



EDUCATIONAL ISSUES POLICY BRIEF

NUMBER 13 / SEPTEMBER 2001

Beginning Teacher Induction: The Essential Bridge

Introduction

The AFT has a longstanding commitment to improving teacher quality as a means to improve student achievement. The union's official policy statement on teacher quality, adopted at the 1998 biennial convention, states in part:

To assure a high-quality teaching force, the union must play a role in developing and/or implementing quality preservice education, effective recruiting and hiring practices, *strong induction and mentoring programs*, high-quality professional development, meaningful evaluation, and, when necessary, fair, timely intervention and dismissal procedures [emphasis added]. *AFT Resolution on Improving Teacher Quality*, July 1998.

AFT policy recognizes induction for new teachers as one of the essential building blocks of teacher quality. The union's position on new teacher induction was reinforced in the resolution on teacher education and teacher quality adopted in July 2000. Derived from "Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction," the report of the AFT K-16 Teacher Education Task Force, the resolution states:

Graduation from a teacher education program...cannot be considered the end of training for teachers. The demands of the pre-college degree—acquiring subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and clinical training—do not allow sufficient time for teacher candidates to develop the

skills and experience necessary for completely independent practice in their initial teaching assignments.... Nonetheless, after graduation most new teachers are assigned a class, often with the most hard-to-reach students, and left to "sink or swim" on their own. By contrast, other countries with high-achieving students induct new teachers into the profession through clinical, real-world training processes...by which inductees develop and perfect their teaching skills under the mentorship of more experienced and skilled colleagues. ...Resolved that the AFT call for an induction program for all beginning teachers.... *AFT Resolution on Teacher Education and Teacher Quality*, July 2000.

This policy brief provides the underlying research-based rationale for the AFT's policy on beginning teacher induction—why induction matters. It then focuses on state statutes and regulations on induction, outlining the attributes of effective statutes and reporting on the results of a 50-state AFT analysis of induction policies. The brief ends with a set of recommendations.

Why Induction Matters

The attrition rate for beginning teachers (those with three to five years of experience) hovers at 20 percent to 30 percent, and can be as high as 50 percent in urban districts (Darling-Hammond, 1997). Novice teachers leave the profession for many reasons: Salaries are low, working conditions are difficult. Among the most often-cited reasons young teachers leave teaching is lack of

support. Induction, with mentoring, goes a long way toward filling the support gap and retaining teachers in the profession.

Research shows that teachers who have no induction program are twice as likely to leave within the first three years of teaching (Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study 1992-93), as cited in “Quality Counts 2000.” Those with induction not only are more likely to stay, but also are able to move more quickly beyond issues of classroom management to focus on instruction (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

The evidence in support of induction as a means of retaining young teachers is compelling. California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA), a mandatory two-year induction program, has reduced beginning teacher attrition in that state from 39 percent to 9 percent.

In Rochester, N.Y., induction is part of the union-negotiated peer assistance and review program. As of 1998, fully 95 percent of teachers who had begun their careers in Rochester a decade earlier and had participated in induction as new teachers were still teaching in the district (Koppich, Asher, and Kerchner, 2001). Other districts with similar programs—Toledo and Cincinnati, Ohio, and Poway, Calif., for example—can cite equally positive results.

Induction provides a hands-on opportunity for beginning teachers—under the guidance of experienced mentors—to link the theory of instruction learned in their teacher preparation programs with the practice of classroom teaching. There is little question that induction programs pay dividends in terms of teachers who are better prepared for their jobs, more confident in their professional skills, and more likely to remain in teaching.

States can send a powerful message. With thoughtful, comprehensive statutes, they can convey to districts, schools, and beginning teachers the importance of deep and rigorous clinical experience as the final step in teacher preparation. Alternatively, through weak language or silence, states can communicate their relative indifference to this important component of improving teacher quality.

Five characteristics, as described in the next section, are common to effective state statutes on induction for beginning teachers. It should be remembered, however, that the distance between statutes, even exemplary

statutes, and successful programs may be wide indeed. Transforming the language of policy into effective practice requires, at a minimum, agreement on what constitutes good teaching.

Characteristics of Effective Induction Statutes

Data from the National Center for Education Statistics show that 56 percent of teachers participate in an induction program in their first three years in the profession (Darling-Hammond, 1997). The quality and duration of these programs, however, vary considerably. For some teachers, induction is mere nuts and bolts: where supplies are kept, where restrooms are located, school rules and procedures. Other teachers are fortunate enough to experience real mentoring with experienced colleagues who pay careful attention to the novice’s developing professional practice.

Effective induction statutes, those that shape successful programs, share the following characteristics:

1. All beginning teachers participate.

All beginning teachers need induction, whether they are licensed through traditional or alternative means. Even, perhaps especially, those teaching on “emergency” licenses (or whatever term the state uses to signify individuals who have neither adequate preparation nor training for teaching) ought to be required to participate in an induction program.

This is not meant to suggest that the AFT condones emergency licensure. There is no substitute for a rigorous preparation program that lays the foundation for good teaching. However, as long as states continue to use emergency certification as a means to fill classrooms, all reasonable opportunities must be provided for these teachers to develop the knowledge and skills that will enable them to promote student learning. An induction program, while not sufficient, can help in this regard.

2. The program lasts at least one year.

Research shows that when it comes to beginning teacher induction, longer is better than shorter. A one- to two-year period of induction can make the difference between a teacher who succeeds early in her career and one who does not, and between a teacher who remains in the profession and one who does not.

Induction that lasts at least as long as a full school year affords the novice teacher an opportunity to experience all of the rites of school—opening the year, planning and teaching complete instructional units, adjusting teaching to meet students’ learning needs, assigning grades, closing out the school year—in the semi-sheltered setting an experienced mentor can provide.

3. All beginning teachers are assigned qualified mentors.

Mentoring is a crucial component of any induction program. Beginning teachers need the support, advice, and guidance that only experienced teachers can provide. But not just any experienced teacher should be assigned as a mentor. Mentors need to be screened carefully and should be required to meet designated criteria that ensure only high-quality practitioners assume this role. Wherever possible, mentors should be “matched” for both grade level and subject area to the individuals they are assigned to mentor. And, in order to create the time necessary for mentors to devote to their task, they should be given reduced teaching loads and be assigned a reasonable number of new teachers to supervise. Finally, in recognition of the important work they are doing, mentors must be fairly compensated for their efforts.

4. Beginning teachers have reduced teaching loads.

Beginning teachers cannot effectively learn to teach while they are managing a full teaching load. In order to hone their professional skills, novices need both the time and the opportunity to observe other teachers teach, confer with colleagues, work with their mentors, and reflect on their own teaching. In this same vein, beginning teachers should not be given the most challenging assignments. To the extent possible, novices should have teaching assignments that offer someone with fledgling skills the chance to succeed.

5. A summative review completes the program.

Successful completion of induction should require a summative review of teaching. Ideally, the mentor should conduct this summative review. It should be based on established standards of effective practice, such as those derived from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Successful completion of induction, including a positive summative review, should be a licensure requirement.

The AFT 50-State Analysis

By means of a 50-state review, the AFT analyzed state policies on induction. The data search included reviews of state statutes and regulations as well as conversations with appropriate personnel in the state department of education or other agency responsible for teacher licensing. We checked our findings against those reported in *Education Week’s* “Quality Counts 2000.” (See Table 1 for a summary of the findings.)

We analyzed state policies specifically for the extent to which they do, or do not, “map” against the five criteria of effective induction statutes.

Two caveats:

1. Only state-level data were collected.* Many districts maintain their own induction programs, separate from state policy, but these are not part of the data used for this policy brief.

2. Collecting data on the quality of implementation of state-specified induction programs was beyond the scope of this study. While we have information on what state law or regulation says, we cannot verify the extent to which actual programs are faithful to the letter or spirit of the policy.

The questions we sought to answer with this analysis are:

- How many states have state-authorized induction programs for new teachers?
- Who participates in induction programs?
- What is the length of induction programs?
- Do beginning teachers have reduced teaching loads?
- Are qualified mentors part of induction programs?
- Does completion of the induction program require a summative review of teaching? Is completion of the program linked to licensing?

How Many States Have State-Authorized Induction Programs?

In the past two decades, induction has become quite popular with state policymakers. In the 1980s, just 15 states had induction programs for beginning teachers on the books (Hirsch, Koppich, and Knapp, 2001). By

*The state statutes and regulations we analyzed generally did not reflect changes that may have been made during the 2000-01 state legislative sessions.

2001, that number had more than doubled. According to the results of the AFT analysis, 33 states have induction policies. Programs specified in statute range from California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA) to Connecticut’s Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST) to Kentucky’s Teacher Internship Program to North Carolina’s Beginning Teacher Induction Program.

While the number of states paying attention to induction for beginning teachers is encouraging, closer examination of the statistics reveals a more troubling picture. Of the 33 states with induction policies, only 22 mandate and fund these programs. In the remaining one-third of the states with induction policies, these policies function only as good intentions, neither mandated nor financially supported. And more than 34 percent of the states—17 states in all—are silent on induction, offering neither policy guidance nor funding.

Who Participates in Induction Programs?

State policies vary widely as to who participates in induction programs (see Table 2). States tend to specify categories of teachers who are included and those who are exempted sometimes within their statute or regulation on teacher licensure. All states with induction policies appear, at first glance, to cover under their policies individuals new to teaching. However, on further examination, it becomes clear that it is the statutorily “exempted” categories that create problematic loopholes.

California, for example, exempts “pre-interns,” individuals with no background or training for teaching, from its induction program. Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania exempt emergency-certified teachers. Virginia exempts teachers who completed teacher preparation via an alternative route.

As a result, those most in need of help—teachers with little or no preparation for teaching—are often excluded from induction. Of the 33 states with induction policies, 20 (60 percent) specify exemptions. Add this to the number of states that have no induction policies at all, and the number of teachers who are unlikely to benefit from these programs is indeed large.

What is the Length of Induction Programs?

As previously indicated, induction programs can be effective if they are of sufficient duration. Too brief and the program may have little more impact than a stint of student teaching.

Of the 33 states that have induction programs in statute, 11 do not specify the program length. Fifteen states specify that induction programs should last one year; three states specify two years; and five states authorize more than two years for induction. When a program length is specified, the norm is one year.

Do Beginning Teachers Have Reduced Teaching Loads?

Only one state has policy language on reduced teaching loads for new teachers. New York specifies that, “... beginning teachers are required to carry no more than 90 percent classroom instruction assignment to allow

Table 1
Summary of Induction Policies by Selected Categories

Category of Analysis	Number of States
State mandates induction program	22
State does not mandate induction program	11
State does not have statute on induction	17*
State-funded program	22
Grant-based program	13
Mentor assigned to beginning teacher	29
Support team assigned to beginning teacher	12
State criteria for mentors	21
Mentors required to receive training	17*
Mentors required to receive stipend	12
Reduced teaching loads for beginning teachers	1
Reduced teaching loads for mentors	1
Summative review of teaching practice required	4
Favorable summative review required for full licensure	4
Program completion required for full licensure	21
State required to evaluate induction programs	7

*The 17 states without statutes or regulations on induction are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

for mentoring activities to occur.”

Three other states—Connecticut, Iowa, and Nebraska—have statutory language on release time for novice teachers. Connecticut’s BEST program requires that, “...the district must provide beginning teachers with at least eight half days to observe [other teachers]...or for professional development related activities.”

Iowa requires that school districts submit plans to receive state funding for induction. These plans must include “the minimum amount of release time for...beginning teachers.” And Nebraska authorizes that “grant funds [for new teacher induction] may be used for substitute salaries for release time.”

North Carolina’s Beginning Teacher Induction Program does not provide for reduced teaching loads for new teachers, but does describe “optimum working conditions,” including assignment in the area of licensure, a limited number of preparations, a limited number of “exceptional or difficult” students, minimal non-instructional duties, and “no extracurricular activities unless the...teacher requests the assignment in writing.”

A few states, then, recognize that beginning teachers need different teaching circumstances than do their more experienced colleagues. Most states, however, continue to expect novices to learn their craft without designated (or compensated) time for reflection, consultation, observation, or further study, and while working under the same difficult conditions even seasoned professionals find challenging.

Are Qualified Mentors Part of Induction Programs?

Statutes in 29 states (89 percent of the total number of states with induction policies) require that mentors be part of induction programs (see Table 3). Of these 29 states, 21 have established criteria for mentors. North Carolina, for example, offers guidelines for mentor teacher selection, including successful teaching in the area of licensure, appraisal ratings “among the highest in the school,” and strong recommendations from principal and peers.

Kansas specifies that a mentor must be “...a certified teacher who has completed at least three consecutive school years of employment in the school district [and] has been selected by the board of education of the school district on the basis of having demonstrated exemplary teaching ability as demonstrated by criteria

established by the state board.” Oregon’s statute requires that a mentor teacher “...has successfully taught for three or more years as a licensed teacher in any public school...[and] has demonstrated a mastery of teaching skills and subject matter knowledge.”

Seventeen of the states with induction policies (51 percent) require that mentors receive training. Even those statutes that require mentors to receive training are fairly unspecific. Most simply say something like, “Mentors must complete a training program developed by the school district.” Maine’s statute is among the most specific, stating that mentors must receive “orientation and training... in peer observation and assessment techniques.”

Some states recognize in policy that providing mentors is a necessary but insufficient condition. Those mentors must be superbly prepared for their role. Two-thirds of the states that have induction programs in state policy, however, fail to specify standards for mentors. Half the states with induction policies have no training requirement for mentors.

Twelve states (one-third of the total with state-authorized induction programs) require that mentors receive stipends—generally from \$500 to \$1,000 per year. The remaining 21 states with induction policies have no requirement for mentor stipends. Whether districts are expected to compensate mentors or mentors are expected to perform these extra duties without extra pay is not clear from state policy.

Just two states—Kentucky and New York—authorize mentors to have reduced teaching loads. New York state law requires that, “Mentors...continue to provide classroom instruction for at least 60 and no more than 90 percent of their time, or they may mentor full-time for no more than two out of five consecutive years.” Kentucky state law requires release time (time away from a teacher’s regular classroom) and expects the district to fund it: “Mentors must spend at least 70 hours working with a beginning teacher, 20 hours in a classroom setting. *Districts must provide substitutes for release time* [emphasis added].”

Indiana has statutory language that implies, but does not mandate, reduced teaching loads or release time: “Mentors [must]...have adequate time to observe beginning teachers in the classroom.” The remainder of the states with induction policies provide neither direction nor guidance on reduced teaching loads for mentors.

Twelve states (36 percent of those with induction policies) assign support teams to beginning teachers. Oklahoma, for example, creates a “residency committee” (“resident” is Oklahoma’s term for a beginning teacher). The committee, by state law, is to be composed of a mentor teacher, a school level administrator, and a teacher educator from a local institution of higher education. The role of the team is to support the resident teacher in issues of “classroom management and professional development” and, upon completion of the one-year residency, to make recommendations regarding whether the beginning teacher should be licensed.

Maine also has a provision for support teams for beginning teachers. Under state statute, the team, which is to be composed of a majority of classroom teachers, is to provide “...services to facilitate good teaching and classroom management skills.”

Does Completion of the Induction Program Require a Summative Review of Teaching? Is Completion of the Program Linked to Licensing?

Only five of the 33 states with policies on beginning teacher induction—Idaho, Indiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, and South Carolina—require that teachers receive some sort of summative review as a condition of completing the program. Indiana’s law, for example, specifies that mentors “...evaluate the progress of the beginning teacher in attaining [teaching] competency...[and] discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the beginning teacher’s skills and practices....” The school principal must, at the end of the school year, determine whether the beginning teacher has successfully completed the internship.

Twenty-one states (64 percent of the total with induction policies) require completion of induction for full licensure. Kentucky, for example, specifies that, “A teacher...who has not successfully completed the internship [induction program] and has exhausted the two-year provision for participation in the Kentucky Internship Program shall not be eligible for a Kentucky teaching certificate....”

However, more than half (29) of all states have no requirement that a teacher complete a successful year or two of teaching in order to be fully licensed. Even in states that maintain induction policies, it is not clear whether a positive appraisal of a teacher’s competence is a condition of licensure. Only four state statutes man-

date a favorable summative review at the end of induction as a prerequisite to licensure.

Recommendations

Induction provides the essential bridge for a beginning teacher between being a student learning about teaching and becoming a professional teacher. Effective induction statutes have five common characteristics: inclusion, adequate length, reduced teaching loads for participants, qualified mentors, and a summative review.

A few states have statutes that meet these criteria. Most, however, fall short on one or more dimensions. Seventeen states do not even recognize beginning teacher induction as a state policy priority. This situation is a cause for concern.

Due to surging enrollments and increasing retirements, this nation needs to recruit 2 million new public school teachers by 2008-09. It will profit us little if we recruit these individuals (a formidable challenge in itself) only to have them leave at the very beginning of their careers—and then have to recruit and train a new cadre all over again.

Research confirms what experience shows. Support and assistance in the initial years of teaching produce teachers who are better equipped for the challenges of the classroom, have a greater likelihood of becoming high-quality teachers, and are more likely to remain in the profession. Induction programs represent a good investment, one that is likely to pay dividends for students far into the future.

1. States should develop statutory policy that reflects the importance of induction for beginning teachers.

All states should have on the books a policy statement that stresses the research-backed importance of induction programs for beginning teachers. If states are committed to reinforcing the link between deep clinical experience for beginning teachers and quality teaching, then it is likely that the necessary time, attention, and resources will be devoted to support beginning teachers in the early years of their careers.

2. States should strive for comprehensive induction policies.

As indicated in this policy brief, effective state

statutes on induction have a common set of characteristics. States should work toward statutes that embody these attributes: All beginning teachers should be included in the program, which is at least one year in length. Beginning teachers also should have reduced teaching loads, be assigned qualified mentors, and receive a summative review of their practice as a condition of completing induction. Although it may not be possible for all states to immediately develop laws that include all of these elements, it is important for all states to begin somewhere and to have a plan by which all of the elements of effective induction statutes are in place by a specified time.

3. States should at least partially fund induction programs.

If induction is simply another unfunded state mandate, it is likely to have less-than-optimum reach and force. Most school districts already have an enormous number of claims on their overburdened budgets. If states supply at least a portion of the funding for required induction programs, they not only reinforce the importance of induction as a state priority, they also lay claim to having some say over the shape of these programs.

4. States should consider induction policies as part of the teacher quality “accountability loop” that includes school districts and institutions of higher education.

Guaranteeing the quality of teachers just entering the profession ought to be a shared responsibility among states, teacher training institutions, and school districts. Well-crafted induction statutes should serve, at least in part, as a way to cement cooperation among these three and operate as a kind of “check and balance” mechanism ensuring that newly licensed teachers meet high and rigorous professional standards.

5. States should look to other states for guidance.

There is no need to reinvent the induction-statute wheel. A number of states are well on their way to comprehensive beginning teacher policies. States can borrow a page from other states’ books, learning from one another and making improvements as they go.

References

- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing What Matters Most: Investing in Quality Teaching*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future.
- Education Week*. “Quality Counts 2000,” Jan. 13, 2000.
- Hirsch, E., Koppich, J., and Knapp, M. (2001). “Revisiting What States Are Doing To Improve the Quality of Teaching.” Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Koppich, J., Asher, C., and Kerchner, C. (2001). *Developing Careers, Building a Profession: The Rochester Career in Teaching Plan*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future.
- What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future*. (1996). New York: National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future.

Table 2
Teacher Participation in Induction Programs*

State	Program name	Teachers included	Teachers not included	Notes
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California	Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA)	First- and second-year teachers with a valid credential; first and second year interns (1)	Individuals with pre-internship certificates (2)	(1) Interns follow the alternate route to licensure. (2) The pre-internship certificate replaces the emergency permit.
Colorado	Induction Program	Teachers with provisional licensure	Teachers with type I authorization (adjunct teacher), type II authorization (intern), type III authorization (emergency), type IV authorization (extension), type V authorization (substitute), type VI authorization (temporary)	
Connecticut	Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST)	Holders of initial educator certificates, interim educator certificates, or temporary 90-day certificates (alternate route)	Teachers with at least three years of successful teaching in a public or nonpublic school, holders of durational shortage area permits (1)	(1) Section 10-145d-422 of the regulations conditions the reissue of the durational shortage area permit on completing the BEST program. However, a permit holder who has met all the requirements except completing the BEST program may be issued an initial educator license.
Delaware				
Florida				
Georgia	Mentor Teacher Program	Teacher with fewer than three years of experience or who needs support and guidance (1)		(1) Georgia has one-stage licensing.
Hawaii				
Idaho	Support Program	Teachers employed under a Category 2 contract (certificated personnel in the first and second years of continuous employment with the same school district)	Teachers employed under a limited one-year contract, holders of a one-year Letter of Authorization Approval (emergency certificate)	
Illinois				

* The information in this table is based on state statutes and regulations as of December 2000.

State	Program name	Teachers included	Teachers not included	Notes
Indiana	Beginning Teacher Internship Program	Teachers who receive an initial standard or reciprocal license; are employed as a teacher by the district; have not already successfully completed an internship program; have fewer than two years of teaching experience outside of Indiana; are employed for at least three hours per day.(1)	Individuals employed on a temporary teacher's contract for an expected length of fewer than 120 days, on a supplemental services contract, or as a substitute teacher.	(1) Districts must provide holders of limited (emergency) licenses with supervision on a regular basis by a teacher assigned to the same school building as the holder of the limited license; who has at least five years of teaching experience; who will serve as an informative resource for the holder of the limited license; and who will not conduct or be involved in the evaluation of the performance of the holder of the limited license. The state does not issue alternative licenses.
Iowa	Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Program	Individuals, new to the profession, serving under an initial or provisional license		
Kansas	Mentor Teacher Program	Probationary teachers (i.e., without contracts)		
Kentucky	Kentucky Teacher Internship Program	New teachers and out-of-state teachers with less than two years' experience seeking initial certification; candidates who complete an alternative certification program	Teachers with emergency certification (1)	(1) Teachers who are judged unsatisfactory by the internship program may not be issued emergency certification.
Louisiana	Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program	Teachers employed for the first time in the state who are seeking to acquire or retain a regular teaching certificate	Candidates hired under the Interim Emergency Policy for Hiring Full- and Part-time Noncertified Personnel; Temporary Teaching Assignment Only; Temporary Employment Permit; Emergency Permit; and Out-of-State Provisional.	
Maine	Teacher Support System	Teachers holding provisional certificates and conditional certificates	Candidates with visiting teacher permits	
Maryland	Teacher Mentoring Grant Program	Teachers during their two-year probationary period, with a one-year extension for teachers holding professional, provisional, or resident teacher certificates		
Massachusetts	Beginning Teacher Induction/Mentoring Program	First-year teachers	Holders of hardship waivers	
Michigan		Teachers during their first three years of employment (1)		(1) It is unclear whether teachers are required to participate for all three years.
Minnesota	Teacher Mentorship Grant Program	Teachers new to the profession or district		

State	Program name	Teachers included	Teachers not included	Notes
Mississippi	Beginning Teacher Support Program	Individual who possesses a teaching license issued by the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development; is employed at least half time, primarily as a classroom teacher, by a school district; and has taught fewer than 90 consecutive days, or 180 days total, as a licensed teacher in any public school		
Missouri	Beginning Teacher Assistance Program	Any teacher who does not have prior teaching experience		
Montana				
Nebraska	Mentor Teacher Program	First-year teachers, individuals entering K-12 teaching in their first year of contracted service in any school, public or private	Those not employed for the instruction of pupils, or those who do not have teaching endorsements	
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	Induction Program	Provisional teachers holding a Certificate of Eligibility (CE)—alternate route; or a Certificate of Eligibility with Advanced Standing (CEAS)—traditional route	Teachers with emergency licenses	
New Mexico				
New York	New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program	First- and second-year teachers holding provisional or permanent certificates, temporary emergency licenses, regular licenses, or temporary per diem certificates (for a field in which licensed teachers are unavailable) (1)	Teachers with Transitional A certificates (alternative certification for teaching a specific career and technical subject); teachers with more than two years of teaching experience	(1) Teachers with the Transitional B certificate (alternative certification for all titles in the classroom teaching service) and the Transitional C certificate (alternative certification for career changers and others holding a graduate academic or graduate professional degree) are required to receive mentoring, but not under this program.
North Carolina	North Carolina Beginning Teacher Induction Program	Novice teachers with an initial license; teachers with lateral entry license (alternative route)	Teachers with provisional certificates (emergency credentials)	
North Dakota				
Ohio	Entry Year Program	New teachers with provisional and alternative licenses		
Oklahoma	Resident Teacher Program	Licensed teachers; holders of alternative placement licenses	Teachers with provisional or emergency certificates (1)	(1) Unless such teachers have taught for less than one year.
Oregon	Beginning Teacher Support Grant Program	Beginning teachers who possess a teaching license; are employed at least half time, primarily as classroom teachers, by a school district; and have taught fewer than 90 consecutive days, or 180 days total, as a licensed teacher in any public, private, or state-operated school		

State	Program name	Teachers included	Teachers not included	Notes
Pennsylvania	Induction Program	Full- and part-time, regularly employed teachers engaged in their initial teaching experience; candidates with intern certificates (alternative certification); substitute teachers and newly employed teachers with prior teaching experience may also be required to participate	Candidates with emergency permits	
Rhode Island	Mentoring Program	New teachers	Not specified	
South Carolina	Induction Program	Teachers with a valid teaching certificate with less than one year of public school teaching experience	Teachers employed on a part-time basis for fewer than 152 days hired under a letter of agreement	
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas		Beginning teachers, including those with alternative certification and emergency permits		
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia	Mentor Teacher Program	Probationary teachers	Teachers with provisional licenses (alternative route)	
Washington	Teacher Assistance Program	Individuals holding state-issued teacher's certificates; beginning teachers with fewer than 90 days experience under contract to any school district; teachers with short-term daily substitute experience (1)	Individuals holding temporary permits (those with missing documentation), teachers in districts that do not operate a program	(1) Districts have flexibility to decide who is included in the program.
West Virginia	Beginning Educator Internship Program	Teachers with professional teaching certificates	Teachers with five years experience in another state; individuals with temporary teaching or temporary vocational teaching certificates; provisional professional teaching certificates, permits, authorizations	
Wisconsin	Peer Review and Mentoring Grant Program	Initial educators	Holders of substitute teacher permits, charter school instructional staff permits, professional teaching permits	
Wyoming				

Table 3
Mentors and State Induction Policies*

State	Program name	Mentor assigned to beginning teacher	Support team assigned to beginning teacher	State criteria for mentors	Mentors required to receive training	Mentors required to receive stipend	Amount of stipend
Alabama							
Alaska							
Arizona							
Arkansas							
California	Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Colorado	Induction Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Connecticut	Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST)	Yes (or support team)	Yes (or support team)	Yes	Yes	No	
Delaware							
Florida							
Georgia	Mentor Teacher Program	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Hawaii							
Idaho	Support Program	No	No	No	No	No	
Illinois							
Indiana	Beginning Teacher Internship Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$600 annually
Iowa	Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$500 per semester
Kansas	Mentor Teacher Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Up to \$1,000 annually
Kentucky	Kentucky Teacher Internship Program	Yes (resource teacher)	Yes (beginning teacher committee)	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$1,000 annually
Louisiana	Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$400 per person
Maine	Teacher Support System	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Maryland	Teacher Mentoring Grant Program	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Massachusetts	Beginning Teacher Induction/Mentoring Program	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Michigan		Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Minnesota	Teacher Mentorship Grant Program	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Mississippi	Beginning Teacher Support Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Missouri	Beginning Teacher Assistance Program	No	No	No	No	No	
Montana							
Nebraska	Mentor Teacher Program	Yes (or support team)	Yes (or mentor)	Yes	No	Yes	\$15 per hour or \$120 per day
Nevada							

* The information in this table is based on state statutes and regulations as of December 2000.

State	Program name	Mentor assigned to beginning teacher	Support team assigned to beginning teacher	State criteria for mentors	Mentors required to receive training	Mentors required to receive stipend	Amount of stipend
New Hampshire							
New Jersey	Induction Program	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$550 to \$1,100
New Mexico		Yes	No	No	No	No	
New York	New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
North Carolina	North Carolina Beginning Teacher Induction Program	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	\$1,000
North Dakota							
Ohio	Entry Year Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Oklahoma	Resident Teacher Program	Yes	Yes (residency committee)	Yes	No	Yes	Not more than \$500
Oregon	Beginning Teacher Support Grant Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Pennsylvania	Induction Program	Yes	Yes (induction team)	No	No	No	
Rhode Island	Mentoring Program	Not specified	No	No	No	No	Not specified
South Carolina	Induction Program	Yes	Yes (assistance team)	No	Yes	No	
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas		No	No	No	No	No	
Utah							
Vermont							
Virginia	Mentor Teacher Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Washington	Teacher Assistance Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not specified
West Virginia	Beginning Educator Internship Program	Yes	Yes (professional support team)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Minimum of \$600 annually
Wisconsin	Peer Review and Mentoring Grant Program	Yes	Yes (review team)	No	No	No	
Wyoming							
Yes		29	12	21	17	12	
No		3	21	12	16	21	
Blank		17	17	17	17	17	
Not specified		1					