

## PROGRAM ASSESSMENT – PART III

### EVERGREEN BTSA INDUCTION PROGRAM

#### DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT THAT ARE USED TO DETERMINE CANDIDATE COMPETENCE

The tool that is used to determine candidate competence throughout the two years of induction is the Continuum of Teaching Practice (CTP). This standardized instrument was developed by the California Department of Education and the Commission on Teaching Credentialing. It is organized to describe five levels of development. Each level addresses what a teacher should know and be able to do in the six CSTP standards. The levels do not represent a chronological sequence in a teacher's growth, but each row describes developmental levels of performance. The levels become increasingly complex and sophisticated and integrate the skills of previous levels. In the first column, under the language of each element, is a space to record evidence of practice as related to that particular *CSTP* element. Teachers reflect and describe practice in terms of evidence prior to self-assessing in order to make valid and accurate assessments.

The training/calibration: Support providers are trained to use the CTP in their FACT training (again developed by the California Department of Education and the Commission of Teaching Credential). This standardized training assists the support provider in using the CTP to support the reflective practice and ongoing learning of teachers, support an ongoing process of formative assessment of a teacher's practice based on standards, criteria and evidence, set short or long-term goals for professional development over time, describe teaching practice and development both during induction and throughout a teacher's career, support a vision of ongoing learning and teacher development, encourage collaboration between classroom teachers, resource personnel and families, and to ensure that all students are successful. Support providers are initially trained when they first begin their role and then meet monthly to ensure that they continue to maintain their skills and recalibrate.

TOOL	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED	PROCESS	STANDARDS	PURPOSES
CSTP Pre/Post <i>Continuum of Teaching Practice</i> Self-Assessment	The <i>Continuum of Teaching Practice</i> is a reference point that is used continuously through the two years of Induction. The Candidate (PT) and SP frequently examine evidence from formative assessment activities, observations, and classroom practice, and then, through shared conversation, agree to which level that evidence points on the <i>Continuum</i> . This happens right from the outset of the Induction experience, continuously throughout Induction, and right up to the end of the Induction experience. The <i>Continuum</i> is the yard stick to measure Candidate development in the CSTP while they are enrolled in the program, their competence when they leave the program, and their growth over the Induction period.	Candidate Assessed Levels on the <i>Continuum of Teaching Practice</i> at the beginning of their Induction experience and as they exit the program.	PTs and SP are constantly assessing their skill and marking their level of attainment in the CTP. This happens early in their Induction experience and continuously. Before second year teachers may exit the program, they are asked to review their <i>Continuum of Teaching Practice</i> and share with the leadership at which level they first placed themselves in any Element of the CSTP and where they last placed themselves. These data are collected electronically and show both individual and program aggregate growth over time.	CS 9, PS 5 and 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess Candidate Competence (Pre/Post comparisons and at any point in time)</li> <li>• Assess professional development needs of PTs</li> <li>• Provide a focus for SP future training</li> <li>• Assess program effectiveness in supporting PTs in particular areas of CSTP</li> </ul>

A secondary tool which is new to us and will be used on our next Biennial Report to assess Candidate Competence is a Completer/Graduate Survey. We do not believe this tool will be as powerful as the CTP Pre/Post, we hope it gives us some indication of the areas where our candidates are having success in particular areas of the CSTP and where the program is making the most impact.

TOOL	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED	PROCESS	STANDARDS ADDRESSED	ADDITIONAL PURPOSES
Completer/ Graduate Survey	Graduates from the previous two years are sent a confidential online survey and asked to rate the extent that they believe their experiences in the Induction program “enhanced their competence” in areas of the <i>California Standards for the Teaching Profession</i> . They are also asked to state what areas of the program were most beneficial to enhancing their competence and what areas could have been improved thereby increasing their competence.	Data collected in this survey focuses on 15 of the core <i>California Standards for the Teaching Profession</i> . Also collected is the amount of time that the support provider and participating teacher spent together each week. This enables a contrast to be made between perceived impact of those who spent at least one hour per week together and those who did not.	Electronic data is collected using a four point Likert forced choice scale (1=no enhanced competence, 2=slightly enhanced competence, 3=moderately enhanced competence, 4=strongly enhanced competence) Email addresses from graduates are maintained and requests are sent to them in February to complete a simple 15 question online survey. The names of those who respond are tracked and those who do not respond are followed-up four times.	CS 9, PS 5 and 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidate Competence</li> <li>• Collect perceptions re program impact on candidate competence</li> <li>• Assess professional development needs of PTs</li> <li>• Provide a focus for SP future training</li> <li>• Assess program effectiveness in supporting PTs in particular areas of CSTP</li> </ul>

TOOL	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED	PROCESS	STANDARDS	ADDITIONAL PURPOSES
Support Provider/ Mentor Self - Assessment (Pre/Post)	Just as candidates (PTs) must assess their practice on the Continuum of Teaching Practice (CTP) in order to know how they are growing over time, so do support providers. When support providers/mentors first are trained in this program, they begin to work with a “Support Provider Self-Assessment Rubric.” Similar to the CTP, it has four levels of practice and support providers can examine their own practice and rate themselves. As they do so, they are encouraged to fill out a “SP Professional Growth Plan” similar to the PT Individual Induction Plan (ILP). Support providers record where they place themselves on the rubric. This rubric is frequently revisited at SP meetings.	The data from the SP Self-Assessment Rubric includes accountability information, relationship making, understanding of role, use of formative assessment, skill in reflective conversation, implementation of PTR, analyzing student work, observation, developing the IIP, strategies, and effective use of meeting time.	New support providers are asked to record where they placed themselves at the end of their first training (on a paper form). This is sent to Sinclair Research Group who do an needs analysis report for the program. The data is kept and at the end of two, experienced support providers are asked to share where they place themselves on this same rubric. Analysis enables the program to show support provider growth over time.	PS 3 and 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the training needs of support providers</li> <li>• Examine the growth of support providers over time</li> </ul>

TOOL	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED	PROCESS	STANDARDS	ADDITIONAL PURPOSES
<p>Initial Surveys of Candidates (PTs) and Support Providers <i>(On past Biennial Report this was a Mid Year Survey)</i></p>	<p>This program works with Sinclair Research Group to develop two local surveys of candidates (PTS and support providers) in the late fall. Many questions also elicit the same data from both role groups so evidence can be triangulated. Data collection also elicits information regarding the needs of participants and about program implement that can be answered early in the year. These surveys are kept simple and focused in order to increase participation (approximately 20 questions). Most questions are four point Likert scale forced choice, however, there are a very few categorical questions. Questions are taken from</p>	<p>While questions are all aligned to Common and Program Standards, they are generally about the extent that the program is being implemented with fidelity at mid-year. Sinclair Research Groups works with the program to develop the questions that work for the program at this time. There are several open ended questions that allow participants to give their opinions.</p>	<p>Participants are asked to complete this online and is very short. While they are asked to leave their name, they are assured that responses are confidential. Names are only tracked so that Sinclair Research Group can follow up on those who do not respond, thereby ensuring high response rates.</p>	<p>CS 3, 6, 9, PS 1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess fidelity of program implementation</li> <li>• Gather evidence for formative program adjustments at mid year</li> </ul>

TOOL	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED	PROCESS	STANDARDS	ADDITIONAL PURPOSES
<p>Year End Surveys of Candidates (PTs) and Support Providers <i>(NOTE: This tool will replace the Statewide Survey which was in our last Biennial Report. It will be developed in February 2015.)</i></p>	<p>This program works with Sinclair Research Group to develop the final two local surveys of candidates (PTS and support providers) at the end of the academic year. This survey replaces the Statewide Survey. Many questions also elicit the same data from both role groups so evidence can be triangulated. Data collection elicits information mainly about program impact. These surveys are kept simple and focused in order to increase participation (approximately 20 questions). Most questions are four point Likert scale forced choice, however, there are a very few categorical questions. Questions are taken from</p>	<p>While questions are all aligned to Common and Program Standards, they are generally about the extent that the program is making an impact on the professional practice of the participants. Sinclair Research Groups works with the program to develop the questions that work for the program at this time. There are several open ended questions that allow participants to give their opinions.</p>	<p>Participants are asked to complete this online and is very short. While they are asked to leave their name, they are assured that responses are confidential. Names are only tracked so that Sinclair Research Group can follow up on those who do not respond, thereby ensuring high response rates.</p>	<p>CS 3, 6, 9, PS 1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess program impact</li> <li>• Gather evidence for formative program adjustments at year end</li> </ul>

**This is a new evaluation tool we are adding for the next Biennial Report**

<b>TOOL</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DATA COLLECTED</b>	<b>PROCESS</b>	<b>STANDARDS</b>	<b>ADDITIONAL PURPOSES</b>
Candidate (PT) Assessment of SP Effectiveness	At the end of each year, candidates respond to two categorical and 17 questions regarding the perceived training and skill of their support provider/mentor. (This tool is closely aligned to the SP Self-Assessment Rubric.) The survey is confidential. Actual results are not shared with the support provider and an aggregate report is issued to the program. However, the program director does see the results and is able to use these, along with the SP Self-Assessment, the SP Growth Plan, and other information as part of an evaluation of the work of the support provider (PS 3). All of this data leads to a reflective conversation with the support provider and planning for future professional growth.	Data is collected regarding accountability information, relationship making, understanding of role, use of formative assessment, skill in reflective conversation, implementation of PTRAs, analyzing student work, using evidence of classroom practice, observation, developing the IIP, strategies, and effective use of meeting time.	At the end of the academic year, data is collected from each candidate (PT) regarding their support provider in 17 areas where support provider should have skill and training. A four point forced choice Likert scale is used. Results are confidential. This data is collected privately and confidentially.	PS 3 and 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide an evaluation system for support providers</li> <li>• To guide future support provider training</li> <li>• To assess support provider knowledge and skill</li> </ul>

**This is a new tool we may add to our next Biennial Report**

<b>TOOL</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DATA COLLECTED</b>	<b>PROCESS</b>	<b>STANDARDS</b>	<b>ADDITIONAL PURPOSES</b>
Site Administrator Survey	Busy site administrators are asked, during their least busy time (generally February) to respond to a brief survey that is highly focused on what site administrators should know about new teachers, their Induction Program, and to give their perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the program.	This survey collects data around district support, the adequacy of personnel and resources, understanding of new teacher needs and the program, school level professional development and the support site administrators are able to give new teachers in pursuing their planned professional development activities.	This survey uses a four point forced choice Likert scale and only 11 questions. It is online in February. Names are kept in order to follow-up with those site administrators that did not respond. The request goes to those who have not responded three times.	CS 1, 3, & 6, PS 1, 2, & 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides information on where site administrators might need more training, information or support</li> <li>• Assesses the level of site administrator knowledge of the needs of new teachers and their perceptions of program effectiveness</li> </ul>

