

Hanford ESD General Education Teacher Induction Program

Summative Report 2018-2019

COMPLETER SURVEY REPORT FROM CTC (Candidate Competence)	<i>CTC sets the various alignments</i>
<p>Description of Tool/Process: Candidates graduating from an Induction Program and applying for their Clear Teaching Credential were asked by the CTC to fill out a <i>Completer Survey</i>. These results are aggregated and sent to the program. The table below shows the results for this program and the overall responses for the entire state. Please note that this CTC-developed survey has various scales that frequently change (indicated in the table below as red text). Occasionally the scale is positive (higher mean scores mean better results); however, most of these questions have a reverse scale (a lower mean score indicates better results). Occasionally there is a question that has a middle score that is most positive. SRG was able to analyze the statistically significant differences for each question based on the changing scale (highlighted in yellow and at a level of .0626). Green highlighting indicates where the program was significantly better than the overall statewide response and red where it was significantly lower.</p>	<p>Scoring Scale: Frequently changing from 1-3 to 1-5, positive, split and reverse skew (generally lower numbers indicate more positive achievement)</p> <p>Number of Program Responses: 8(<i>This should be at least 80% of completers if reliability of results is to be ensured.</i>) (Statewide Responses N=9,821; 99.7%)</p>

RESULTS

COMPLETER GRADUATES FROM 18-19	Notice Changing SCALE	18-19 State-wide Mean	18-19 Program
YOUR PROGRAM AND SUPPORT PROVIDER/MENTOR			
1. How long after you were hired into an assignment that requires a CA preliminary teaching credential were you enrolled in a Commission-approved induction or clear credential program? (1=At or before time of hire or beginning of assignment, 2=One-two months, 3=Three - Five months, 4=More than five months, 5=One year or more) PC 1 & 2	5 pt - lower is better	2.46	2.25
2. How long after you were enrolled in your induction/clear credential program did you begin working with a Support Provider (SP/ Mentor) or receive support from Clear Credential Personnel? (1=Within one month of enrolling in program, 2=Within two	5 pt - lower is better	1.23	1

months, 3=More than three months after, 4=Was assigned a SP but never worked with him/her, 5=Was never assigned a SP) PC 2			
3. What was the length of your induction/clear credential program? (1=Less than one school year, 2=One school year, 3=More than one, but less than two, 4=Two school years, 5=More than two school years)	No analysis	3.61	4
4. How helpful was your support provider/mentor/system of support in helping you impact students in learning regarding the following: (1=Very helpful, 2=Helpful, 3=Somewhat, 4=Not at all)			
4a. Modeling instruction while I observed (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.64	1.25
4b. Identifying resources (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.44	1.25
4c. Providing feedback from observations to improve my instruction (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.38	1.25
4d. Teaching practices (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.43	1.25
4e. Content support (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.64	1.25
4f. Instructional design and planning (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.57	1.25
4g. Creating and maintaining a safe and positive climate (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.45	1.25
4h. Using strategies to support English Learners (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.65	1.25
4i. Using strategies to support students with disabilities (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.71	1.25
4j. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.58	1.38
4k. Setting and reaching Professional Learning Goals (PC 3 & 4)	4 pt - lower is better	1.38	1.25
5. How well matched were you with your support provider/mentor? (1=Well matched, 2=Somewhat well, 3=Not well) PC 2	3 pt - lower is better	1.15	1
6b. Did the program address the issue(s) with the match? (1=Yes, 2=To some extent, but not fully, 3=No) PC 2 & 6	3 pt - lower is better	2.16	2.16

7. On average, how frequently did you and your Support Provider have meaningful communication about issues related to your teaching practice? This includes all face-to-face or virtual interactions via technology. (1=Daily, 2=Two-three times per week, 3=Weekly, 4=Twice per month, 5=Less than twice monthly) PC 2 & 3	5 pt - lower is better	2.79	2.57
8. Across the full induction/clear program, how frequently did your Support Provider observe and coach you in your classroom during the program (in person or via visual technology)? (1=More than 10 times during entire program, 2= 6-10 times, 3= 3-5 times, 4=Once or twice, 5=Was not observed by my SP)	5 pt - lower is better	2.26	1.0
9. What amount of interaction with your Support Provider would have been best for you? (1=Significantly more time, 2=Little more, 3=Same amount given, 4=Little less, 5=Much less) PC 2 & 3	5 pts - mid point is best	2.87	2.86
CONNECTION BETWEEN YOUR INDUCTION/CLEAR PROGRAM AND YOUR INDIVIDUAL INDUCTION PLAN (IIP)			
Reflecting on your engagement with formative assessment activities during your induction and credential program experience:			
10. To what degree was there cohesion between the professional development received in district or on site and induction/clear credential program goals and activities? (1=Strong, 2=Moderate, 3=Weak) PS 2, 3 & 4	3 pt - lower is better	1.51	1.14
11. How strong was the collaboration between your induction or clear credential program and your site administration? (1=Very Strong, 2=Strong, 3=Not Strong) PS 2, 3 & 4	3 pt - lower is better	1.77	1.14
12. How much impact did participating in the following activities have on your classroom practice? (1=Extensive Impact, 2=Limited, 3=No Impact)			
12a. Collection and analysis of evidence of my teaching practice (PS 3 & 4)	3 pt - lower is better	1.34	1.43
12b. Analysis of my students' work (PS 3 & 4)	3 pt - lower is better	1.28	1.43
12c. Observation of experienced teachers (PS 3 & 4)	3 pt - lower is better	1.28	1.29

12d. Examination of my teaching practice against the CSTP (e.g., the Continuum of Teaching Practice) (PS 3 & 4)	3 pt - lower is better	1.43	1.43
12e. Development of my Individual Induction Plan (IIP)/Individual Learning Plan (ILP) (PS 3 & 4)	3 pt - lower is better	1.4	1.43
12f. Professional Learning as identified on my IIP or ILP (PS 3 & 4)	3 pt - lower is better	1.39	1.17
12g. Collaboration with colleagues (PS 3 & 4)	3 pt - lower is better	1.21	1.14
IMPACT OF INDUCTION ON TEACHING PRACTICE			
Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning			
13. To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas? (1=Very well, 2=Well, 3=Adequately, 4=Poorly, 5=Not at all)			
13a. Connect classroom learning to the real world (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.84	1.14
13b. Engage students in inquiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote their critical thinking (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.72	1.0
13c. Meet the instructional needs of English learners (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.88	1.29
13d. Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.83	1.29
Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning			
14. To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas? (1=Very well, 2=Well, 3=Adequately, 4=Poorly, 5=Not at all)			
14a. Establish and maintain a safe and respectful learning environment for all students (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.58	1.14
14b. Create a productive learning environment with high expectations for all students (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.57	1.29
Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning			
15. To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas? (1=Very well, 2=Well, 3=Adequately, 4=Poorly, 5=Not at all)			

15a. Use effective instructional strategies to teach specific subject matter and skills (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.68	1.29
15b. Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to all students (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.68	1.43
Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students			
16. To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas? (1=Very well, 2=Well, 3=Adequately, 4=Poorly, 5=Not at all)			
16a. Plan instruction based on students' prior knowledge, academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.71	1.43
16b. Plan and adapt instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies, resources and technologies to meet the learning needs of all students (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.68	1.29
Assessing Students for Learning			
17. To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas? (1=Very well, 2=Well, 3=Adequately, 4=Poorly, 5=Not at all)			
17a. Involve all students in self-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.81	1.71
17b. Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.78	1.57
Developing as a Professional Educator			
18. To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas? (1=Very well, 2=Well, 3=Adequately, 4=Poorly, 5=Not at all)			
18a. Evaluate the effects of actions on student learning and modify plans accordingly (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.81	1.29
18b. Work with colleagues to improve instruction (PS 3, 4 & 5)	5 pt - lower is better	1.78	1.0

<p>19. Overall, how effective was your induction program at developing the skills, habits, or tools you needed to grow your teaching practice? (1=Very effective, 2=Effective, 3=Somewhat, 4=Not at all) (PS 3, 4 & 5)</p>	<p>5 pt - lower is better</p>	<p>1.72</p>	<p>1.0</p>	
<p>20. Overall, how effective was your induction program at developing the skills, habits, or tools you needed to continue in your career as a teacher? (1=Very effective, 2=Effective, 3=Somewhat, 4=Not at all) (PS 3, 4 & 5)</p>	<p>5 pt - lower is better</p>	<p>1.71</p>	<p>1.14</p>	

Program Strengths:

Program Areas for Growth:

Program Modifications:

LEADERSHIP SURVEY (Program Effectiveness/Needs Assessment)	<i>Aligned to Standards cited after each question in table below</i>
<p>Description of Tool/Process: This survey gathered data from those involved in the leadership of this program (superintendents, assistant superintendents, curriculum directors, coordinators, union representatives, IHE liaisons, lead mentors, etc.). The survey focused on the Common Standards; particularly program vision, administrative involvement and support, monitoring credential requirements, the program evaluation process, adequacy of funding, sharing of information, coordination of professional development, and coordination with human resources. In addition to assessing program effectiveness, it was used to assess the level of knowledge of those in leadership and to guide the future focus of the program. The table below shows the results (below) and has three different types of highlighting: green indicating areas of strength (where the program is 3.75 or above out of 4); red indicating where results may be areas for growth (below 3.0 out of 4); yellow indicating where program results are significantly different (.0626) than the aggregate results for all programs.</p>	<p>Scoring Scale: Likert (4=<i>strongly</i> +, 3=<i>moderately</i> +, 2=<i>slightly</i> +, 1=<i>do not...</i>) (also “Don’t know option) Number of Program Responses = 12 <i>(All program N=75)</i></p>

RESULTS

Leadership Survey Questions	All Programs Mean 18-19	This Program Mean 18-19
1. To what degree are you involved in the planning and administrative support of the program(s) you help to lead? (Reliability of results)	2.91	3.08
2. To what degree are you aware of the program standards (Preconditions, Common Standards and specific Program Standards) for the programs you help to lead? (Reliability of results)	3.53	3.67
3. If you have examined candidate evidence, to what degree have you found that evidence to be in accordance with the program design(s)? (IS 5)	3.92	4.0
4. Please rate the extent you agree or disagree with the following statements: (Note: If you are very involved with more than one program, please average.) a. I am involved in the organization, coordination and decision making for this/these program(s). CS 1	2.96	3.27
b. I regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues to improve this/these program(s). CS 1	3.31	3.5
c. Administration provides sufficient resources for effective operation of this Induction Program. CS 1	3.62	4

d. Administration employs and retains only qualified persons to provide professional development. CS1	3.72	4
e. Appropriate information and personnel are accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements. CS2	3.87	4
f. This/These program(s) has/have a clearly defined process in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies. CS 2	3.86	4
g. This/These program(s) regularly collect, analyze, and use candidate and completer data to continuously improve services. CS 4	3.87	4
h. This/These program's system(s) for mentoring/coaching, support and professional learning is individualized. PC1 and PC3	3.92	4
i. Candidates in our program(s) are appropriately matched with mentors and begin meeting within 30 days of enrollment in Induction. PC2	3.87	4
j. Administrative leadership provides resources to support mentors/coaches having a minimum of one hour per week to provide individualized support and mentoring to candidates. PC3	3.77	4
k. Accountability structures are in place that ensure mentors/coaches and candidates are spending at least one hour per week for individualized support and mentoring. PC3	3.78	4
l. Each of our mentors/coaches is helping candidates to develop goals for their professional growth plan (ILP, IIP, etc.) within 60 days of enrolling in the program(s). PC4	3.86	4
m. The candidate's professional growth plan is used solely for candidate growth and not for employment evaluation. PC5	3.94	4
n. The professional standards (CSTP, CPSEL, TPE, CAPE) are the basis for our program(s), and the focus is on helping candidates to meet those standards. IS1	3.96	4
o. The program design is driven by the professional growth plan and based on the professional standards (CSTP, CPSEL, TPE, CAPE). IS 3	3.94	4
p. Adequate resources are available to candidates and mentors/coaches to enable the candidate to accomplish the plans contained in their professional growth plans. IS 3	3.73	4
q. Dedicated time for regular mentor/coach and candidate meetings for support and assessment is provided. IS 3	3.75	4
r. Selection of mentors/coaches is based on specific criteria. IS 4	3.79	4

s. Mentors/Coaches are provided with guidance, clear expectations and thorough training. IS 4	3.81	4
t. The program(s) provide(s) for the candidates to be regularly assessed on their mastery of the professional standards (CSTP, CPSEL, TPE, CAPE). IS 5	3.83	4
Program Strengths:		
Program Areas for Growth:		
Program Modifications:		

CANDIDATE MID-YEAR SURVEY (Program Effectiveness - Implementation)	<i>Aligned Standards are cited after each individual question in the tables below</i>																									
<p>Description of Tool/Process: Candidates were given a survey at mid-year which was formative in nature and mainly focused on program implementation and participant needs. This survey was kept focused and short in order to facilitate increased participation. Most questions were four-point Likert scale forced choice; however, there were a few categorical questions (yes/no) and several qualitative questions in the survey. The table below shows the results for all SRG-contracted programs and this program group of candidates. It has three different types of highlighting: green indicating areas of strength (where the program is 3.75 or above out of 4 or above 90%); red indicating where results may be areas for growth (below 3.0 out of 4 or below 80%); yellow indicating where program results were significantly different (.0626) than the aggregate results for all programs.</p>	<p>Scoring Scale: 4 point forced choice Likert Scales (4=<i>strongly</i> +, 3=<i>moderately</i> +, 2=<i>slightly</i> +, 1=<i>do not...</i>) and categorical data Number of Program Responses = 28 (All programs N=1945)</p>																									
RESULTS																										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="226 672 1465 743" style="text-align: center;">Candidate Mid-Year Survey</th> <th data-bbox="1465 672 1663 743" style="text-align: center;">18-19 All Programs</th> <th data-bbox="1663 672 1869 743" style="text-align: center;">18-19 This Program</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="226 743 1465 831">Were you assigned a mentor/candidate within 30 days of you beginning (your candidate beginning) teaching in your (their) first year? (PS2) (% Yes)</td> <td data-bbox="1465 743 1663 831" style="text-align: center;">96.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1663 743 1869 831" style="text-align: center;">100.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="226 831 1465 919">When did you actually begin working with your mentor in your first year of this Induction Program? (Total meeting within one month of enrolling.)</td> <td data-bbox="1465 831 1663 919" style="text-align: center;">98.2%</td> <td data-bbox="1663 831 1869 919" style="text-align: center;">100.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="226 919 1465 1042">Generally, are you meeting, in person, with your mentor (teacher candidate) (or with someone else, but coordinated by you or your mentor) for an average of at least one hour per week about issues related to teaching practice? (PC3) (% Yes)</td> <td data-bbox="1465 919 1663 1042" style="text-align: center;">94.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1663 919 1869 1042" style="text-align: center;">100.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="226 1042 1465 1153">On average, how frequently are you meeting, in person, with your candidate/mentor (or someone else, but coordinated by your mentor) about issues related to your teaching practice? (PC3) (% At least weekly)</td> <td data-bbox="1465 1042 1663 1153" style="text-align: center;">83.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1663 1042 1869 1153" style="text-align: center;">100.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="226 1153 1465 1230">Generally, are meetings with your mentor or candidate(s) one-on-one or in a group? (PC3)</td> <td data-bbox="1465 1153 1663 1230"></td> <td data-bbox="1663 1153 1869 1230"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="226 1230 1465 1276">One-on-one</td> <td data-bbox="1465 1230 1663 1276" style="text-align: center;">88.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1663 1230 1869 1276" style="text-align: center;">100.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="226 1276 1465 1315">Group</td> <td data-bbox="1465 1276 1663 1315" style="text-align: center;">12.0%</td> <td data-bbox="1663 1276 1869 1315" style="text-align: center;">0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Candidate Mid-Year Survey	18-19 All Programs	18-19 This Program	Were you assigned a mentor/candidate within 30 days of you beginning (your candidate beginning) teaching in your (their) first year? (PS2) (% Yes)	96.7%	100.00%	When did you actually begin working with your mentor in your first year of this Induction Program? (Total meeting within one month of enrolling.)	98.2%	100.0%	Generally, are you meeting, in person, with your mentor (teacher candidate) (or with someone else, but coordinated by you or your mentor) for an average of at least one hour per week about issues related to teaching practice? (PC3) (% Yes)	94.0%	100.00%	On average, how frequently are you meeting, in person, with your candidate/mentor (or someone else, but coordinated by your mentor) about issues related to your teaching practice? (PC3) (% At least weekly)	83.9%	100.00%	Generally, are meetings with your mentor or candidate(s) one-on-one or in a group? (PC3)			One-on-one	88.0%	100.00%	Group	12.0%	0.00%
Candidate Mid-Year Survey	18-19 All Programs	18-19 This Program																								
Were you assigned a mentor/candidate within 30 days of you beginning (your candidate beginning) teaching in your (their) first year? (PS2) (% Yes)	96.7%	100.00%																								
When did you actually begin working with your mentor in your first year of this Induction Program? (Total meeting within one month of enrolling.)	98.2%	100.0%																								
Generally, are you meeting, in person, with your mentor (teacher candidate) (or with someone else, but coordinated by you or your mentor) for an average of at least one hour per week about issues related to teaching practice? (PC3) (% Yes)	94.0%	100.00%																								
On average, how frequently are you meeting, in person, with your candidate/mentor (or someone else, but coordinated by your mentor) about issues related to your teaching practice? (PC3) (% At least weekly)	83.9%	100.00%																								
Generally, are meetings with your mentor or candidate(s) one-on-one or in a group? (PC3)																										
One-on-one	88.0%	100.00%																								
Group	12.0%	0.00%																								

Did you develop Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) goals with your teacher candidate(s) (mentor) within the first 60 days they (you) were enrolled in this Teacher Induction Program? (PC4) (% Yes)	97.2%	100.00%
On which of the CSTP(s) is your current Individual Learning Plan (ILP) and professional learning focused? (Mark all that apply.) (Information only, No analysis +/-) (PS3 and PS4)		
CSTP 1. Engaging and Supporting all Students in Learning	41.5%	46.40%
CSTP 2. Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	46.3%	71.40%
CSTP 3. Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	26.0%	39.30%
CSTP 4. Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for all Students	41.0%	39.30%
CSTP 5. Assessing Students for Learning	33.5%	39.30%
CSTP 6. Developing as a Professional Educator	17.4%	28.60%
How many in-depth visits to your classroom (to observe and give you feedback) has your mentor made so far this year? (PS 3 & 4) Information only, no analysis		Candidate
Three or more visits	27.3%	96.40%
Two visits	28.3%	3.60%
One visit	38.0%	0.00%
No visits so far this year	6.4%	0.00%
Please rate the extent you agree or disagree with the following statements: (4=Strongly Agree; 3=Moderately Agree; 2=Slightly Agree; 1=Do not agree)		Candidate
a. I have the necessary resources available to me in order for me to accomplish the goals of my Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) (e.g. professional development, observation of other teachers, and other individualized support). (PS3, CS1)	3.70	3.89
b. The Induction process I experience supports the consistent practice of reflection on the effectiveness of instruction and student achievement. (PS3)	3.76	3.93
c. There are multiple opportunities during my Induction experiences for me to assess my progress towards mastery of the CSTP (or equivalent district standards/frameworks). (PS5)	3.63	3.93
d. My mentor uses the CSTP (or equivalent standards/frameworks) to guide my support and help me plan for my professional learning. (PS4)	3.65	3.89

e. My mentor provides guidance and clear expectations regarding this Teacher Induction experience. (PS4)	3.75	3.86
f. My mentor and I are well matched (adequate knowledge of the context and content area I am teaching, close proximity, etc.). (PS2)	3.75	3.75
g. My mentor demonstrates the ability, willingness and flexibility to meet my needs for support. (PS4)	3.84	3.79
h. My mentor provides effective support to me which enables me to implement my ILP. (PS4)	3.78	3.79
i. My mentor is providing high-quality service to me. (PS4)	3.79	3.82
Program Strengths:		
Program Areas for Growth:		
Program Modifications:		

CANDIDATE FEEDBACK ON MENTOR SKILL & EFFECTIVENESS (Program Effectiveness/Needs Assessment)	<i>Aligned to Induction Standards 3, 4 and 6, Teacher Leadership Skills Frameworks. Various Standards cited after each question below.</i>
---	--

Description of Tool/Process: At the end of each year, candidates respond to questions regarding the perceived training, skill and effectiveness of their mentors. (This tool is closely aligned to and can be triangulated with the Mentor Self-Assessment Survey.) Individual results are not shared with the mentors and an aggregate report is issued to the program. The table below shows the results and has three different types of highlighting: **green** indicating areas of strength (where the program is 3.75 or above out of 4); **red** indicating where results may be areas for growth (below 3.0 out of 4); **yellow** indicating where program results are significantly different (.0626) than the aggregate results for all programs.

Scoring Scale:
4 point forced choice
Likert scale (4=*strongly +*, 3=*moderately +*, 2=*slightly +*, 1=*do not...*)
Number of Program Responses = 28
(All program N=1926)

RESULTS

Candidate Feedback re. Mentor Knowledge and Skill	All Program Mean 18-19	This Program Mean 18-19
a. My mentor created an environment of trust, caring and honesty, so that I feel valued, safe to risk, learn and share. TLS 1-3, Induction Standard (IS 4)	3.86	3.85
b. My mentor used our time together effectively, focusing on my needs and not being unduly hurried. TLS 1 & 2, Pre-Condition (PC) 3, Common Standard (CS) 1	3.80	3.78
c. My mentor used reflection as a tool to inform my practice and develop my professional goals. TLS 1, 3, IS 3 & 4	3.80	3.74
d. My mentor encouraged collegial inquiry. TLS1-3, IS 2 & 4	3.79	3.74
e. My mentor helped me reflect on and assess their own practice and set goals. TLS 1 & 2, PC 4, IS 2	3.81	3.7
f. My mentor worked with me to assess my professional practice based on professional standards with multiple tools at multiple times during the year. TLS 1, 2 & 4, PC 4, CS 1, 2 & 4 IS 1- 6	3.76	3.74
g. My mentor understood the requirements of this program, how I would earn a credential, and their role as a mentor. TLS 2 &3, IS 4	3.81	3.78
h. Conversations with my mentor actively engaged me. TLS 1,3, IS 4	3.82	3.78

i. My mentor documented our shared meetings to records what we did in our work together. TLS 3, IS 4	3.76	3.89
j. My mentor moved me toward task completion using appropriate processes. TLS 1-3, IS 4	3.79	3.78
k. My mentor used a variety of differentiated strategies to support my needs. TLS 1, 3, CS 2, IS 2 and 4	3.73	3.67
l. My mentor communicated positively and with optimism. TLS 1 & 3, IS 4	3.86	3.89
m. My mentor facilitated learning-focused discussions in a way that engaged me in reflective thinking, inquiry, analysis and the plan-teach-reflect-apply cycle of formative assessment. TLS 1-3, IS 3 and 4	3.78	3.74
n. My mentor paraphrased what I said and asked me clarifying questions. TLS 1-3, IS 4	3.75	3.67
o. My mentor used data-driven dialogue to help me make decisions and take appropriate actions. TLS1-4, IS 2, 3 & 4	3.71	3.67
p. My mentor was able to help me move toward decisions. TLS 1 & 2	3.82	3.7
q. My mentor used curriculum standards and professional standards to build on previous my previous professional growth plans and plan for future improvement. TLS 1-4, CS 1 and 2, IS 1-6	3.77	3.67
r. My mentor used data to inform our shared conversations and regularly worked with me to adjust my professional growth plans based on my personal strengths and needs. TLS1,4, IS 3 & 4	3.74	3.63
s. My mentor shared effective strategies to help me engage students in learning. TLS 1,3 & 4, IS 3 & 4	3.83	3.74
t. My mentor observed me and provided feedback to me based on evidence aligned to professional standards. TLS 1,3 & 4, IS 2-5	3.84	3.81
Program Strengths:		

Program Areas for Growth:

Program Modifications:

CANDIDATE YEAR-END SURVEY (Program Effectiveness - Impact, Candidate Competence & Needs Assessment)	<i>Aligned Standards are cited after each individual question in the tables below</i>	
Description of Tool/Process: Candidates were given a survey at the end of the academic year which was both summative and formative in nature. The survey was kept simple and focused on program impact. Most questions were four-point Likert scale forced choice. However, there were a few categorical questions and several qualitative questions. The survey results, as well as being developed for the overall program, were disaggregated and compared by Year 1 and Year 2 candidates in order to focus improvement to the target group (show in the body of the Candidate Year-End Survey report). The table below shows the overall results for all SRG-contracted programs as well as this program. It has three different types of highlighting: green indicating areas of strength (where the program is 3.75 or above out of 4 or above 90%); red indicating where results may be areas for growth (below 3.0 out of 4 or below 80%); yellow indicating where program results are significantly different (.0626) than the aggregate results for all programs.	Scoring Scale: 4 point forced choice Likert Scales (4= <i>strongly</i> +, 3= <i>moderately</i> +, 2= <i>slightly</i> +, 1= <i>do not...</i>) and categorical data Number of Program Responses = 28 (All program N=1926)	
RESULTS		
Candidate Year-End Survey Questions	18-19 All Programs Candidates	18-19 This Program Candidates
This academic year, did you receive an average of, and not less than, one hour per week, INDIVIDUALIZED support and mentoring, either given by or coordinated by your mentor? PC 3	94.7%	100%
Did you receive this INDIVIDUALIZED support in person? (not by email, text, skype, etc.) (% Yes)	96.0%	100%
Please rate the extent you agree or disagree with the following statements.		Candidate Mean
a. This Teacher Induction Program made the necessary resources available in order for me to accomplish the goals of my ILP (e.g. resources that provided for professional development, observation of other teachers, and other individualized support). CS 1, IS 3	3.67	3.74
b. The mentoring process in which I participated supported the consistent practice of reflection on the effectiveness of instruction and student achievement. IS 3	3.76	3.85
c. With my mentor this year I analyzed student and other outcome data and used these data to further inform the repeated cycle of planning and instruction. IS 2-4	3.66	3.44

d. This Teacher Induction Program provided multiple opportunities for me to assess my progress towards mastery of the CSTP. IS 5	3.71	3.85
e. In terms of meeting my overall needs and completing the program requirements, the time I spent with my mentor was adequate. PC 2 & 3	3.76	3.78
How strong were the connections between the goals and research activities you developed for your Individual Learning Plan (also called an ILP, Inquiry Professional Growth Plan) and the following? IS 2-4		
a. Professional development in which I participated.	3.60	3.63
b. Induction sponsored professional development activities	3.56	3.7
c. District/site professional development activities.	3.42	3.78
d. Work with your Induction support provider (mentor).	3.78	3.85
How strong was the collaboration between this Teacher Induction Program and my (candidate's) site administration? (CS 1)	3.27	3.37
How much impact did the following Induction experiences have on your classroom practice? Strong Impact= 4, Moderate Impact=3, Slight Impact=2, No Impact=1 (CS 5 & PS 2-6)		Candidate Mean
a. Coaching and feedback from my support provider (mentor) based on observations of my teaching and analysis of student work.	3.74	3.78
b. Collection and analysis of evidence of my teaching practice.	3.63	3.59
c. Developing my professional growth plans (also called an Inquiry or Individual Learning Plan) with my support provider (mentor).	3.64	3.74
d. Designing and engaging in professional development as identified on my professional growth plans.	3.62	3.74
e. Observing experienced teachers at my school or district.	3.55	3.67
To what degree have you grown in the following areas during your time in Induction? (CS 5 & PS 2-6)		
a. Developing a repertoire of teaching strategies.	3.61	3.67
b. Developing a repertoire of assessment strategies.	3.41	3.44
c. Using results of assessment data to design instruction.	3.46	3.54
d. Managing my classroom and fostering a safe environment that promotes student well-being.	3.63	3.7
e. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy.	3.41	3.56

f. Assessing student needs and differentiating instruction (including analysis of student work).	3.51	3.44
g. Teaching to content and common core standards.	3.49	3.59
h. Teaching English Language Learners.	3.29	3.52
i. Teaching students with special needs.	3.21	3.42
j. Collaborating with families of my students, including communicating learning goals and progress.	3.25	3.3
k. Using technology as a teaching and learning tool.	3.42	3.74
To what extent did your Induction Program experiences (working with your mentor, developing your ILP, participating in professional development) positively impact your growth in the following areas? (CS5 & PS2-6) (4=Strong, 3=Moderate, 2=Slight, 1=None)		
1a Connect classroom learning to the real world	3.42	3.59
1b Engage students in inquiry, problem solving, and reflecting to promote their critical thinking	3.52	3.67
1c Meet the instructional needs of English learners	3.30	3.56
1d Identify and address special learning needs with appropriate teaching strategies	3.35	3.44
2a Establish and maintain a safe and respectful learning environment for all students	3.64	3.67
2b Create a productive learning environment with high expectations for all students	3.64	3.63
3a Use effective instructional strategies to teach specific subject matter and skills	3.62	3.59
3b Select, adapt, and develop materials, resources, and technologies to make subject matter accessible to all students	3.55	3.59
4a Plan instruction based on students' prior knowledge, academic readiness, language proficiency, cultural background, and individual development	3.52	3.67
4b Plan and adapt instruction that incorporates appropriate strategies, resources and technologies to meet the learning needs of all students	3.56	3.59
5a Involve all students in self-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring progress	3.37	3.48
5b Give productive feedback to students to guide their learning	3.45	3.63
6a Evaluate the effects of actions on student learning and modify plans accordingly	3.54	3.7
For those only completing their first year in Induction. In which areas do you desire more support from your Induction Program in order to enhance your impact on student learning? (Mark all that apply) Information and needs assessment only – no analysis		Candidate Mean
a. Additional coaching, observation and feedback from a support provider (mentor).	22.2%	31.30%
b. Developing a repertoire of teaching strategies.	38.6%	43.80%

c. Developing a repertoire of assessment strategies.	40.2%	37.50%
d. Using assessment data to design instruction.	36.7%	37.50%
e. Managing the classroom and fostering a safe environment that promotes student well-being.	26.4%	6.30%
f. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy.	20.1%	18.80%
g. Assessment of student needs and differentiating instruction.	41.1%	43.80%
h. Teaching to content/common core standards.	20.7%	6.30%
i. Ensuring access to the curriculum for all students/Teaching English Language Learners.	35.8%	18.80%
j. Ensuring access to the curriculum for all students/Teaching students with special needs.	34.0%	18.80%
k. Communicating and collaborating with families.	30.3%	18.80%
l. Using technology as a teaching and learning tool.	32.4%	37.50%
To what extent did your Induction Program experiences positively impact your own growth in the CSTP? CS 5 & IS 1-4		
CSTP 1 Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning	3.60	3.67
CSTP 2 Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	3.63	3.67
CSTP 3 Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	3.49	3.67
CSTP 4 Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students	3.57	3.67
CSTP 5 Assessing Students for Learning	3.47	3.67
CSTP 6 Developing as a Professional Educator	3.57	3.69
Do you wish to continue teaching next year? CS 2	98.1%	100.00%
Program Strengths:		
Program Areas for Growth:		

Program Modifications:

CSTP Self-Assessment of Competence on Exiting the Program (Candidate Competence - Needs Assessment)	<i>Aligned to Common Standard 5 and Induction Standard 1 and 5</i>
<p>Description of Tool/Process: <i>The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the associated 38 Elements contain 5 levels of practice for each Element. (These are detailed in the <i>Continuum of Teaching Practice</i>.)</i> These five levels are reference points that are used continuously through the two years of Teacher Induction. Candidates and their mentor frequently and regularly examine evidence from formative assessment activities, observations, and classroom practice, and then, through shared conversation, agree to which level that evidence points toward. This happens right from the outset of the Induction experience and continuously throughout the two years. The results below show where a group of candidates and mentors assess their competence as they are exiting the program. (Note to director: You may find that you have to change this description somewhat depending on how your program assesses and collects data sent to SRG. Also, while overall results are given, there is no green/red highlighting to indicate thresholds for +/- (as every program collects and uses this data in a different way).</p>	Scoring Scale: <i>1-5 Rubric</i> <i>(1=Emerging, 2=Exploring, 3=Applying, 4=Integrating, 5=Innovating)</i> Number of Program Responses = 14 (Exiting 2 nd year and ECO only) (All program responses 587)

RESULTS

CSTP Competence on Exiting the Program (By Element)	18-19 All Programs	18-19 This Program
CSTP 1.1	3.48	4.08
CSTP 1.2	3.39	4.08
CSTP 1.3	3.43	4.31
CSTP 1.4	3.43	4.13
CSTP 1.5	3.31	3.86
CSTP 1.6	3.50	4.17
CSTP 2.1	3.44	4.08
CSTP 2.2	3.37	4.00
CSTP 2.3	3.45	4.08
CSTP 2.4	3.32	3.92
CSTP 2.5	3.44	4.23
CSTP 2.6	3.51	4.07
CSTP 2.7	3.42	4.17
CSTP 3.1	3.42	3.92
CSTP 3.2	3.31	3.77
CSTP 3.3	3.43	3.83
CSTP 3.4	3.43	4.08
CSTP 3.5	3.33	3.85
CSTP 3.6	3.21	3.87
CSTP 4.1	3.21	3.75
CSTP 4.2	3.26	3.93

	CSTP 4.3	3.30	3.69	
	CSTP 4.4	3.33	4.27	
	CSTP 4.5	3.41	3.92	
	CSTP 5.1	3.24	3.83	
	CSTP 5.2	3.30	4.08	
	CSTP 5.3	3.27	4.15	
	CSTP 5.4	3.25	4.27	
	CSTP 5.5	3.04	3.93	
	CSTP 5.6	3.18	4.08	
	CSTP 5.7	3.10	3.69	
	CSTP 6.1	3.51	4.14	
	CSTP 6.2	3.38	4.14	
	CSTP 6.3	3.48	4.14	
	CSTP 6.4	3.17	3.79	
	CSTP 6.5	2.82	3.08	
	CSTP 6.6	3.43	4.08	
	CSTP 6.7	3.56	4.17	

Program Strengths:

Program Areas for Growth:

Program Modifications:

CSTP Growth Over Time (Candidate Competence - Needs Assessment)	<i>Aligned to Common Standard 5 and Induction Standard 1 and 5</i>
<p>Description of Tool/Process: <i>The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the associated 38 Elements contain 5 levels of practice for each Element. (These are detailed in the <i>Continuum of Teaching Practice</i>.) These five levels are reference points that are used continuously through the two years of Teacher Induction. Candidates and mentors frequently and regularly examine evidence from formative assessment activities, observations, and classroom practice, and then, through shared conversation, agree to which level that evidence points. This happens right from the outset of the Induction experience and continuously throughout the two years. Data was collected from all candidates regarding where their level of practice was in an Element when they first marked their assessed level and where they last marked themselves. This could be a short period of time or even over two years. When aggregated, the results show the growth of program participants over time.</i></p> <p><i>(Note to director: You may find that you have to change this description somewhat depending on how your program assesses and collects data sent to SRG. Also, while overall results are given, there is no green/red highlighting to indicate thresholds for +/-Δ (as every program collects and uses this data in a different way).</i></p>	<p>Scoring Scale: <i>1-5 Rubric</i> <i>(1=Emerging, 2=Exploring, 3=Applying, 4=Integrating, 5=Innovating)</i></p> <p>Number of Program Responses = 14 (Exiting 2nd year and ECO only) (All program responses 587)</p>

RESULTS

CSTP Growth Over Time (By Element)	18-19 All Programs	18-19 This Program
CSTP 1.1	1.19	0.83
CSTP 1.2	1.16	1.00
CSTP 1.3	1.14	1.00
CSTP 1.4	1.15	0.87
CSTP 1.5	1.11	0.93
CSTP 1.6	1.13	1.17
CSTP 2.1	1.06	0.85
CSTP 2.2	1.12	0.83
CSTP 2.3	1.05	0.83
CSTP 2.4	1.15	0.83
CSTP 2.5	1.17	0.87
CSTP 2.6	1.08	0.80
CSTP 2.7	1.14	0.92
CSTP 3.1	1.10	1.00
CSTP 3.2	1.17	0.92
CSTP 3.3	1.15	0.92
CSTP 3.4	1.12	0.92
CSTP 3.5	1.12	0.77

	CSTP 3.6	1.19	0.93	
	CSTP 4.1	1.11	0.92	
	CSTP 4.2	1.17	0.86	
	CSTP 4.3	1.16	0.85	
	CSTP 4.4	1.18	1.07	
	CSTP 4.5	1.14	1.00	
	CSTP 5.1	1.14	0.92	
	CSTP 5.2	1.16	1.08	
	CSTP 5.3	1.12	1.08	
	CSTP 5.4	1.14	0.87	
	CSTP 5.5	1.18	1.07	
	CSTP 5.6	1.08	1.00	
	CSTP 5.7	1.08	0.85	
	CSTP 6.1	1.09	0.86	
	CSTP 6.2	1.16	0.71	
	CSTP 6.3	1.15	0.71	
	CSTP 6.4	1.00	0.86	
	CSTP 6.5	0.99	0.67	
	CSTP 6.6	1.06	0.67	
	CSTP 6.7	1.07	0.58	

Program Strengths:

Program Areas for Growth:

Program Modifications:

GENERAL EDUCATION TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS PLANNING

Areas for Improvement

Plans