are made. Each spring the program leaders, to suggest changes for the coming year, use all available data. In September of each year, those changes are confirmed and implemented. And the cycle begins again.

4(d) *The results of program evaluation, the implications of new knowledge about teaching and learning, and the identified strengths and needs of participating teachers form the basis for adjustments and improvements in program design.*

The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program Director and Assistant Director collaborate with the State BTSA Task Force, Cluster One BTSA Leadership under Cindy Gappa, the Instructional Support Services division of the Sacramento County Office of Education under Joyce Wright, California State University-Sacramento College of Education under Michael Lewis and others to stay abreast of current replicable research about teaching and learning, particularly as it applies to participating teachers. New knowledge and understands are shared with our Advisory Council, the District Coordinators and Support Providers.

The Support Providers within the Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program actively work with Participating Teachers to identify their individual strengths and areas of need as determined against the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)*. Both Participating Teachers and Support providers are surveyed regarding these identified strengths and needs. The Consortium collects copies of the participating teacher's Individual Induction Plan (IIP) each year, along with IIP revisions. In 2002-03, this information will be available to the Consortium leadership via the interactive web-based database.

Our external evaluator, Dr. Lois Rolland, provides the Consortium with ongoing, timely assessment of the feedback collected from program participants.

Formal or informal program review results are gathered each year, following an internal review of our program strengths and areas of growth.

All of the above information is gathered on a yearly basis and shared with program leaders. All decisions regarding the changes made each year to improve our program are based on data.

4(e) *Program sponsor(s) participate in external reviews designed to examine program quality and effectiveness, including program approval and formative review processes established and administered by the state agencies that approve the program.*

The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program has participated in external reviews since it began in 1993-94. The early external reviews were Peer Reviews. The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program helped design those early Peer Review Protocols when Margaret Olebe was our director. She worked collaboratively with Cindy Gappa, Pam Mullin and Lois Rolland, all BTSA directors at the time in Northern California.

As time went on, more formal review protocols were established and used. More recently, the Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program Director helped to pilot the current Formal Program Review process and has served as a lead reviewer since the Formal Program Review began. The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program participated in one Formal Program Review three years ago and will participate in Formal Program Review in 2003-04. Each other year, we participate in the Informal Peer Review process.

The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program is firmly and fully committed to the process of program review. This is one source of good information that allows the program to target appropriate growth goals each year.

What opportunities for program evaluation will the Participating Teacher experience as he or she progresses through the induction program?

Each participating teacher has the following opportunities to provide program evaluation feedback.

Time Line	Instrument
July-December	State Consent Forms
August/September	CSTP Interest Inventory
October-November	How's It Going? Survey
January-February	How's It Going? Mid-Year Survey
March-April	How's It Going? End of Year Survey
May	State Survey
May	CSTP Program Impact Survey
On-going	Professional Development Event Feedback
Spring	Informal or Formal Program Reviews
On-going	Phone calls, emails, letters, etc.

And Our Surveys and Feedback Said . . .

In this section we share pertinent information gleaned from the data and analysis of our 2001-2002 surveys and feedback. This is evidence of a functioning program in continual growth. We are consistently seeking to balance:

- The need for stability and predictability for our participants, and
- The need to be an organization that listens to our stakeholders and makes modifications that will significantly improve the quality of the services delivered.

We analyze data from three sources annually:

1. External surveys and feedback collected by our evaluator, Lois M. Y. Rolland, Ph. D., Sinclair Research Group.
2. The Statewide Survey of Participating Teachers, Support Providers, Site Administrators, and BTSA Program Staff.
3. Informal Program Review or our Formal Program Review (depending on the cycle we are in and the year).

1. External Evaluation Conclusions

The Summative Program Evaluation Report for 2001-2002 for the Sacramento BTSA Consortium by Lois M.Y. Rolland, Ph. D., is 178 pages in length and covers the following reports:

1. CSTP Inventory Report (fall)
2. CSTP Impact Assessment Report (spring follow up)
3. Participating Teacher and Support Provider Fall Survey Report
4. Participating Teacher and Support Provider Mid-Year Survey Report
5. Site Administrator Survey Report
6. District Leadership Survey Report
7. Participating Teacher and Support Provider Year-End Survey Report
8. Professional Development Report
9. Commendations and Recommendations

See Evidence #3 at the end of Standard 4: Commendations and Recommendations from the 2001-2002 Summative Program Evaluation Report prepared by our external evaluator, Lois M.Y. Rolland, Ph. D.

2. 2001-2002 Statewide Survey Results

<i>Program Staff Reported (scale of 1-4 with 4 being the highest)</i>	Means	Standard Deviation
Satisfied with use of evaluation data	3.68	0.56
Familiar with evaluation data	3.60	0.69
Satisfaction with implementation of program design	3.58	0.62

<i>Participating Teachers Reported</i>		
In five years, BT: likely to be in teaching profession	3.49	0.83
BT satisfaction: current teaching assignment	3.42	0.85
BT satisfaction: teaching at current site	3.33	0.92
BT satisfaction: teaching in current district	3.21	0.95
Connection between formative assessment and formal evaluation	2.99	0.80
Foundation for ongoing future professional growth	2.83	0.87
In five years: BT: likely to teach in same district	2.82	1.11
In five years: BT: likely to teach in same school	2.62	1.11
<i>Support Providers Reported</i>		
SP likely to serve as SP again	3.22	1.02
Satisfied with use of evaluation data	3.15	0.82
Connection between formative assessment and formal evaluation	3.02	0.99
Familiar with evaluation data	2.68	0.90
<i>Site Administrators Reported</i>		
SP improve teaching practice	3.52	0.69
Satisfied with use of evaluation data	3.12	0.74
Familiar with evaluation data	2.10	0.96

3. Informal Program Review Conclusions

The Informal Program Review found the following strengths:

- The Consortium has developed a formal comprehensive evaluation plan that includes formative and summative information. This information provides valuable information for program improvement.
- Dr. Rolland's experience and evaluation expertise has been invaluable in the evaluation design.
- All districts use the same evaluation instruments that have been developed by the evaluation consultant and the program director.
- Evaluation feedback is collected on a regular basis and analyzed.
- Evaluation feedback is discussed at monthly coordinator meetings and is used for program improvement.

The Informal Program Review found no areas of growth.

Analysis and Conclusions:

The Sacramento BTSA Consortium Professional Teacher Induction Program uses evaluation and feedback from multiple sources and through a variety of methods. The purpose of collecting data is to analyze and synthesize the information in order to make appropriate program modifications. The evidence indicates that the Consortium does a strong job of providing the information from the data analysis and synthesis to program leaders. All program decisions are made in collaboration with the Consortium's governing members based on the evidence determining program strength and areas for program growth.

Three (3) groups - participating teachers, support providers, and site administrators - indicate that while they are not overly aware of the data, they are comfortable with the decisions made from that data. An area for growth is to provide that same analysis and synthesis that is provided to program leaders to participating teachers, support providers, and site administrators in a streamlined, palatable manner. This discussion will be scheduled on the November Agenda for District Coordinators and discussed again at the Spring Planning Retreat where we solicit input from approximately 80-90 representatives from all stakeholder groups.

Our evidence documents that we have a strong, comprehensive formative program development and evaluation system. We engage in on-going, regular evaluation of all aspects of our program to ensure consistent, high quality implementation.

LOIS M.Y. ROLLAND

512 Polk Street
4646
Monterey, California 93940

Phone (831) 372-
Email: Sinclairgroup@aol.com

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS:

Experienced and current in the fields of educational research, program evaluation, assessment, curriculum and instruction, higher education and educational administration as a result of state, county, and district educational leadership. Ability to bring educational theory into practical program delivery.

EDUCATION:

Ph.D. (Educational Administration), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, 1990
M.A. (Curriculum and Instruction), University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1980
B. Ed (Secondary Education), University of Manchester, Manchester, England 1978

RECENT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Sinclair Research Group – Director

1983 – Present (Program Evaluation, Research and Training)

Adjunct Faculty – Teacher Education, California State University, Monterey Bay, California, (Research Methodology & Educational Psychology) 1998 - Present

State Program Evaluator – Beginning Teacher Support & Assessment Programs
1996 – Present

Trainer of Trainers, California Formative Assessment & Support System for Teachers (CFASST)

1998 – 2001

National Trainer of Trainers, Standards-based Classroom Management Program (SCM)
2002

State Trainer, BTSA New Director’s Academy
1996 – 2000

Adjunct Faculty - Educational Administration & Policy Development
California State University, Sacramento, California, 1997

Consortium Director, Beginning Teacher Support & Assessment Program
Contra-Costa and Alameda County Offices of Education 1992 - 1997

Adjunct Faculty - Educational Leadership and Teacher Education,
St. Mary’s College, California, 1991 - 1993

Assistant Director, Minnesota Principal Assessment Center

Minneapolis, MN, 1990

Adjunct Faculty - Teacher Education Department

Macalester College and Crown College, St Paul, Minnesota 1988 – 1990

Adjunct Faculty – Teacher Education

Crown College, Minneapolis, MN, 1988 - 1990

Assistant Principal

Jackson Junior High School, Champlin, Minnesota 1987 - 1988

Teacher

Scott Highlands Middle School, Rosemount, Minnesota 1981 - 1987

Vice President for Educational Services

Energy Education and Services, Minneapolis, Minnesota 1980 - 1981

Director of Curriculum and Instruction

AHP Associates, Minneapolis, MN, 1978-1980

EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS:

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

- Assess curricular needs and design training plans
 - Design, implement and conduct training in the areas of leadership, program evaluation, teacher support and assessment, classroom management, team building, mentoring and coaching, classroom observation systems

ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

- Represent state and counties in grant programs
- Develop, implement, direct, monitor and evaluate educational programs
- Develop reports for state and counties
- Direct certificated and classified personnel

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

- Develop syllabi, lesson plans and teach in higher education in the areas of Educational Psychology, Research Methodology, and Educational Foundations.
- Develop, implement and evaluate educational improvement programs in conjunction with central office staff, administrators and teachers at all grade levels
- Design experimental programs consistent with state, county and district goals

SUPERVISION

- Supervise and direct multiple district and county level programs
- Supervise and evaluate certificated and classified staff
- Develop and implement teacher and program evaluation procedures
- Supervise teachers in public and private school

FEDERAL AND STATE PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

- Analyze data and write reports for district, county, state and federal agencies
- Review and evaluate proposals
- Develop federal, state and private grant applications and program review documents
- Coordinate federal and state programs and projects

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CREDITS:

American Evaluators Association (AEA)
American Educational Research Association (AERA)
National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
National Staff Development Council (NSDC)
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
NASSP Certified Administrative Assessor
Program Quality Review (PQR) Trainer
Education Testing Service National Certification in the Pathwise Observation System

RECENT PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

BTSA Director's Guidebook, Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2001

"Professional Development Programs That Work For Intern Teachers And Their Mentors", Keynote Speaker, California Intern Program Conference, March 2001

"Bottom Line: What Really Works For New Teachers", Quality Mentoring Conference, February 2001.

"Models for Effective Delivery of Support Provider Services", *Educational Leadership*, January/February 2000.

"Path to Educational Excellence: BTSA", Presentation at the Annual Conference of the Association of California School Administrators, November 1999.

"BTSA Program Evaluation Report – East Bay BTSA Consortium," CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1999

"BTSA Program Evaluation Report – Monterey County Office of Education," CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1999

“BTSA Program Evaluation Report – Sacramento County Office of Education,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1999

“BTSA Program Evaluation Report – Tulare County Office of Education,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1999

“BTSA Program Evaluation Report – Santa Clara County Office of Education,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1999

“BTSA Program Evaluation Report – San Jose Unified School District,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1999

“BTSA Program Evaluation Report – Vista Unified School District,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1999

“Effectiveness of BTSA Director’s Academy,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1998

“Effectiveness of BTSA Foundations,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1998

“BTSA Program Evaluation Report – East Bay Consortium,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1998

“BTSA Program Evaluation Report – Sacramento County Office of Education,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1998

“Effectiveness of BTSA Director’s Academy,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1997

“Effectiveness of BTSA Foundations,” CA Dept. of Education and CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1997

“Using Portfolios in Program Evaluation,” 1274 School Restructuring Conference, San Diego, California 1996

“Training the Trainers for Spreading the Effect,” Beginning Teacher Induction Network, San Francisco, California 1996

*“Collaborations That Work” Beginning Teacher Induction Network, San Francisco
California 1995*

*“Collaborations That Work” California Association of Curriculum and Staff
Development, San Francisco, California 1995*

“Authentic Demonstrations of Growth Through Portfolio Evidence,” San Francisco, California, California Association of Curriculum and Staff Development 1994

RECENT CLIENTS (Pre-Intern, Intern, BTSA & PAR Program Evaluation)

Alum Rock Union Elementary School District
Antioch Unified School District
Antelope Valley Union High School District
California State University, Monterey Bay
California State University, Stanislaus
East Bay BTSA Consortium
Fremont Unified School District
Hayward Unified School District
Monterey County Office of Education
Newark Unified School District
Sacramento County Office of Education
San Jose Unified School District
San Luis Obispo County Office of Education
Santa Barbara County Office of Education
Southern Prairie AEA 15
Tulare City Elementary School District
Tulare County Office of Education
Vista Unified School District

REFERENCES:

Dr. Margaret Olebe, Administrator for 2042 Legislation, California Department of Teacher Credentialing, 1812 Ninth St., Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 322-6254

Mrs. Alice Bullard, Regional BTSA Cluster Consultant, 5715 Musick Ave., Newark, CA 94560 (510) 818-4158

Dr. Lynne Cavazos, Director, Santa Barbara County BTSA Program, 4400 Cathedral Oaks, Santa Barbara, CA 93160 (805) 964-4711 Ex. 5430

Dr. Mikie Loughridge, Induction Consultant, State of California, 44811 Sierra Highway, Lancaster, CA 93534-3226 (661) 948-7655 Ex. 315

Ms. Barbara Shinn, Director, Sacramento BTSA Consortium, 9738 Lincoln Village Drive, Sacramento, CA 95827 (916) 228-2495

Mr. Gordon Surface, BTSA Director, East Bay BTSA Consortium, 5715 Musick Ave., Newark, CA 94560 (510) 818-4261

Evidence #2 for Element (b) of Standard 4:

1. External Program Evaluation Alignment Chart to BTSA Program Standards and Induction Standards;
2. BTSA Program Standards Aligned to Induction Program Standards
3. 2001-2002 State Survey and alignment with the 13 BTSA Program Standards And the 20 Professional Teacher Induction Program Standards

**External Program Evaluation Alignment Chart
Questions Aligned to the Induction Standards, BTSA Program Standards and External Survey for the Sacramento BTSA Consortium**

BTSA Program Standards <i>Induction Program Standards</i>	CSTP Needs Assessment	Site Admin. Survey	Mid Year Survey of BTs	Mid Year Survey of SPs	District Leadership Survey	CSTP Growth Assessment	Year End Survey of BTs	Year End Survey of SPs
1 <u>1</u>	A		22, 24		1			
	B		23	1	1, 10e	2, 19	1, 4a, 4c, 8b, 11a	1, 4a
	C			1	1, 10e	3, 20	1	1
2 <u>10</u>	A	X		10c	4,21	X		
	B	X	10	1	1	X	1	1
3 <u>5&7</u>	A				5,22			
	B		4	5	6	6,23		
4 <u>11</u>	A		7	4, 8b	9b(1,2,3)	7		
	B		5	4, 8a	9a			
	C		6	4, 8b, 10a	9b(1), 10c			
5 <u>11</u>	A	X	3, 11, 13	8b, 10a	9b(2), 10c		X	
	B	X	1, 2, 10				X	
6 <u>8</u>	A		17	1, 6		8		
	B		17	6, 10g	10a	8	1, 4f	1, 4g
7 <u>9</u>	A		14, 15, 16	10b	10b, 10c, 10e, 10f	9,24		2, 4d, 4e
	B	X	1, 8	10b	10b, 10f		X	2, 4d, 4e, 4f
8 <u>13</u>	A	X	15	9, 10b			X	2
	B	X		9			X	2
	C	X		9			X	2

BTSA Program Standard		CSTP Needs Assessment	Site Admin. Survey	Mid Year Survey of BTs	Mid Year Survey of SPs	District Leadership Survey	CSTP Growth Assessment	Year End Survey of BTs	Year End Survey of SPs
<u>9</u> <u>12</u>	A			9, 10b				2	
	B			9				2	
	C								
	D			9				2	
<u>10</u> <u>12</u>	A		18, 19	1, 2, 3, 7	1, 2, 3, 8	11		1, 2	1
	B	X	17, 20	1	1, 10d		X		
	C	X					X		
<u>11</u> <u>12</u>	A	X	9, 12, 17	10e	10d	12, 26	X		4b, 4f
<u>12</u> <u>2</u>	A		21, 22			16, 27			
<u>13</u> <u>4</u>	A	X	25			17, 29	X		
	B	X	25	10d, 10f		29	X	4b, 4d, 4e, 4g	4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f
Retention								3, 4b	3

Induction Program Standards Aligned to BTSA Program Standards

Professional Teacher Induction Program Standards	BTSA Program Standards
<i>Foundation Standards</i>	
1: Sponsorship, Administration, and Leadership	1: Sponsorship and Administration of the Program
2: Resources	12: Allocation and Use of Resources
3: Professional Development Providers (New Standard)	
4: Evaluation	13: Program Development, Evaluation and Accountability
5: Articulation with Professional Teacher Preparation Programs (New)	3: Collaboration
6: Advice and Assistance (New)	
7: Collaboration	3: Collaboration
8: Support Provider Selection and Assignment	6: Selection of Support Providers/Assessors
9: Support Provider Professional Development	7: Provision of Professional Development for Support Providers/Assessors
<i>Implementation Standards – A: Program Design</i>	
10: Program Design	2: Program Rationale, Goals, and Design
11: Roles and Responsibilities of K-12 Schools	4: School Context and Working Conditions 5: Roles and Responsibilities of Site Administrators
12: Professional Development Based on an Individual Induction Plan	9: Development and Use of Individualized Induction Plans 10: Provision of Individualized Assistance and Support by Support Providers/Assessors 11: Design and Content of Formal Professional Development Activities for Beginning Teachers
13: Formative Assessment Systems	8: Formative Assessment of Beginning Teacher Performance
14: Completion of the Professional Teacher Induction Program (New)	

<i>Implementation Standards – B: Teaching Curriculum</i>	
15: K-12 Core Academic Content and Subject Specific Pedagogy (New)	
16: Using Technology to Support Student Learning	

<i>Implementation Standards – C: Teaching</i>	
17: Supporting Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum	
18: Creating a Supportive and Healthy Environment for Student Learning	
19: Teaching English Learners	
20: Teaching Special Populations	

**2001-2002 State Survey and alignment with the 13 BTSA Program Standards
And the 20 Professional Teacher Induction Program Standards**

Induction	BTSA Standards					
1	Standard 1: Sponsorship and Administration of the Program		BT	SP	SA	Staff
Sponsorship, Admin. and Leadership	Clarity of allocation of authority					3a
	Clarity of roles & responsibilities of sponsors					3b
	Clarity of roles & responsibilities of program staff					3c
10	Standard 2: Program Rationale, Goals, and Design		BT	SP	SA	Staff
Program	Length of time to receive services after beginning teaching		2,3			
Design	Clarity of rationale, goals, design			15a	6a	3d
	Clarity of role of site administrator					3e
	Clarity of role/responsibilities of SPs			15b	6b	3f
	Clarity of Selection of SPs					3g
	Clarity of Professional development needs of SPs					3h
	Clarity of Requirements for BTSA participation		14a	15c		
	Degree which BTSA built upon teacher preparation		15a			
	Satisfaction with implementation of program design					5
5 & 7	Standard 3: Collaboration		BT	SP	SA	Staff
Artic. With Prof. Tr. Prep Programs	Coordin- ation of BTSA with:	Teacher Preparation Programs				6a
		Human Resources & Personnel				6b
		Curriculum & Instruction				6c
		District priorities				6d
		School priorities				6e
Collaboratio n		Other professional development			7	
	Match of BT PD with school/district priorities			11		

11 Roles & Resp. Of K-12 Schools	Standard 4: School Context and Working Conditions	BT	SP	SA	Staff
	Challenging assignments	9a	10a	5a	
	Support for challenging assignments	9b	10b	5b	
	Helpfulness of support for challenging assignments	9c			
	Types and adequacy of support			5c, d	
	BTSA foster supportive professional culture in school			9	
11 Roles & Resp. Of K-12 Schools	Standard 5: Roles and Responsibilities of Site Administrators	BT	SP	SA	Staff
	School site orientation for BT	1, a, b, c			
	SA knowledge of BTSA: attend training			3	
	SA knowledge of BTSA: Methods to get info on BTSA			4	
	Understanding of formative assessment process			6c	
	Understanding of knowledge/skills in formative assessment			6d	
	Understanding of purpose and importance of BTSA events			6f	
8 Select of Support Providers	Standard 6: Selection of Support Providers	BT	SP	SA	Staff
	Match between BT/SP	5a-d			
	SP experience with K-12 teaching		1		
	Ratio of SP: BT		1a		

9	Standard 7: Provision of Professional Development for Support Providers		BT	SP	SA	Staff
Support Provider Prof. Develop.	Extent to which SPs prepared to work with BTs				10	
	Usefulness of SP training:	Local context for teaching		3a		
		Respond to diverse needs of BTs		3b		
		Use formative assessment instruments		3c		
		Use evidence from formative assessments		3d		
		Reflective conversation about teaching practice		3e		
		Use assessment evidence to develop IIPs		3f		
Support Provider Prof. Develop.	Frequency meet with other SPs for PD/problem solving			3		
	Knowledge and skills of trainers in:	BT development		4a		
		CSTP		4b		
		Form assessment process		4c		
		Student content standards and frameworks		4d		
		Interpersonal communication skills		4e		
	Opportunity to meet with other SPs			5		
Usefulness of formative feedback on SP work			6			

	SP know- ledge and skills in:	BT development				7a
		Student content standards and frameworks				7b
		<i>California Standards for the Teaching Profession</i>				7c
		Teaching English Language Learners				7d
		Teaching special populations				7e
		Using computer tech to support learning				7f
		Assessing student learning				7g
		Creating healthy/supportive environment for student learning				7h
		Supporting equity, diversity, access to core curriculum				7i
		Working with families				7j
12 & 13	Standard 8: Formative Assessment of Beginning Teacher Performance		BT	SP	SA	Staff
Prof. Dev. Based on IIP	How often and how helpful were following activities:	Observation of teaching	10a	12a		
		Collecting other evidence of teaching	10c	12c		
		Analysis of student work	10b	12b		
		In-depth investigation of teaching	10d	12d		
		Support in reflecting on teaching	10e	12e		
		Examining teaching against criteria	10f	12f		
	(CFASST-using BTs only) last event completed	11b				
	Formative assessment system:	Fair in representing BT skills & abilities		17a		
		Effective in supporting BT professional development		17b		

Formative	Strength of connection between areas for growth and evidence of teaching practice	12a	13a		
Assessment Systems	Clarity of form assessment process	14b			3i
	Clarity of knowledge/skills in form assessment				3j
Prof. Dev.	Standard 9: Development and Use of Individualized Induction Plans	BT	SP	SA	Staff
Based on	Strength of connection between areas for growth and professional development activities	12b			
IIP	Clarity of understanding of professional growth plan	14c		6e	3k
	Standard 10: Provision of Individualized Assistance and Support by Support Providers	BT	SP	SA	Staff
Formative Assessment Systems	Frequency of BT/SP communication	4a	7		
	Timeliness of support from SP	7a	9		
	Adequacy of time to meet with SP	6	8		
	Standard 11: Design and Content of Formal Professional Development Activities for Beginning Teachers	BT	SP	SA	Staff

Prof. Dev. Based on IIP Formative Assessment Systems	BT satisfied with support or SA see improvement of BTs skills in:	Classroom management	8a			
		Student content standards/curriculum frameworks	8b, j		12a	
		Analyzing student wk/assessing student learning	8c		12e	
		Teaching English language learners	8d		12b	
		Teaching special populations	8e		12c	
		Using computer tech	8f		12d	
		Supporting equity, diversity, access to core curriculum for all students	8g		12g	
		Working with families	8h		12h	
		Subject matter pedagogy	8i		12i	
		Creating healthy/supportive environment			12f	
Prof. Dev. Based on IIP	Timeliness of support from workshops/seminars/courses	7c				
Formative Assessment Systems	Extent to which BTSA helped BTs:	Improve teaching knowledge and skills	17a	18a		
		Improve ability to use stand-based instruction	17b	18b		
		Improve ability to use standards-based assessment	17c	18c		
		Meet students' differing needs	17d	18d		
2 Resources	Standard 12: Allocation and Use of Resources		BT	SP	SA	Staff
	Adequacy of BTSA program resources				8	
	Adequacy of fiscal resources					4a
	Adequacy of personnel					4b
	Adequacy of facilities					4c

4 Evaluation	Standard 13: Program Development, Evaluation and Accountability	BT	SP	SA	Staff
	Familiar with evaluation data		16a	13a	8a
	Satisfied with use of evaluation data		16b	13b	8b
	Participant Satisfaction	BT	SP	SA	Staff
	BT satisfaction: teaching in current district	18a			
	BT satisfaction: teaching at current site	18b			
	BT satisfaction: current teaching assignment	18c			
	Satisfaction with implementation of program design				5
	SP likely to serve as SP again		19		
	Program Outcomes	BT	SP	SA	Staff
	In five years, BT: likely to be in teaching profession	19a			
	In five years, BT: likely to teach in same district	19b			
	In five years, BT: likely to teach in same school	19c			
SP improve teaching practice			11		
Connection between formative assessment and formal evaluation	13	14a, b			
Foundation for ongoing future professional growth	16				
Other:	BT	SP	SA	Staff	
Structure of SP work assignment	4b				
Years of experience of SP	4c				
Years experience as SA			1a,b		
Years of experience in BTSA			1c	1	

Evidence #3 of Standard 4: Commendations and Recommendations from the 2001-2002 Summative Program Evaluation Report prepared by our external evaluator, Lois M.Y. Rolland, Ph. D.

2001-2002 Commendations and Recommendations from External Evaluator

After careful analysis of all evidence collected from the Sacramento BTSA Consortium during the 01-02 academic year, the following commendations and recommendations are offered:

Commendations

1. All of first year and 99% of second year teachers plan to continue teaching next year. Most of these will continue at the same school (P.S. 13)
2. The program bases its professional development events on the assessed needs and interest of beginning teachers. This is reflected in very positive ratings regarding the relevancy of professional development events and in the areas where beginning teachers feel that BTSA has made the most impact (BTSA Program Standard 11).
3. While initially beginning teachers said they were least interested in professional development relating to CSTP 6 (Developing as a Professional Educator), at the end of the program they indicated that the greatest impact of the BTSA program was in leading them to reflect on the craft of teaching, on the means to improve as a teacher and develop as a professional, and on the value of colleagues in helping to hone their skills (CSTP 6.1, 6.2, 6.5).
4. At the first of the year, first-year teachers reported that they were most interested in professional development in CSTP 1 and 2. At the end of the year, these same first year teachers reported that BTSA had significantly assisted them in CSTP 2 (Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning) and, in particular, in planning and implementing classroom procedures and routines that support student learning (2.5): they felt more confident in establishing a framework of activities. They also reported that BTSA has assisted them in classroom management: establishing and maintaining standards for student behavior (2.4), and establishing a climate that promotes fairness and respect (2.2). These are important issues for first-year teachers facing their first classroom full of students; BTSA seems to have had salubrious results in this area.
5. Second-year teachers feel that BTSA has helped them in areas that should occupy the attention of more experienced teachers: mastery of their subjects and cultivation of artful and effective means to organize and present them. They report that BTSA has aided them in demonstrating knowledge of their subject, creating an engaging classroom environment, and better organizing their curriculum to support students in its mastery

- (3.1, 2.1, 3.2). More experienced teachers delve more deeply into their subjects, and seek creative strategies to engage their students; that BTSA has succeeded here is a positive sign.
6. Most beginning teachers are informed about site resources, personnel, policies and procedures when they are first hired. (BTSA Program Standard 4, 5)
 7. Beginning teachers and support providers have a clear understanding of how they are going to work together. Site administrators also support this finding. (BTSA Program Standard 3B),
 8. Beginning teachers are appropriately matched (BTSA Program Standard 6AB), and have set and agreed times to work together (BTSA Program Standard 10A). Site administrators agree.
 9. The CFASST process is well imbedded in the program. Eighty percent of beginning teachers had completed the first CFASST Event in their sequence by mid-year (BTSA Program Standard 8ABC, 9ABD). Support providers are trained in CFASST Events well before the time they need to work on these Events with their beginning teachers (BTSA Program Standard 7AB).
 10. Beginning teachers and their support providers feel their connections are very strong. They also find their relationship with their support provider very valuable. (BTSA Program Standard 7AB, 8A, 9A).
 11. All beginning teachers have high morale and enthusiasm for teaching. Indeed, beginning teacher morale has been high in this program for the past four years. (BTSA Program Standard 13B).
 12. Beginning teachers have moderately high rates of confidence in their effectiveness in teaching students (BTSA Program Standard 13B).
 13. As a group, support providers feel very involved in the BTSA program.
 14. Support providers have very high levels of morale and enthusiasm for teaching (BTSA Program Standard 13B).
 15. Support providers feel very confident about their effectiveness in working with beginning teachers (BTSA Program Standard 13B)
 16. Most participants regularly attend BTSA professional development events (P.S. 2b, 11a).
 17. There is evidence that the participation of the beginning teacher in the CFASST process and the BTSA program has helped them to grow in the teaching standards (BTSA Program Standard 8b).
 18. Support providers have grown in the teaching standards because of their own involvement in the BTSA program (BTSA Program Standard 7ab).
 19. Beginning teachers clearly feel that the most valuable aspect of the BTSA program is their work with their support provider. The other two things most often stated as valuable are the professional development opportunities and the networking with other teachers. Support providers value mirror those of the beginning teachers. They feel that the most valuable aspect of the BTSA program is their time spent with the beginning teachers. They also value the professional development and the support provider networking.

20. First- and second-year teachers and support providers agree that they have established regular meeting times, and most have explored instructional strategies based on program standards and student performance. (BTSA Program Standard 10A, Induction Standard 4a)
21. Beginning teachers are quite confident in the discretion of their support providers, and trust that they can candidly discuss issues arising in their classroom, school-site, and overall professional experience. (Induction Standard 11c)
22. Sinclair Group's research frequently shows a decline in morale among second-year teachers. That is not the case in the Sacramento BTSA Consortium, where second-year teachers report slightly higher morale than first-year teachers. (BTSA Program Standard 13b)
23. Support providers are enthusiastic about BTSA staff support, and give a clearly positive assessment of this support in general. (BTSA Program Standard 1bc, 7a)
24. Site administrators have a clear understanding of the needs of beginning teachers, and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (BTSA Program Standard 5ab).
25. District leaders clearly understand their role and responsibility within the district program (3b) and believe that BTSA goals are achieved within the district (2a). They have regular opportunities to collaborate with consortium partners in developing the BTSA program, and believe that the consortium is well led and well administered (1b). They also believe that the consortium BTSA program achieves its goals (2a) and is effective in its support of beginning teachers (BTSA Program Standard 13).

Recommendations

1. Both first and second year beginning teachers reported that the program had least impact on aiding beginning teachers in their work with communities and families to improve professional practice (CSTP 6.3, 6.4). These may seem remote and abstract to beginning teachers already fully occupied with the daily requirements of teaching life. However, the program may wish to examine these two areas.
2. First-year teachers also felt that BTSA has had relatively low impact on their ability to guide students toward assessing their own progress in learning (CSTP 5.3); this logically must follow after the teacher has mastered strategies and means of assessment, which first-year teachers are likely still developing.
3. They also report relatively little impact on assisting them to find strategies for communicating with students, families, and others on student progress (CSTP 5.5). This may merit attention, particularly in the area of communicating with students.
4. Second-year teachers also report little BTSA assistance in cultivating the means to guide students in assessing their own learning (CSTP 5.3). This is related to their report that BTSA has also had relatively little impact in

guiding them toward promoting self-directed learning among their students, or in helping them to conceive of the means to engage students in problem-solving or critical thinking as they work through subject matter (CSTP 1.5, 1.4). All of these have to do with fostering active learning, which, in a sense, requires that a teacher stop teaching for a time to let the students do some learning. This is an advanced teaching skill, and may be just beyond the ken of those who are just learning to teach: it comes with time and experience, but is worth addressing within the BTSA program.

5. BTSA also had relatively little impact on some curricular issues: use of varied materials, resources, and technologies to make content accessible to students; developing means to engage students in problem solving and critical thinking; and fostering self-directed learning (CSTP 3.5, 1.4, 1.5). First-year teachers are likely more text-focused, and still developing a sense of the shape of the curriculum; creative means of exploring it come with greater experience. These are areas that the program may also wish to address more deeply.
6. The program needs to help districts more quickly identify beginning teachers and match them with support providers. Just one third of first year, and half of second year beginning teachers and support providers met before the school year began. (BTSA Program Standard 1BC, 2B, 6B, 10AB)
7. The program needs to continue its efforts to help site administrators find ways of support beginning teachers in challenging placements. Half of all beginning teachers feel that they are in challenging classroom placements. While most of these beginning teachers feel that they are receiving the support they need from their support provider, it is a concern that nearly 1/3 of these same beginning teachers do not feel that they are receiving the support they need from their site administrator or the BTSA program. It is also important for the program to help beginning teachers understand that the support provider they are satisfied with IS the BTSA program – provided by, trained by, and released for their support. In addition, when the total population of beginning teachers was asked to rate site administrator support, some 30% of first-year teachers (and 27% of second-year teachers) rate site-administrator support at 5 or lower. (BTSA Program Standard 4ABC, 5A).
8. The program should continue to help support providers and beginning teachers to view the CFASST process and its associated paper work in this way. Beginning teachers clearly feel that the CFASST process is too paper intensive. Other suggestions for improvement were for fewer meetings, improved meeting facilities and clearer expectations for the program at the beginning of the academic year. Support provider responses for improvement in the program cluster around those of the beginning teachers: less paperwork. They also have concerns around increased and earlier communication. Generally when support providers become more experienced in the CFASST process, complaints regarding it being paper work intensive tend to diminish. The program director recently talked

about the paperwork being seen as a “recording of the action and conversation between the beginning teacher and the support provider” –an excellent suggestion.

9. The program should pay particular attention to districts where these mean scores are low and give strong guidance to these districts. Beginning teachers reinforce the notion that institutional support is perceived to be of lower quality. Only 44% to 51% of new teachers rate BTSA program support in the highest range of 8 or better. Over 20% of both groups rate BTSA support at 5 or below. This is particularly a problem for some individual districts. (BTSA Program Standard 1B, 2A) \
10. Support providers and beginning teachers were asked to suggest one area for improvement in their district BTSA program. Their comments were mainly about the need for more release time, the cumbersome paperwork of California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST), and the timing and organization of BTSA activities.
11. Site administrators (and district leaders) still need a lot more training, particularly regarding Senate Bill 2042 and the Learning to Teach System. Site administrators also need support in helping them to adequately inform staff of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and design professional development around them. They also need help in identifying ways for providing extra support for beginning teachers in challenging classroom situations.
12. It is not clear that within district programs professional development is aligned to the needs of beginning teachers. This is a particular area on which the program should help districts focus in the coming year.
13. It is important to note a year that responses among beginning teachers to nearly all questions were widely diverse (indicated by standard deviations above 2.0). Responses are not concentrated in one area, but are spread fairly evenly throughout all response choices. This generally means that participants are experiencing the program in very different ways from district to district and often indicates varied program quality. The program should pay close attention to disaggregated mean scores and intervene in districts where scores are generally lower. High standard deviations (wide disagreement among respondents) often generate statistical results with moderate mean scores.