



# EDUCATIONAL ISSUES POLICY BRIEF

NUMBER 5 / SEPTEMBER 1998

## Mentor Teacher Programs in the States

### Introduction

Beginning teachers face a range of difficulties that hinder their effectiveness and cut short their careers. Only half of new teachers will make it to seven years of teaching (Schlechy and Vance, 1983). Most teachers depart in the first three years, and 9% of new teachers won't even make it to the end of their first year (Department of Education, 1997). These rates reflect the problems new teachers face in adjusting to life in the classroom. Furthermore, teachers who leave appear to be disproportionately among the most academically gifted (Schlechy and Vance, 1983). Finding programs that will increase the effectiveness of beginning teachers and encourage them to remain on the job is thus a paramount concern if policy makers are going to increase teacher quality in the face of a teacher shortage.

Teacher induction programs are one solution to this problem. Teachers who have left the profession claim that better support for beginning teachers is among the five top policy reforms that would help school systems retain more teachers (Department of Education, 1997). Mentoring, the pairing of a beginning teacher with an experienced colleague, is at the core of most induction programs. According to teacher educators, mentoring in the first year is the most important issue facing teacher education (Buttery, 1990). There is no doubt that beginning teachers find these programs to be very effective and want this support to help them adjust to the profession. In one large district where participation was voluntary, only 6% of eligible teachers declined the

opportunity to work with a mentor (Ganser, 1993). The same study found that more than 91% of the principals in the district supported the program.

The basic policy goals of a mentoring program can include easing transition into teaching, increasing the retention rate of new teachers, and improving the quality of teaching. Another policy goal is the reinvigoration and empowerment of the mentor teacher. Mentor programs reward excellent, experienced teachers, while keeping the focus on the classroom. All too often, the only reward for excellent teaching is promotion out of the classroom into administrative ranks.

### How Mentoring Works

The common thread of all mentoring programs is the pairing of a beginning teacher with a more experienced mentor. There are, however, many differences in these programs, as they are implemented in school districts across the country. For example, there are variations in the goals. In some programs the mentor's responsibilities are specifically educational – providing advice on classroom management or lesson preparation. In other programs the emphasis is on social and psychological support – providing reassurance, and help to new teachers as they learn to deal with school bureaucracy and become part of the school community. Most programs have some mix of these goals. In addition, a number of mentor programs are specifically focused on retention.

Resources and structure vary to an even greater degree than goals. Many programs operate on an informal basis, with the assignment of a “buddy” teacher being the sum of the program. Other programs allow mentors to leave their classrooms and observe and comment on the work of mentees, or build in time for mentees to observe as their mentors teach. Still other programs provide professional development for mentors, set qualifications and provide incentives to attract better mentors. There are even programs that mandate the number of contact hours between mentor and mentee.

In addition, many mentor programs are components of larger induction and first year teaching programs. Features of some of these programs include: orientations and meetings for new teachers throughout the school year; newsletters for new teachers; and in some instances, even help for new teachers settling into the community. Some programs include the continued involvement of colleges of education as well.

Only a handful of mentor programs include an evaluation of the beginning teacher as a component. Most programs place a firewall between mentors and the formal evaluation of mentees. The rationale being, that without the evaluative component, mentees will feel free to request assistance and not feel that such a request might be perceived as an admission of weakness.

## Evaluation of Mentor Program Effectiveness

Evaluations of mentor programs have largely focused on qualitative measures of mentee’s attitudes towards the profession. Some studies have focused on the impact on mentors’ perceptions of teaching and of the program as well. A handful of studies have examined the impact on retention rates, and an even smaller number have tried to look at changes in teaching behavior or student performance. One of the problems of drawing conclusions from the evidence is that a great many of the mentor programs have been informal or ad-hoc. Furthermore, some studies have attempted to draw conclusions about effects that particular mentor programs were not designed to create.

### *Teacher Attitudes*

The most important finding of the research is that mentored teachers’ perceptions of the profession and their place within it are more positive than those of non-mentored teachers. The results here are unequivocal, including findings from surveys of groups of mentored and non-mentored teachers nationwide (Huling-Austin and Murphy, 1987), as well as experimental evaluations where groups of non mentored teachers served as a control group. Such studies have been completed in Montana, Washington and Indiana (Spuhler and Zetler, 1995; Broulliet, 1988; Summers, 1987). Mentored teachers in each of these studies describe themselves as more confident in their teaching than their non-mentored colleagues.

Mentored teachers describe themselves as better able to deal with social and bureaucratic aspects of the job than do their non-mentored peers. A study of New York City teachers indicated that mentored teachers felt that support from supervisors and colleagues had increased since their participation in the mentor program (Office of Educational Research, 1994. pg. 25). The mentees in this program rated encouragement and support of the mentor as the most important component of the program. Both mentors and mentees felt that the program helped mentees deal with parents, work collegially, do paperwork and obtain supplies. A final caveat from the research is that mentoring works best when new teachers do not have particularly trying assignments (i.e., disproportionately remedial or disadvantaged students, or floating assignments during the school year). In such instances mentoring, rather than becoming a support can become an additional burden.

### *Retention*

There have been few large scale evaluations of the impact of mentor programs on retention, but the results are promising. In New York City’s Mentor Teacher Internship Program, both the mentors and the mentees claimed that the program was effective in increasing the probability of mentees continuing to teach. Unfortunately, the New York data do not allow for an actual comparison of retention rates. Experimental analysis finds that teachers with mentoring remain in teaching at a much greater rate than do teachers in control groups. Montana’s experimental study found that 4% of mentees left after their first

year of teaching, as compared to 28% from the control groups. There was greater retention in the second year as well. Similar results pertain for studies from mentor programs in Indiana, Ohio, Alabama and other places (Summers, 1987; Columbus Education Association, 1998; Blackburn, 1977).

### *Teaching Quality.*

Very few evaluations have focused on student achievement, and more research in how to make mentoring effective needs to be done in this regard. Of the two studies that were found, from Alabama and Oklahoma, neither indicated a statistically significant advantage in test scores for students of mentored teachers (Blackburn, 1977; Crawford, et al, 1984). It important to note, however, that the vast majority of these programs have not had student achievement increases as a specific goal. Given the range of mentor programs—from the random assignment of a teacher as a resource, to the creation of programs where mentors receive specific training, are able to spend time in the mentee’s class and have specific goals—the jury is still out on this front.

Nonetheless, there is evidence that mentor programs can effect teaching in a positive manner. The Alabama and Montana studies found that principals were more satisfied with the performance of mentored teachers. The Oklahoma study indicated that while there was no significant difference in achievement on standardized tests, mentored teachers had a higher rate of one-to-one contact with students, were more interactive with students in general, were more focused on academic content and handled discipline better. Similarly, the Indiana study found that mentees had an increased awareness of curriculum guides, an enhanced ability to communicate with parents and an increased inclination to understand and use higher order questions. A California study found evidence of similar improvement in teacher behaviors (California Department of Education, 1992).

Another analysis focused on what additional help mentored and non-mentored teachers felt they needed at the end of their first year (Odell, 1986). The results indicate that non-mentored teachers may develop more slowly as teachers. Non-mentored teachers indicated that student discipline and motivation, classroom organization, parent teacher relations and even securing materials, were still among their needs. Mentored

teachers, on the other hand, indicated that ideas about instruction, advice on resources for teaching and information on school district policies and procedures were needed. The analysis concluded that mentoring might allow teachers to move beyond a focus on disciplinary issues, and begin to focus on effective teaching

### *Mentor Outcomes*

The New York City study found that mentor teachers increased their professional satisfaction, and their awareness of their own teaching methods. The mentor relationship also opened up new conduits for them to discuss new techniques and to critically examine their own methods. Other evaluations also indicated that mentors felt more connected to their school and to their teaching.

## What’s Happening in the States

State governments, as the bodies charged with the ultimate responsibility for educating our children, are the key locus for policy reform in this area. As Table 1 indicates, 30 states have a mentoring program of some form or another on the books. Of these, 21 mandate mentoring, but only 14 provide funding specifically for this program. A number of states that have had programs in the past have chosen not to continue funding, often citing budgetary constraints. This is the case in Hawaii, Alabama and Florida. Governors’ vetoes have also recently eliminated funding in New York and New Mexico. In addition, there are states that provide funds in the form of grants, or pilot projects, but do not have a comprehensive statewide program. This is an issue that is heating up, however. There is proposed legislation in at least half a dozen states to either fund programs or create new pilot projects.

## Characteristics of Mentor Programs in the States

The research also highlights some important lessons about effective mentor-programs that policymakers should keep in mind, and a number of states have tailored their mentor programs accordingly. These include matching mentors and mentees by subject and grade level, providing training for mentors, setting qualifications and offering incentives for mentors. These keys to

effective mentoring programs are discussed in greater detail below.

### *Matching Mentors by Subject Matter and Grade*

The research indicates that matching mentors to mentees by subject matter and grade level is important. Surveys of beginning teachers are the main basis for this conclusion (Huffman and Leek, 1986). In addition, the NYC studies (OER 1992-93) indicate that matching of mentors in subject area lead to better retention rates. NYC Interns who were matched with mentors in the same subject area consistently found the mentoring experience to be more valuable.

### *Qualifications*

A study critical of many mentoring efforts finds that qualifications for choosing mentors are typically not clearly defined and that this harms programs (Durbin, 1991). Table 1 indicates that only 15 states set standards for mentors. Typically these standards mandate that a mentor must have at least three years of experience. Louisiana, for example, recommends five years, but sets three years as a minimum. In addition, a number of the states do mandate that, where possible, mentors be in the same school building as the mentee, and teach in the same subject area and grade level. Some states require that the mentor have a record of competent teaching.

### *Training*

Experience with student teacher programs shows that untrained supervision of beginning teachers can be harmful (Durbin, 1991). It is no surprise then that an analysis of a mentor program that did not succeed found that failure to provide adequate mentor training and compensation was a key mistake (Kilgore and Koziak, 1989). Lack of adequate training was seen as a problem in the Oklahoma, Washington and Indiana programs cited here (Durbin, 1991).

Seven states, Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, Washington and West Virginia, specifically fund mentor training programs. In addition, four more states, California, Ohio, Delaware and Idaho provide funds that districts may use for training mentors. This is not the end of state involvement however. A number of states, including Rhode Island and Missouri also allow other state professional development funds to be used for mentor training.

Georgia allows mentor training to count towards state professional development requirements. South Carolina charges districts a nominal fee for the provision of mentor training programs.

If mentor training is mandated, then oversight is essential. An evaluation of Ohio's mentoring efforts found that despite the intent to provide high quality professional development for mentors, 22% of the districts placed only a minor emphasis on training.

### *Stipends*

Stipends not only help attract quality mentors, they signal the value of the work of the mentor. This helps to insure that mentors take their responsibilities seriously. In addition, stipends for mentors send the signal that good teaching is rewarded. Administrators surveyed as part of the Montana pilot study indicated that a reward is needed to attract good mentors, although there was disagreement on the exact amount of reward necessary. Again, the lesson in Ohio concerning oversight and the potential need for mandates is useful. Despite the intent of that program to allow for stipends, many districts used the money for other purposes.

There are ten states that specifically require compensation for mentors (California, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Washington and West Virginia). Four others, Ohio, Nebraska, Idaho and Delaware, provide funding that is specifically allowable for mentor stipends. The size of the stipend varies. In Oklahoma it is \$500 for 72 hours of work. In California it is between \$4000 and \$4200. A number of states report that mentor stipends are provided at the local level, as a result of contract negotiations. Hawaii, rather than attaching a direct stipend to mentorship, counts mentoring as partial fulfillment of the professional development required for a salary step increase.

### *Release Time*

For a program to be effective there must be an opportunity for mentors to leave their classes and observe their mentee in action. Similarly, the mentee must have the opportunity to observe the mentor in action. Studies indicate that this is absolutely essential for effective mentoring (Hoffman and Leak, 1986). If a state's mentoring program is supposed to improve teaching quality, then a focus on the classroom is all the

more essential.

Yet this is the area where states are providing the least amount of support. Only seven states (California, Delaware, Idaho, Kentucky, Nebraska, Ohio and Washington) specifically allow mentor program funds to pay for substitute teachers so that mentors and mentees can spend time in the same class observing each other. Of these, only Kentucky and Washington make release time a specific component of a funded program. Texas mandates release time only for its alternative certification program, and provides no funding. While state professional development money may be used by districts for this in some instances, this is an area where state support is low.

## References

- Blackburn, J. 1977. "The First Year Teacher: Perceived Needs, Intervention Strategies and Results." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Broulliet, F.B. 1988. *Report to the Legislature on the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program*. Olympia Washington: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Buttery, T.J., Haberman, M., and Houston, W.R. 1990. "First Annual ATE Survey of Critical Issue in Teacher Education." *Action in Teacher Education*. 12(2): 1-7.
- California Department of Education. 1992. "Effects of New Teacher Support." *Teacher Connections* 1:6-7.
- Columbus Education Association. 1998. "Facts & Stats: 1986/87 - 1994/95 school years" HTML Document.
- Durbin, D. 1991. "Review of Pre 1980 and Post-1980 Induction Programs." *ERIC Document 338562*.
- Eisner, K. 1984. "First Year Evaluation Results from Oklahoma's Entry-Year Assistance Committees." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators.
- Ganser, T. et al. 1993. "The Perceptions of School Principals about a Mentoring Program for Newly Hired Urban School Teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Diversity in Mentoring Conference.
- Huffman G, and Leak, S. 1986. "Beginning Teachers' Perceptions of Mentors." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 36:22-25.
- Huling-Austin, L. and Murphy, S.C. 1987. "Assessing the Impact of Teacher induction Programs: Implications for Program Development" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Kilgore, A.M. and Koziak, J.A. 1989. The effects of a planned induction program on First Year Teachers: A Research Report. In *Teacher Induction*, Judy Reinhartz, ed. Washington DC: National Education Association.
- Odell, S. 1986. "Developing Support Programs for Beginning Teachers in Assisting the Beginning Teacher." Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Office of Educational Research. 1994. *Mentor Teacher Internship Program, 1993-94*. Brooklyn, NY: Board of Education of the City of New York.
- Schlecty, P and V Vance 1981 "Do Academically Able Teachers Leave Education? The North Carolina Case. *Phi Delta Kappan* 63. Pp. 106-112.
- "Recruitment, Selection and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force." 1983. *Elementary School Journal*. 83:469-487.
- Summers, J.A. 1987. *Summative Evaluation Report: Project Credit*. Terre Haute: Indiana State University.
- Spuhler, L and Zetler, A. 1995. *Montana Beginning Teacher Support Program: Final Report*. Montana State Board of Education. Helena.
- U.S. Department of Education. 1997. "Characteristics of Movers and Stayers."

**TABLE 1: QUALITIES OF STATE MENTOR PROGRAMS**

State	Mentor Program	Mandated Mentor Program	Funded Mentor Program	Mentor Training	Mentor Stipend	Mentor Requirements	Release Time	Notes
Alabama	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	The legislature funded an initial pilot program, but has not funded it since.
Arizona	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Arkansas	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Mentoring is mandated for alternative certification route.
California	Yes	No	Yes	D	Yes	No	D	Funding comes from the California Mentor Teacher Program and the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program. Stipends vary between \$4000 and \$4200, and districts receive almost \$1900 per mentor that can be used for release time, professional development and supplies.
Colorado	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Each district is required to create an induction program, although there is a waiver process that some districts use. Mentoring is mandated for alternative certification.
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Mentors must be tenured teachers. Originally there were funds to implement the program, but these have largely been eliminated.
Delaware	Yes	No	Yes	D	D	No	D	The program is voluntary but this year all 19 school districts will take part. The districts receive funds that may be used for training, release time, or stipends.
Florida	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	There was a program, but it was cut by the legislature. A new law provides a bonus to National Board Certified Teachers who become mentors.
Georgia	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Compensation varies year to year. Mentor training can count towards professional development requirements
Hawaii	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	There was a program but it was cut. Mentors can still receive professional development credits (four per year, maximum of twelve) that count on the salary scale.
Iowa	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Mentoring was part of a legislative package that was vetoed this year. There is a possibility for it to be revisited. Districts can use staff development funds (\$48 per student) for release time and mentor training.
Idaho	Yes	No	Yes	D	D	No	D	State law requires that mentor funds be used for some combination of stipends, training and release time.
Illinois	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Indiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The funding for mentor training has become limited.
Kansas	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	This has been an issue for some years. There is a proposal to modify the certification process to include mentoring, but action has not been taken.
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mentors should have four years experience and a masters degree, and are part of a three person support committee.
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Mentor qualifications include a minimum of three years service, completion of mentor training program, and evidence of good teaching.

*Note Bene:* The information in this table was provided by staff in various AFT state affiliates, and by staff in a number of state departments of education.

Key: Yes – state either has program, mandates program, sets qualifications or provides funding for the specified component.  
 No – state either does not have program, does not mandate program, or does not provide funding for the specified component.  
 Discretionary (D) – State Funding is provided, and may be used for feature

State	Mentor Program	Mandated Mentor Program	Funded Mentor Program	Mentor Training	Mentor Stipend	Mentor Requirements	Release Time	Notes
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	
Maryland	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Some county programs receive targeted state aid.
Maine	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Initially there was state funding. The state program requires mentors to have three years experience.
Michigan	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Compensation is a local issue.
Minnesota	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Licensing is being restructured. It is slightly possible that mentoring will be a component of this process. 1998 is the final year for a grant program and a seven district pilot project.
Missouri	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Mentoring is a requirement for final certification. A percentage of the state's foundation grant must be used for professional development, and part of this must be spent on beginning teachers. Given that mentoring is required, districts often put this money towards release time, mentor training and compensation. The state recommends that mentors be master teachers with three years of experience.
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	There will be an effort to create a funded pilot program either this legislative session or next.
Montana	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	There are a number of local programs, and there was a state evaluation (1992-95) that found mentoring to be highly effective. There may be legislation in the coming year.
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Although requirements have been in place for some time, state funding has been intermittent. As part of the Excellent Schools Act, money is now supplied for stipends and professional development.
North Dakota	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	There is currently a pilot program in Bismarck.
Nebraska	Yes	No	Yes	No	D	Yes	D	Legislation was recently passed, and the rules process has not been completed. Compensation would potentially be allowed, but staff development is not allowable under legislative intent.
New Hampshire	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	There are local programs.
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Mentoring is required as part of the certification process. This matches the alternative certification requirements
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	The governor vetoed funding this year
New York	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Funding was vetoed this year. Last year, 70 districts received funding for professional development and release time. Mentors are required to be permanently certified teachers serving in the applicable subject area, although there can be waivers. Note that alternatively certified teachers must receive mentoring.
Nevada	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	The largest district, Clark County, has an extensive program that is part of a larger induction effort.
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes	D	D	No	D	The state provides grant funds for districts to use for mentor training, compensation and release time.
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Funding is minimal. The stipend is \$500 for 72 hours.
Oregon	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	The state ceased specific funding of the mentor program in 1993, but the statute specifically allows funds to be used for each criteria, and sets mentor standards. There is a request this year to restart the program. In addition, Goals 2000 money is being used for a competitive mentoring grant program.

State	Mentor Program	Mandated Mentor Program	Funded Mentor Program	Mentor Training	Mentor Stipend	Mentor Requirements	Release Time	Notes
Penn.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	All schools are required to submit a plan for approval. There are no state funds or formal requirements regarding stipends, release time, mentor qualifications or training.
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	This was legislated in 1998 as part of the accountability program. Professional Development funds can be used for mentor program
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	State provides a mentor training program for districts at a nominal fee.
S Dakota	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Tennessee	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	The state board of education had a policy on mentoring, but the legislature has never funded the program. The policy includes stipends, release time, professional development and mentor qualifications. Some districts implement parts of the program on their own.
Texas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Beginning teachers are required to have a mentor, but there is no guidance as to what a mentor is or does. There will be an effort this year to create a pilot program for evaluation.
Utah	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Mentoring is mandated, but each of the forty districts creates its own program. The law requires that "if possible" a mentor should have the same area of teaching as the mentee, and have at least three years of experience. The state has a Career Ladders Program, and mentoring is one of the ways districts may use these funds.
Virginia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	There is no authorized statewide program. The legislature has appropriated \$1.2 million for grants for collaborative programs between school districts and colleges. This money must be used for stipends, among other uses. There have been previous grant funds. A task force is examining induction, and should make mentoring a major component of its proposals.
Vermont	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Some state funds may be used by districts for mentoring. A working group on induction has recommended a mentoring and induction program to the board.
Washington	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	There is a stipend for both mentor and mentee. State funding has diminished over time.
Wisconsin	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	The Department of Public Instruction's budget proposal for the next biennium includes a comprehensive proposal.
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Requirements are that the teacher be experienced, and teach in the same or a similar subject area. The stipend is \$600 per year.
Wyoming	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	The legislature has begun to look at this issue.

# Sample Legislative Language

In order to provide context on what states can do to create mentoring programs we include samples of laws from Kentucky, Indiana, New York, and Nebraska. These are intended for illustrative purposes, and are not intended to provide specific legislative models. Furthermore, each law is designed to fit into the customs and specific situations of its own state, and may not be applicable to other states.

*Kentucky. The mentor program in Kentucky is part of a larger induction process. The mentor (referred to here as a resource teacher) is assigned to work with a beginning teacher (referred to here as an intern). The resource teacher has a formal evaluative role. The law mandates contact hours, creates a mentor training program and sets criteria for matching mentor and mentee by subject and geographical location. Excerpts of the law are included below.*

## Kentucky Revised Statutes

161.030 Certification authority—Assessments of beginning teachers—Temporary certificates—Internship—Beginning teacher committee—Resource teachers

(5) All new teachers, and out-of-state teachers with less than two (2) years of successful teaching experience who are seeking initial certification in Kentucky shall serve a one (1) year internship. The teacher shall be a full-time employee or shall have an annual contract and serve on at least a half-time basis and shall have supervision, assistance and assessment during the one (1) year internship. The internship may be served in a public school or a nonpublic school...Successful completion shall be determined by a majority vote of the beginning teacher committee. The internship period shall be counted as experience for the purpose of continuing contract status, retirement eligibility, and benefits for single salary experience increments. Upon successful completion of the beginning teacher program, the one (1) year initial teaching certificate shall be extended for the remainder of the usual duration period established for that particular certificate by Education Professional Standards Board administrative regulations.

(6) The beginning teacher committee shall be com-

posed of three (3) persons who have successfully completed special training in the supervision and assessment of the performance of beginning teachers as provided in subsection (8) of this section. The committee shall consist of a resource teacher, the school principal of the school where the internship is served, and a teacher educator from a state-approved teacher training institution to be appointed by the president of that institution. *[NB sections 6a-6e concern the non-teacher members of the induction committee]*

- (6f) The resource teacher shall be appointed by the Department of Education from a pool of qualified resource teachers, and, any statutes to the contrary notwithstanding and to the extent of available appropriations, shall be entitled to be paid a reasonable stipend by the Department of Education for work done outside normal working hours. In the case of a resource teacher in a nonpublic school, payment shall be made directly to the resource teacher by the Department of Education. Priority shall be given to resource teachers with the same certification as the teacher intern in the following order:
- (1) Teachers in the same school;
  - (2) Teachers in the same district; and
  - (3) Teachers in an adjacent school district
- (6g) The committee shall meet with the beginning teacher a minimum of three (3) times per year for evaluation and recommendation with all committee members present. In addition, each member of the committee shall observe the beginning teacher in the classroom a minimum of three (3) times per year. If the teacher's first year performance is judged by the committee to be less than satisfactory, the teacher shall be provided with an opportunity to repeat the internship one (1) time if the teacher is employed by the school district.
- (7) The resource teacher shall spend a minimum of seventy (70) hours working with the beginning teacher; twenty (20) of these hours shall be observing the beginning teacher in the classroom setting; fifty (50) of these hours shall be in consultation other than class time or attending assessment meetings. The resource teacher shall have completed at

least four (4) years of successful teaching experience as attested to by his or her immediate supervisor or by having achieved tenure and be able to show evidence of continuing professional development by having achieved a master's degree or its equivalent or the accumulation of two thousand (2,000) hours of continuing professional activities.

- (8) By contract with teacher education institutions in the Commonwealth, the chief state school officer shall provide special training for persons who will be serving on the beginning teacher committees. Completion of special training shall be evidenced by successfully passing the assessments as prescribed by the Educational Professional Standards Board. A principal hired after July 15, 1996 shall be required to complete the beginning teacher committee training program within one (1) year after his appointment.

*Indiana. This legislation, which is included in its entirety, sets qualifications for the mentor, provides for a specific mentor stipend, and creates guidelines for release time. It also mandates that the mentor's role is explicitly non-supervisory and that school principals are responsible for evaluation of new teachers.*

## **Indiana Code Section 20-6.1-8**

### **Chapter 8. Beginning Teacher Internship Program**

Sec. 1. This chapter applies to each individual who receives an initial standard or reciprocal teaching license after March 31, 1988.

Sec. 2. As used in this chapter, "advisor" means a representative of a teacher training institution within Indiana who acts as teacher advisor for a beginning teacher.

Sec. 3. As used in this chapter, "beginning teacher" means an individual who:

- (1) receives an initial standard or reciprocal license;
- (2) is employed as a teacher by a school corporation under a contract described in IC 20-6.1-4;
- (3) has not successfully completed an internship program under this chapter; and
- (4) has less than two (2) years of teaching experience outside Indiana.

Sec. 4. As used in this chapter, "internship program"

refers to the beginning teacher internship program established under this chapter.

Sec. 5. As used in this chapter, "mentor" refers to an individual who is assigned under section 10 of this chapter.

Sec. 6. As used in this chapter, "teacher training institution" means a college or university offering a program of teacher education approved by the board.

Sec. 7. The beginning teacher internship program is established to:

- (1) assist beginning teachers in the performance of their duties;
- (2) identify teaching skills and educational practices necessary to acquire and maintain excellence in teaching;
- (3) evaluate the performance of beginning teachers by principals; and
- (4) evaluate the quality of teacher training programs.

Sec. 8. (a) Each beginning teacher shall participate in an internship program for at least one (1) school year. However, a beginning teacher who has not successfully completed an internship program at the end of the school year in which the beginning teacher originally entered the internship program may participate in a second internship program with:

- (1) the school corporation that initially employed the beginning teacher; or
- (2) another school corporation; upon the consent of that school corporation. A beginning teacher who does not successfully complete an internship program in the first year and who is participating in a second internship program shall be provided individualized assistance under section 16(b) of this chapter for the second internship program.
  - (b) During the internship program, the beginning teacher is entitled to at least the same salary and benefits ordinarily granted by the school corporation to a teacher with teaching experience that is comparable to the experience of the beginning teacher. If a beginning teacher participates in an internship program for a second year, that beginning teacher is not entitled to credit during that year for the teaching experience gained during the first year internship program.

Sec. 9. (a) Each school corporation shall prepare a plan for the beginning teacher that describes the teaching skills and educational practices necessary to achieve competency in teaching. This guide shall be used by the mentor and the beginning teacher to assist the beginning teacher to acquire these skills and follow these practices.

- (b) The mentor shall periodically meet with the beginning teacher to:
  - (1) evaluate the progress of the beginning teacher in attaining competency as described in the plan prepared under subsection (a);
  - (2) discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the beginning teacher's skills and practices; and
  - (3) provide guidance to the beginning teacher in attaining excellence in teaching.
- (c) The department shall develop models for the teaching plan required by subsection (a).

Sec. 10. (a) Each superintendent shall, with the consent of the mentor, assign a mentor to assist each beginning teacher under the internship program. The superintendent shall, whenever possible, assign a mentor who:

- (1) has at least five (5) years of teaching experience;
  - (2) teaches at a grade level similar to that of the beginning teacher;
  - (3) teaches similar subjects as those of the beginning teacher; and
  - (4) teaches in the same building as the beginning teacher.
- (b) The mentor must be a teacher:
    - (1) with outstanding teaching skills; and
    - (2) who has the ability to guide a beginning teacher toward attaining the skills and practices described in the plan prepared under section 9(a) of this chapter.
  - (c) A mentor does not become a supervisor under IC 20-7.5-1-2(h) as a result of performing duties under this chapter.
  - (d) The superintendent shall take the action necessary to provide the mentor adequate time for the mentor to observe the beginning teacher in the classroom setting. Whenever practical, the super-

intendent shall provide the mentor release time from the mentor's non-classroom duties.

- (e) The mentor, including a mentor who is employed by an accredited nonpublic school, is entitled to an annual stipend of six hundred dollars (\$600) to be paid by the state.

*Nebraska. These two sections are taken from the Nebraska Quality Education Accountability Act that was passed in 1998. This is a broad education reform package. The included sections relate to the funding of the mentor program, and the guidelines for the program. The state board of education is currently at work on the regulations. It is an example of a program that has a continuing funding stream, and mandates that mentors have strong qualifications.*

#### **Nebraska Quality Education Accountability Act**

(2) The Education Innovation Fund is hereby created. Each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1994-95, at least seventy-five percent of the lottery proceeds allocated to the Education Innovation Fund shall be available for disbursement. The Education Innovation Fund shall be allocated in the following manner: Up to ten percent to fund the mentor teacher program pursuant to the Quality Education Accountability Act; up to seventy percent as quality education incentives pursuant to the act; and up to twenty percent of the fund shall be allocated by the Governor through incentive grants to encourage the development of strategic school improvement plans by school districts for accomplishing high performance learning and to encourage schools to establish innovations in programs or practices that result in restructuring of school organization, school management, and instructional programs which bring about improvement in the quality of education. Such incentive grants allocated by the Governor are intended to provide selected school districts, teachers or groups of teachers, nonprofit educational organizations, educational service units, or cooperatives funding for the allowable costs of implementing pilot projects and model programs.

Sec. 5. The State Board of Education shall develop guidelines for mentor teacher programs in local systems in order to provide ongoing support for individuals entering the teaching profession. Funding for mentor teacher programs shall be provided to local systems which provide each first-year teacher in the local system

with a mentor. The mentor teacher programs shall be funded by the Education Innovation Fund pursuant to subsection (2) of section 9-812 and shall identify criteria for selecting excellent, experienced, and qualified teachers to be participants. The state board shall report to the Legislature on or before December 1, 1998, on its progress in implementing this section.

*New York. New York's legislation, while not mandating participation, lays out a plan and incentives for districts to create mentor programs. It creates a role for teacher organizations in the selection of qualified mentors. It also sets requirements that the mentor and mentee's teaching loads be set at no more than 90% of maximum to allow adequate time for meeting. The law provides specific requirements for funding release time.*

#### **New York State Title IV Article 62**

#### **§ 3033. New York state mentor teacher-internship program.**

1. Boards of education and boards of cooperative educational services are hereby authorized to participate in the New York state mentor teacher-internship program in accordance with the provisions of this section.

2. Each board of education or board of cooperative educational services which applies for funds under this section shall prepare a plan for implementation of a mentor teacher-internship program consistent with article fourteen of the civil service law. The plan shall be developed in accordance with this section and regulations of the commissioner. The board of education or board of cooperative educational services shall submit an application and plan by May first of the current year for approval by the commissioner; provided however for the nineteen hundred ninety-seven—ninety-eight school year, such plan may be submitted by November first, nineteen hundred ninety-seven.

3. Each board of education and board of cooperative educational services which determines to participate in the program shall select persons eligible to serve as mentor teachers from a list of persons who have demonstrated their mastery of pedagogical and subject matter skills, given evidence of superior teaching abilities and interpersonal relationship qualities, and who have indicated their willingness to participate in such program. Such list of persons eligible to serve as mentor teachers shall be developed by a selection committee composed of certified or licensed personnel employed by the

school district or the board of cooperative educational services, a majority of whom shall be classroom teachers chosen by the certified or recognized teachers employee organization. The assignment of particular mentor teachers and teacher interns to work together shall be made by the superintendent of the participating district or district superintendent of the participating board of cooperative educational services. Each person designated as a mentor teacher shall continue to provide classroom instruction for at least sixty percent of the time spent in performance of such individual's duties during the school year or such person may so serve on a full-time basis for not more than two school years out of five consecutive school years, provided that such service as a mentor teacher shall not diminish or impair the tenure and seniority rights of the mentor teacher.

4. Each board of education and board of cooperative educational services which determines to participate in the mentor teacher-internship program shall require those first or second year eligible teachers which it chooses to include in the program to perform their duties under the guidance of a mentor teacher, and shall ensure that such teacher intern and mentor carry no more than a ninety percent classroom instruction assignment in order to allow such teacher intern time to receive special assistance from a mentor teacher. In order to participate as a teacher intern in a mentor teacher-internship program, a first or second year teacher shall hold a provisional or permanent teaching certificate, temporary emergency license, regular license, or temporary per diem certificate for a field in which no licensed person is available to teach and shall not have participated in such program in the previous year.

5. A school district or board of cooperative educational services participating in an approved mentor teacher-internship program in the current year shall be eligible for aid including but not limited to costs related to release time of the intern and mentor teacher up to ten percent of the mentor teacher's salary and up to ten percent of the teacher intern's salary respectively in accordance with the provisions of this subdivision. To receive such assistance, a school district or board of cooperative educational services must file a claim with the commissioner by October first of the current school year in a form prescribed by the commissioner which shall include the actual salary of each program participant as of September fifteenth of such year. The commissioner shall pay one-half of the amount of such assis-

tance by January fifteenth of each year and shall pay the remaining amount based upon a final report filed by the school district by August fifteenth of each year.

6. Each board of education and board of cooperative educational services which participates in the program shall file a report with the commissioner on or before August first of each school year concerning compliance

with the requirements of the program during the preceding school year. Such report shall be in such form and in such manner as the commissioner may require. The commissioner shall evaluate such programs and file a report with the legislature on or before December first, nineteen hundred eighty-seven.