

The Impact of a Systemic Mentoring and Induction Program Initiative

**Mary Ann Blank, Ed.D., Cheryl Kershaw, Ed.D.,
Leslie Suters, Ph.D., Mary Humphrey, M.S.**

**The University of Tennessee
College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences**

This study assesses the impact of an innovative urban teacher mentoring and induction model, developed through a Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant, that involves principal and teacher “Mentor Core Teams” in professional development, school-based induction planning linked to school improvement plans. The effectiveness of the program in general and at 21 individual school sites is documented by perceptual data of all stakeholders, analysis of mentoring activity reports, field notes, and teacher retention data. Findings indicate that establishing school-based mentoring teams empowers experienced teachers, enhances professional development across the school, provides needed guidance and support to novice teachers, and establishes a structure for scaffolding the induction of novice teachers in schools with traditionally high turnover rates.

Paper Presented at

**The American Educational Research Association
San Diego, California
April 2004**

Introduction

When mentoring with clear and purposeful expectations occurs between experienced professionals and new teachers, it is almost always perceived as highly effective and valued by both partners. But, when “one-on-one” mentoring occurs within the context of a systemic teacher induction model, the perceived (and actual) impact is even greater. It is becoming clear that most novices who are learning to teach must have extended assistance beyond their first year in the profession. The extended time frame ensures numerous opportunities for professional learning with and from colleagues at all levels. More importantly, these increased opportunities for professional learning significantly strengthen the collaborative culture in schools, thus promoting the professional growth of both novice and experienced teachers (Ingersoll, 2001; Moir & Bloom, 2003, Darling-Hammond, 2003). In addition, in schools where the professional culture is strong, the new teachers choose to continue their careers in teaching, and, for the most part, in those schools.

URBAN IMPACT, in its fourth year of Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grant funding, supported the development of an innovative, research-based mentoring and induction program designed to support beginning teachers primarily in urban settings in one southern state. This model of mentoring and induction evolved directly from collaborative efforts between URBAN IMPACT partners: two universities, two large urban school systems, and the state department of education. It was later refined to incorporate pertinent aspects of another statewide mentoring program. As a result of this alignment, the program currently represents the additional perspectives and needs expressed by statewide induction taskforce members, school system administrators, and the state teachers’ association.

The overall goal of both initial grant-funded initiatives was to find a means to strengthen and scaffold the induction of beginning in-service teachers. The URBAN IMPACT model moved the goal to reality by developing a consistent set of beliefs, definitions, and guidelines for induction and by creating a professional development model and delivery system for developing induction programs at the school level. A major design consideration was to establish a model that could be sustained after grant resources were depleted.

Theoretical and Research Perspectives

All stakeholders in American education want quality teachers because they recognize the linkage between quality teaching and the quality of education (Cushman, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 1996, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Cochran-Smith, 2003b). However, it is well documented that teachers often leave education due to the lack of preparation for their work assignment, support, and opportunities for advancement (Rhoton & Bowers, 2003). National studies indicate that only 10% of those who left after 5 years of teaching indicated that salary was the primary reason (Bolich, 2001).

This URBAN IMPACT study reflects three years of research focused on improving the induction of novice teachers in urban settings. It builds upon the theories of the development of a professional (Berliner, 1998), teacher induction (Haberman, 1987;

Howey, 2000), culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995; 2001), self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), and adult learning (Lambert, 2003). The need for these interventions and this study was based on teacher retention statistics, particularly in urban settings, and their negative impact on teaching and learning (Haberman, 1987; Delpit, 1995; Collins, 1999; Weiner, 1999, 2000; Howey, 2000). Research has shown that teachers are the single largest factor impacting student learning (Sanders & Horn, 1998). However, statistics document the fact that from one-third to one-half of our novice teachers, particularly those in urban settings, do not remain in their schools or classrooms long enough to make the transformation from novice to what Berliner (1988) defines as “mature” or “expert” levels (Howey, 2000; Gay, 2000). According to Sanders (2004), this has a direct impact on student learning and achievement. In disaggregating test score data for students across the entire state, he has found that it takes approximately three to five years for novice teachers, even those among the most effective, to make significant gains in student achievement. Furthermore, he has concluded that if students have a low performing teacher for two years in a row, it becomes extremely difficult for them to overcome the resulting deficits in their learning curves which ultimately impacts their success in school (W. L. Sanders, personal communication, February 2, 2004). Therefore, students’ academic potential is adversely impacted by the revolving door of novice teachers who leave their classrooms and the profession before they have developed the level of expertise needed to promote their learning (Darling-Hammond, 2003). This is particularly acute in urban schools where the teacher attrition rates often exceed 50%.

Part of the reason for the high turnover rates is ineffective preparation for working with students and families from diverse backgrounds (Irvine, 1992; Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Zeichner, et. al, 1998, Weiner, 1999; Howey, 2000). This is compounded when novices are met with limited efforts to scaffold their induction, particularly in urban contexts. To support the success of increasing numbers of minority students in schools, pre-service and induction programs for teachers must make an understanding of and appreciation for the students’ school and community cultures a top priority (Taylor and Wilson, 1997; Delpit, 1995). Otherwise, the novices are totally dependent on theory. Ladsen-Billings (2001) contends that culture is a complex concept and few teachers are provided with opportunities to gain insight to support their successful teaching and interaction with students, parents, and community leaders, particularly those from cultures other than their own.

Furthermore, too many induction plans remain at the “hoped for” level. In a NEA (2002) publication on induction programs, Barry Sweeny is quoted as identifying three levels of induction models: 1) the basic orientation model where novices are socialized and taught “the ropes,” 2) the instructional practice model where induction is focused on helping novices implement standards, and 3) the school transformation model that links induction to school renewal. Beyond mere socialization, continuous nurturing, modeling, and monitoring are essential components of the induction process if we are to move to the instructional practice model.

Although pre-service teachers often use their mentors’ practice to guide their own, they must have sufficient opportunities to refine their own practice through systemic inquiry, reading, research, and seminars (Robinson, 1998; Whittaker, Markowitz, & Latter, 2000). For novice in-service teachers, having opportunities to reflect on research

and practice is equally important. Furthermore, according to Sweeny, the rare school transformation models are “connecting induction programs to systemic, school-wide renewal efforts that promote continuous improvement” (p. 2). It is the transformation model that helps novice teachers align their own professional growth with that of students and their efforts with the total school improvement planning process. NEA (2002) also charges administrators and mentors at both school and system levels to collect and use data regarding the quality of their induction program, just like they would in any other aspect of school improvement planning. According to Wong (2001), the lack of effective, systemic mentoring programs for new teachers in urban schools directly contributes to high attrition rates.

The URBAN IMPACT Mentoring & Induction Model, the focus of this study, was developed from a comprehensive definition of mentoring and induction. The model focused on developing what Feiman-Nemser (2003) defines as an “explicit endorsement of induction as a shared responsibility and a professional culture that supports collaboration and problem solving” (pp. 29-29). Whether it is called the school’s “climate,” “ethos,” or “saga” (Deal, 1993), many researchers are compiling impressive evidence on the impact of school culture on teaching and learning. Healthy school cultures are reported to correlate strongly with increased student achievement and motivation along with teacher productivity and satisfaction. In his recent publication, Sagor (2003) reported that the professional culture of the organization is the single best predictor of student success. This researcher strongly advocated attending to the professional culture of the school if teachers are to be motivated to meet the high expectations of high-stakes testing and the challenge of universal student success. School culture and its impact on teachers’ attitudes toward their work was documented by Yin Cheong Cheng (1993) who found stronger school cultures had better motivated teachers. This study of effective and ineffective organizational cultures highlighted the fact that schools as workplaces need to manifest the cultural attributes of professional learning communities so that teachers experience higher job satisfaction and increase productivity.

Design Process

The URBAN IMPACT mentoring and induction program was designed to assist schools in creating a culture that provides numerous supports for novice teachers during the critical first three years of teaching. In some schools, the timeframe extended through the fifth year. The specific objectives of the program were to reduce attrition, improve student academic success, strengthen novice (and experienced) teachers’ instructional practice and perceptions of their professional efficacy, build strong personal and professional relationships, and initiate a systemic support system that would become the first step in building a culture that nurtures novice and experienced faculty and staff.

In order to successfully meet these objectives, it was critical to identify effective, research-based components and obstacles to be avoided. A careful review of the literature identified developing systemic programs at school and system levels; identifying needs and developing focused action plans aligned with school improvement planning to address them; tailoring induction models to the local school context; incorporating a focus on understanding context (school, families, and communities) establishing positive

relationships; involving strong teacher leaders in mentoring roles, and collecting data and evaluating the effectiveness of the program on a regular basis were consistently reported in the research (Wong, 2001; NEA 2002, Darling-Hammond, 2004).

Obstacles identified in the research were verified by the initial group of mentors in schools participating in the pilot for the URBAN IMPACT program. While effective practices were in place in each, the participants highlighted the following challenges they faced:

1) *Issues related to making mentor-novice pairings.* The assignment of teacher mentors has been a longstanding requirement at state and local levels across the county, but, in a large percentage of participants' experiences, the actual mentoring relationships were described as superficial, sporadic, and sometimes non-existent. In most of the schools, the responsibility of identifying educators to serve as mentors to the new hires usually fell to an administrator who needed to insert a name on a form. Criteria for making the pairings often include similar grade or content assignments, compatible philosophical beliefs, willingness of participants to mentor or be mentored, or the selection of "appropriate role models." Many assignments were made without any actual communication or commitment from the mentor to participate. And, likewise, novices were often unaware of being assigned a mentor. Without appropriate accountability, many of the pairings were on paper, but the actual mentor-novice relationship never existed. In addition, it was found that if the initial pairings are not productive, there is generally no mechanism for changing the pairings although it would have been appropriate and advantageous to do so.

2) *Unclear mentoring expectations for both novices and mentors.* Many mentors said that they were not sure what specific roles they should play or what responsibilities those roles entailed. Several also said they felt ill-prepared to fulfill the required responsibilities. Many were fearful that their "help" would not be seen as such and might be interpreted as intrusive and controlling or might be discounted altogether. Novices were also unsure and anxious about how to engage in the relationship. Some were hesitant to share their concerns fearing that their inadequacies would lead others to evaluate them as incompetent or poorly prepared.

Confusion related to a definition of "novice teacher" was another concern. In many schools, only teachers in their first year of teaching were considered to be novices. The mentors reported that other teachers (e.g., those in their second and third years; some experienced teachers who were new to the grade level, content area, school or system; a few seasoned teachers who were marginally effective) were also struggling and in need of mentoring assistance. Many mentors, however, were unsure whether or not they should be included in the mentoring program.

3) *Infrequent interactions leading to stagnant relationships.* Mentor-novice relationships grow as a result of frequent and often informal contacts; just "being there" when the novice needs reinforcement; and providing encouragement or advice. It was found that ease of access needs to be a major consideration in pairing novices and mentors. When mentors and novices are physically removed from one another, the frequent, timely contacts generally do not happen, even when intentions are positive. This degree of proximity between the mentor and novice is an important obstacle to frequent interactions.

The relationship between mentor and novice should also be a dynamic and developmental one. The ultimate outcome of the relationship is that the novice will, at an appropriate point after sufficient mentoring, become an independent, autonomous professional. As the relationship begins, the mentor is in the dominant position providing the guidance, models, and opportunities to the novice who is dependent by virtue of inexperience in the school context. As the relationship progresses, it should become more collaborative as both participants engage as equals with knowledge and energy coming from both. Ultimately the novice should be ready to function independently. The goal is for the well-mentored novice to have a strong appreciation for collegial support and a desire to replicate the mentoring process with future novice teachers. Hopefully the novice is convinced of the power of mentoring and is committed to that role. Teachers in our study, who were mentored effectively and have become mentors themselves, report that their mentoring experiences have tended to shape the way they approach their mentoring role. Those who were in a supportive mentoring relationship tend to approach mentoring in that same way. Those who did not experience appropriate mentoring either choose not to be a mentor or go about it in the way they feel it should be done.

5) *Lack of adequate time and other resources to mentor.* Having the necessary resources is critical or frustration results. Mentoring requires time and some monetary resources to support important activities. In many schools, no time was protected for mentoring nor resources allocated to accomplish significant activities such as observations, conferences, and collaborative planning. In addition, mentoring requirements were often seen as “add on” responsibilities for mentors and for novices.

Another intervening factor was the fact that many mentors were overloaded already with their own classroom concerns, instructional duties, extracurricular activities, or school leadership roles. Many expressed frustration with not having time to mentor, to go into a novice’s classroom, to have the novice observe in the mentor’s classroom, or to meet with other mentors on professional development days to coordinate induction activities. And, finding a way to balance their own needs with the needs of their novice was also acknowledged as a struggle for many mentors.

6) *Limited school or central office administrative support.* It was found that in most schools mentoring was given much “lip service” as being an important activity and was generally acknowledged as an important strategy in retaining new teachers. The problem was that mentoring was, in most cases, not considered a school priority. This disconnect was linked to administrators’ (both school and system level) limited awareness of the need improved induction programs and its potential impact on academic achievement and school improvement.

In developing the URBAN IMPACT Mentoring and Teacher Induction Program, a concerted attempt was made to avoid these obstacles. A priority was placed on the selection of effective mentors to coordinate teacher induction in their schools. The focus was on identifying the “right” educators to serve as mentors. In some of the schools with especially high teacher turnover rates, it was a challenge to select teachers who had the personal qualities, experience, credibility, and instructional and interpersonal expertise to serve as positive role models and mentors to new teachers. The need for mentors in some schools often exceeded the numbers of qualified teachers trained to be mentors. The most

viable option was to establish teams of educators (teacher leaders and an administrator) configured to align with the needs of each school.

There were several reasons for designing the administrator-mentor team approach. First, it was to address the challenges facing new teachers that could not be overcome by individual mentors alone. For example, many novices continue to be given the most challenging teaching assignments or students in most need of teachers who have developed true instructional expertise. Mentoring teachers are not in a position to address this issue on their own. Furthermore, administrative support for limiting excessive extra-curricular assignments, assuring that novices are provided with adequate resources, and helping establish a climate where novices are welcomed and supported is critical to the success of mentors' efforts and novices' experiences. Finally, it is administrators who lead school improvement efforts. The need to assume a leadership role in assuring that induction is viewed by the faculty as equally important as any other priority in improving student achievement. It has become clear that the administrator member of the Mentor Teams is a critical participant in assuring its effectiveness.

In terms of providing monetary support for mentoring, the situation for URBAN IMPACT was complicated by the other state level Title II grant. This grant was designed to award a stipend to individual mentors who successfully completed training and submitted documentation of mentoring activities. It became clear that a financial obligation of this extent could not be supported by state or district level funding after grant resources were depleted. More importantly, this system of payment set an expectation that individual mentors should be paid for their efforts. URBAN IMPACT designers agreed with the concept that professionals should be compensated for their work, but another, more sustainable method had to be found. Therefore, limited funding was provided at each school site with an established Induction Program to support the efforts of the program.

URBAN IMPACT Mentoring and Induction Model

URBAN IMPACT is a collaborative initiative designed to overcome “hoped for” mentoring and induction. It goes well beyond typical approaches that focus on orientation and social induction (Johnson & Kardos, 2002). Planners focused on four critical areas: 1) establishing a structure that would assure that induction was a priority at the school level, 2) establishing a team approach which was ultimately called the Mentor Core Team (MCT), 3) involving the MCT in developing action plans linked to the school improvement planning process, and 4) providing needed professional development and support for the teams to be able to replicate at individual schools. This is not to say that many forms of effective mentoring did not occur in these schools prior to URBAN IMPACT. The existing support and nurturing was acknowledged as an opportunity on which to build. The intent was to establish a substantive, broad based, team-oriented model for mentoring and induction that places teacher induction at the center of the professional culture of the school.

Guiding Assumptions. The research-based model reflects the following assumptions that are addressed in the professional development component. These assumptions are:

1) *The underlying goal of mentoring is to increase expectations for teacher performance that will, in turn, result in increased student achievement.* Through productive mentoring, expectations for optimal teacher performance can be communicated, modeled, fostered, and monitored, thus ensuring increased student achievement and more positive attitudes towards learning—in all schools, but especially in high need schools.

2) *Mentoring is one form of professional development all novice teachers should experience in the most positive ways.* Mentoring has been shown to be one of the most significant forms of professional development—one that has lasting impact. The approach teachers use in learning to teach during their first years sets the pattern for how they will continue to learn throughout their entire careers.

3) *Mentoring should be embedded in the work of teaching and learning to teach—as is the case with all effective professional development.* Mentoring activities should be purposeful, timely, comprehensive, and based on the novice teacher’s needs. Mentoring must also incorporate current research and “best practices” to ensure that it will enhance the capacity to learn for all individuals within the school community and will increase their feeling of satisfaction and efficacy. It is more than helping novices feel comfortable and patting them on the back. High quality mentoring should help them address the challenge of improving teaching and learning. This requires time focused on their instructional needs.

4) *Induction programs should be developed at the school site.* Each school is a unique setting with particular strengths in terms of the environment, opportunities, programs, resources, and people. Mentoring is one way to capitalize on the strengths while working to support other areas. The school context does play a significant role in the teaching and learning process—whatever the context, the collaborative efforts promoted by induction programs can enrich and strengthen it.

5) *Mentoring should occur within an environment where the desire for improvement and lifelong learning are pervasive.* No matter how high performing a school is (or the educators are), improvement and learning are essential qualities of productive mentoring. Schools with learning community cultures plan for, encourage, monitor, and celebrate the professional growth of all – students, novices, mentors, staff, families, and leaders. Problems are viewed as challenges or opportunities for growth and renewal.

6) *Mentoring is integral to school improvement efforts.* Improved student achievement is the bottom line. Schools with high teacher turnover rates, which results in a continual influx of novice teachers, face ongoing issues in improving student achievement. Mentoring can help to minimize disruptive influences and be another major avenue for achieving the school’s vision. Every child deserves to experience the highest quality instruction. When novice teachers are mentored in effective ways, they can move to Berliner’s (1998) “mature” level more quickly. Schools and school systems that recognize the correlation between teacher quality, attrition, and student achievement make induction a priority.

7) *Mentoring can be an important way for teachers to develop their leadership capacity.* Veteran teachers who mentor become more confident in their expertise and effectiveness and more secure in their leadership ability outside the classroom. There is also an obvious two-way benefit to mentoring. Many novice teachers bring innovative

teaching strategies, technology and other skills to the partnership. In addition, their enthusiasm and energy can revitalize colleagues, teams, and total faculties.

8) *Mentoring should occur within an environment where all educators willingly contribute to the development of the novice.* The concept of mentoring as a pervasive activity in a school is an idea borrowed from effective Professional Development Schools (PDSs) where everyone is encouraged to find opportunities to support and to contribute to the growth and well-being of novice teachers. This is the basis for building strong school cultures and learning communities. Furthermore, this support should be extended to everyone on the faculty.

9) *Mentoring is most productive when it is multidimensional and comprehensive — attending to all important factors that can positively impact the novices' capacity to learn to teach.* To effect maximum growth in novice teachers, mentors need to assist them in negotiating their new environment and in acquiring knowledge and skills about each of the factors that impact their capacity to learn. Effective mentoring goes far beyond socialization, but doesn't ignore the importance of helping novices establish productive relationships.

Components. Assumptions remained only words until ownership developed and words became actions incorporated as program components. It was found that shared ownership of novice teacher success was best promoted when the research-based components were tailored to each school's needs. Educators at participating schools were strongly encouraged to establish, develop, grow, and sustain their own programs. The following components were seen as necessary to create a systemic induction program at the school or system level.

1) *Mentor Core Teams (MCTs).* MCTs are basically school-based leadership teams given the major responsibility for developing induction plans to support mentors and novices (pre-service and in-service). The specific composition of the teams should align with the needs of the school, but are all composed of at least one administrator and teacher leaders who represents targeted grade levels and/or core subject areas. MCTs in large, high need schools may have representation from each grade level or core content areas and include special educators and members from non-core areas. This is the design followed by the teams involved in the grant partnership that were studied for this paper. Schools in suburban or rural areas adapted the structure of the teams to the particular needs at their sites. All, however, include administrators and teacher leaders working in alignment with school leadership efforts.

In one participating middle school, a structure was established to rotate membership on the MCT and part of the induction program. As first year teachers, novices were mentored by MCT team members. As second year teachers, the same novices assumed leadership roles in implementing the school's induction plan (e.g., coordinating orientation activities, assisting with professional development sessions, participating in planning sessions where they provided the "voice" of novices). By their third year, the novices assumed leadership for the induction program with advisors from the faculty and MCT. By their fourth year, the novices were integrated into other school leadership roles and joined the ranks of advisors. Two of these teachers have remained the "lead MCT" members as their school leadership role and have assumed responsibility for coordinating the rotation system.

Members of the MCTs assumed responsibility for selecting and coaching other mentoring teachers; implementing, assessing, and revising the induction plans on an annual basis; and linking induction to other aspects of school leadership and planning, specifically the school improvement process. Including a building administrator on the MCT provided a school-wide perspective, an advocate for decisions related to the induction plan, support for MCT members, and a realistic perspective on the time and effort involved in developing and implementing an effective induction program.

2) *Designated mentoring coordinator.* An educator who is seen as a knowledgeable and skilled leader in the school and who has an interest in and a commitment to mentoring is a likely candidate for the position. The individual must be willing to devote the time and energy necessary to making mentoring experiences positive for everyone involved. The Mentor Coordinator position could rotate through the members of the MCT. It was recommended that if, at all possible, the mentor coordinator should be compensated in some appropriate way. For example, a high school mentor coordinator might be given an additional plan period devoted to induction activities. An elementary mentor coordinator could be excused from some of the typical duties and/or be given some compensatory time.

3) *Administrative involvement and support.* Building level administrators should be involved in mentoring to the extent they desire or are able. At a minimum, commitment to productive mentoring must be evident and involvement in MCT meetings and activities should be ongoing. Experience has shown that having overt and continued support from building-level leadership is critical to making mentoring programs successful.

4) *Input from others in designing the induction program.* It is advisable for the Mentor Coordinator and MCT to form an additional advisory group of experienced educators (2nd or 3rd year teachers as well as veterans) to provide guidance in designing the details of the program. Decisions need to be made about: mentor selection (criteria, application, selection process); roles and responsibilities (of mentors and novices); criteria for mentor-novice matching; training or professional development opportunities (customize materials and agenda, set dates, etc. for mentor and novice training); and procedures (assignments, matching, oversight, monitoring). Gathering input from a large number of educators sends the message that mentoring is our collective responsibility and promotes ownership.

Identifying opportunities for active involvement of other experienced teachers promotes school-wide mentoring of novices. Many productive learning experiences for novice teachers can be provided by qualified, experienced teachers other than the assigned mentors. Engaging others in appropriate ways can stimulate increased performance expectations for all teachers. Developing a broad base of shared responsibility among the school faculty and staff in these ways was seen to increase the likelihood that novice teachers will have a successful experience.

5) *Defined roles, responsibilities, guidelines, and procedures.* Clarity of terms, roles, responsibilities, and expectations is critical to maximizing the positive impact of mentoring. URBAN IMPACT defined several important mentor roles. As a *leader*, mentors are involved in school and/or district leadership positions and in professional organizations, contributions to professional growth activities. As a *professional role model*, mentors share their expertise in content, curriculum, instruction, communications,

relationships, and team membership. As a *coach*, mentors use and share their expertise in observing, giving feedback, and teaching to standards. In this role, they also help novices understand policies and school politics. The coaching role is clearly differentiated from that of an evaluator. The coach helps prepare the novice for the evaluation process in a number of very important ways, but the mentor is not an evaluator. A mentor-novice relationship would be far less open, productive, and supportive if the mentor were also an evaluator. As a *liaison, facilitator, and relationship builder*, they serve as a “networker,” help the novice get to know other faculty members, assist the novice in making connections with community members and families, guide the novices’ involvement in school-wide activities, and school traditions and history. Finally, in the role of and *supporter*, they serve as a promoter and a “safety net.” They serve as nonjudgmental listeners and confidants whose empathy, acceptance, encouragement support the novice’s transition.

Gaining an understanding of the roles and expectations prior to beginning mentoring tends to minimize or eliminate “avoidable” problems. It is equally important to conceptualize the way the relationships grow across time so that learning can progress smoothly. In addition to clarity about roles and responsibilities, timely professional development opportunities need to be available to the mentors so that they may fulfill those roles effectively. The content of mentoring and the role expectations are highly complex. From the experience of working with over 200 mentors, it has become apparent that many mentoring teachers had not thought about teaching and learning from the different perspective mentoring required. Many are also not accustomed to working with other adults in the variety of roles they need to play and/or may not feel that they possess the depth of knowledge and skills necessary to induct novices into the profession.

6) *Alignment of mentoring and induction in school improvement planning and district consolidated planning.* Planning for school and system improvement is a data driven process. The need for mentoring and induction can be documented through data such as teacher attrition and turnover, anticipated retirements, impact of current professional development activities and school climate indicators. When data show high teacher attrition and turnover, a large number of anticipated retirements, less than enthusiastic response to professional development and limited application of advocated instructional practices, and low staff morale, the need for structured mentoring and induction becomes evident. Structured induction can minimize the “learning curve” for new teachers and promote steady and rapid skill development. In addition, principals and central office administrators realize that high teacher turnover is a major obstacle to school improvement and sustained, continuous growth (for students and for teachers). Induction, therefore, should become one of the multiple supports are required at each school site to improve student achievement.

Therefore, one important recommendation presented in the training is that the MCTs align their mentoring and induction activities with their school’s improvement priorities and incorporate MCTs as responsible parties in their written school improvement action plans. Likewise, mentoring and induction need to be addressed at the district level and incorporated in the system’s Consolidated Plan for Federal Programs. Districts have the option of supporting mentoring and induction with local Title II funds. Every attempt should be made to assure that induction is systemic, planned

for, nurtured, and regularly monitored as an ongoing activity of school and system improvement.

7) *Formative and summative evaluations.* To maintain a high quality program, it is important to conduct both formative evaluations during the year and summative evaluations at the end of the year – and to use the results to guide program development. It would be ideal to have the formative evaluations occur through brief face-to-face interviews at appropriate points during the year. If individualized contact is not an option, surveys could be distributed at designated times. Formative evaluations provide timely information so that decisions about adjustments or changes can be made. Near the end of the year, summative evaluations should be conducted to provide the MCT with information about how to revise the program for the subsequent year. As with all evaluations, the information collected must be kept in strictest confidence and reported anonymously.

In addition to program improvement, disillusionment or dissatisfaction with the mentoring experience can occur on either side--mentor or novice. In order to keep the mentoring program on track and functioning well, it is important that there is an identified course of action and some individual or group designated to serve as “quality control” or “oversight” for the mentoring program. The Mentor Coordinator and/or administrator are the logical choice, but it might be helpful to also have others involved. Although a great deal of planning and effort goes into making mentoring a success, there are always some unpredictable problems that occur which have the potential to undermine the program. Problems of incompatibility or minor irritation can be dealt with satisfactorily by the designated individual, but some unforeseen circumstances may require additional advice and counsel.

8) *Recognition and celebration of progress and effort.* Showing appreciation for effort and accomplishments are always appropriate and should be part of the normal tradition in all schools. Educators are very creative in finding ways to privately and publicly recognize and show appreciation to colleagues who have been involved in mentoring. There are many appropriate ways to show individuals that they are valued.

9) *Resources.* As stated earlier, the other Title II grant included an annual stipend paid to mentors. It became apparent that in a fiscally conservative state facing continual financial crises, an induction program that relied on salaries for teachers to assume full-time system-wide (or school level) leadership roles was not an affordable option. The financial constraints were a given, but it was becoming clear that a comprehensive approach to teacher induction was necessary to overcome the teacher attrition rate that ranked, at the outset of the program, among the highest in the nation. Rethinking the expenditure of resources was critical if a systemic structure for teacher induction and mentoring was to be an affordable option for any and all school system(s).

Mentoring became the responsibility of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). A variety of methods to provide reasonable, cost-effective resources to MCTs has evolved. The most adopted method is the provision of an annual discretionary fund to MCTs to support induction program activities. Money is then available to support various needs (e.g., hiring substitutes for peer coaching; paying mentors for providing needed professional development sessions to new and interested teachers; purchasing professional resources for the school’s professional library to support induction and professional development efforts; and purchasing supplies for orientations, welcome

baskets, and celebrations). Some schools have found ways to release their Mentor Coordinator for a class period or from previously held responsibilities so that more time can be dedicated to mentoring.

One additional resource available to all MCTs is a website that was established as a way to share effective induction and mentoring practices and to promote networking across MCTs. A number of resources are currently posted and solicitation efforts are ongoing. A current initiative, just in its initial stages, is web-based “teacher friendly” examples of expectations for each of the state’s standards for teacher performances that could be used by mentors and/or administrators to assist novice teachers having difficulty in a particular area.

10). Professional Development Structure. One logical responsibility for mentors and MCTs was to ensure that novices strengthen their initial instructional skills in ways consistent with students’ needs and school improvement priorities. MCTs have first-hand knowledge of the instructional challenges facing novices in their schools and can design ways to address these challenges through professional development. While the mentors are selected because they are strong educators who exhibit effective interpersonal skills, most of them initially lacked the knowledge and skills for promoting the professional growth of colleagues. This simply was not part of their professional experiences nor was it the usual expectation. In addition, these teacher leaders were in schools that previously did not have a structure that would ensure their ability to serve in a significant role as teacher leaders.

To meet these needs, MCTs participated in an intensive three day professional development program focused on what mentors and novices need to know and do to effectively impact teaching of novice teachers and the learning of their students. One training component was on professional development standards and effective professional development strategies and practices. Prior to completing the training, MCTs devised action plans that structured the MCTs role in promoting professional development within their schools. The plans were developed to ensure that mentoring and professional development would impact the teaching and learning in the novices’ classrooms, but also the learning in as many other classrooms as possible. Furthermore, they were he designed to fit the individual and unique culture and capacity of each school, to build the capacity of individual leaders, and to positively impact the organizational culture of the school.

To meet the need for trained mentors and to complete the professional development delivery system, an additional level of mentor training was developed and implemented. Talented mentors were selected from each school system to serve as “Lead Mentors” who would receive additional professional development certifying them as mentor trainers. The effort was instituted to ensure a pool of trained mentors in every school system. Due to a variety of reasons, every school loses the services of mentors due to retirement, extended leaves of absence, or leadership roles within the school system. or of those who are out on extended leave. Without grant support and resources, continued mentor training needed to be transferred to individual LEAs and schools. Not only does the “Lead Mentor” program allow for the expansion or support of the professional development component (and new members to MCTs), it also helps mentors gain required points toward the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) highly qualified status using the HOUSSE option.

Key Features of the Professional Development Curriculum. One asset of the model appears to be its broad applicability and adaptability to the uniqueness of each school. The adaptability is attributed to the breadth of the mentoring experiences and the “curriculum” which is organized into factors that impact individuals who are learning to teach. The structure was designed to raise the awareness of mentors regarding their roles and the wide array of demands on novice teachers. The following factors form the organizing structure for the mentor program:

1) *External.* External expectations are those influences, outside the school, that affect all teachers. They include the teacher evaluation processes, state and local curriculum expectations, mandated assessments, school improvement initiatives, and professional development. By focusing attention on how to assist a novice and in addressing the often overwhelming external demands, the MCTs develop a phased-in induction plan that helps novices prioritize expectations so they are not attempting to attend to everything all at one time. As a result, mentors recognize that priorities and expectations for first year teachers should vary from those of second and third year teachers.

2) *Community.* This factor highlights the importance of understanding students’ worlds outside of school. Most novices are teaching in schools and communities that differ significantly from their own experiences. In most cases, they, along with their experienced colleagues, drive to and from school without ever learning about – or even noticing - the community in which they are teaching. This is often accompanied by beliefs or stereotypes about community, students, and families that may not be accurate. Research has shown that when teachers become more aware of both the assets and challenges facing children and families in the community, they can develop more culturally and contextually relevant practices that are more effective in impacting student learning (Delpit, 1998; Ladsen-Billings, 1998; Howey, 2000; Ladsen-Billings, 2001). MCTs collaboratively develop school-based strategies for overcoming the barriers between home and school and for helping novices establish productive partnerships with families and community members.

3) *School.* School related challenges have a major impact on a novice’s transition into teaching. Issues related to role conflicts, isolation, self-management, multi-tasking, difficult work assignments, and the demands of non-teaching responsibilities have been well documented as stressors for novice teachers (Gordon, 1991). Many of the MCTs are moving beyond the traditional “sink or swim” approach to induction by making difficult school-related decisions such as not giving novices the most difficult students, the most challenging courses, and the worst classrooms – or no classroom at all. These teams are creating conditions for successful induction into the profession which benefit the novice teachers and their students, which, in turn positively impact the professional lives of experienced teachers and days at school.

4) *School Culture.* School culture can be defined as the historically transmitted pattern of meaning including the norms, values, beliefs, ceremonies, rituals, traditions, and myths about the school community (Stolp & Smith, 1994). The importance of school culture for MCTs is that the meaning one holds about the school culture tends to shape what educators think and how they act. Mentoring teams can help novices understand the culture of their new school and the power of relationships, trust, and communication.

Effective mentoring promotes and strengthens relationships and encourages supportive, respectful communication and trust among students, colleagues, and families. Mentors become aware of the need to serve as role models for collaboration, professional risk taking, and promoting and celebrating diversity – for their colleagues as well as novice teachers.

5) *Classroom*. The typical classroom challenges of motivation, managing student behavior, planning to meet diverse student needs, assessing progress, and developing culturally relevant instructional strategies can be eased with the assistance of mentors serving as coaches. Mentors acquire some basic cognitive coaching skills including observing instruction and giving feedback, planning collaboratively, making recommendations for professional growth, and providing demonstration lessons and/or structured observation opportunities tailored to the needs of novices (Costa & Garmston, 1994). They are also provided with in-depth experiences related to the state evaluation process so they are better able to help novices understand both the rationale for each component and exactly what is expected. They also better understand their role as a coach vs. an evaluator.

6) *Personal*. Novices naturally have feelings of exhilaration and anticipation as well as those of anxiety, self-doubt, and confusion. Most novices are not aware of the normal ups and downs of the first year, the typical stages of professional growth, or how to develop a sense of efficacy. The focus of this component is to provide mentors focus with strategies for helping novices recognize feelings of inadequacy and disillusionment before they become problematic.

Emerging Results from URBAN IMPACT’s Mentoring and Induction Program

As part of our evaluation of our Title II grants, we have studied the impact of the program in over forty partnership schools and have gathered informal feedback from over sixty others. In addition to being the operational model for mentoring in the partnership schools, the Induction and Mentoring Program has been shared by the state department in over 150 urban elementary, middle, and high schools in urban, rural, and suburban schools. To date, over 2,000 mentors have been trained across the state. To facilitate the expansion of the program, a Lead Mentor Program has subsequently been developed to place effective mentors in enhanced leadership roles in implementing the program in all school systems.

This study focused on the 21 schools that have implemented a mentoring program in the one of the grant’s university/school system partnerships. Participants in the study included members of each MCT (administrators and mentors) and novice teachers (pre-service and in-service). Data were collected to: 1) assist the schools in linking their induction programs to the needs of their novice teachers; 2) to assure that mentors had the knowledge, skills, and support they needed to carry out their mentoring roles; 3) to determine perceptions of all stakeholders regarding the impact of the program; and 4) to track teacher turnover data. The evaluation design reflected what Guskey (2002) has outlined as “levels” of assessment in determining the impact of professional development. It included evaluations from workshops as the basic level, but further assessed participants’ learning and use of new knowledge and skills, and organizational support and change. The impact on student learning still remains a challenge. The

following data sources provided baseline, formative, and summative feedback for the program at each of the levels.

1) *Mentoring workshop evaluations.* Ratings by participants, as well as specific feedback, were compiled for each workshop. Presenters used the formative feedback to refine future workshops as well as materials used to deliver them.

2) *Novice teacher pre-assessment data.* Novices in each of the 21 schools completed a pre-assessment questionnaire that asked them to identify their strengths as well as their needs.

3) *Mentor needs assessment.* At each of the Mentor Workshops, mentors completed a needs assessment that highlighted areas of greatest need or concern. Data from this instrument were used to “fine tune” the workshops, but to also identify common themes across the participating schools that needed to be highlighted in workshops and in ongoing meetings with MCTs.

4) *Novice teacher perceptions of the mentoring experience surveys.* Administered in May of each school year, this instrument provided feedback for school personnel about how the novices’ perceived their efforts. The focus was on how well the mentoring experience helped the novice fulfill professional obligations. (See Appendix B for the survey instrument.)

5) *Field notes.* Members of the URBAN IMPACT staff met twice in the fall and once in the spring with the MCTs to support their efforts. As part of the support, the project team analyzed the pre-assessments and post-assessments and assisted the MCTs in using the data to refine their programs. Notes of these meetings were summarized and used as a data source.

6) *Interviews.* For the schools with MCTs, URBAN IMPACT’s external evaluator conducted interviews with all administrators, a random sample of mentors from each school, and a random sample of novice teachers from each school. Findings were included as a data source.

A number of themes related to induction and the impact of Mentor Core Teams’ efforts have begun to emerge from three years of implementation. It must be noted that only 5 schools have been in the program for four years. Each year, the partnership added between 5-6 schools which was the capacity that could be supported by the grant and the school system. Therefore, of the 30 schools with MCTs in the current partnership, this study only focuses on the 21 that have been in the program two years or more. Only 15 of the schools have been in the program for more than three years. The themes that are emerging from the study of the 21 schools include:

1) Feedback from workshops indicated that the information provided was highly needed by teachers who had been engaged in mentoring activities for a number of years – without a clear understanding of the role they were expected to play. Increased awareness of what mentoring entails, knowledge about both mentoring and induction programs, and having specific tools use in carrying out their responsibilities were noted by nearly all participants as strengths of the workshops. After the third day, when MCTs shared their successes and challenges, they noted the value of learning from others and networking to their list of highly satisfied factors.

2) Pre- and post- assessments of novices indicate that all of the factors addressed by the program are important and are being addressed at an acceptable level by the MCTs.

While levels of satisfaction vary from school to school, nearly all factors were ranked among the satisfied to very well satisfied levels. It is apparent that once a MCT becomes aware of expectations for quality mentoring and the needs of novices, plans are developed to address them.

3) In nearly all of the schools the novices indicated, on the post-assessment surveys, that they needed greater support from mentors in establishing effective partnerships with families and the community and working effectively with administrators. While these were not major areas of concern, they were areas where a large percentage indicated a need for further assistance.

4) Mentors who have a clear understanding of their role and the global needs of novice teachers, a “toolbox” of strategies to use in addressing the specific needs of their novices, and a school-based structure that supports their efforts are more likely to feel that their time and effort have been well spent and a willingness to continue their mentoring roles.

5) MCTs are not leaving the learning of novice teachers to chance. All provided a structure to support the induction program by conducting pre- and post- assessment of novices and mentors, coaching other mentors, implementing and annually revising plans to support novice teachers, and assuring that induction remains a key component of the school’s annual improvement plan.

6) There was variation in design, implementation, and effectiveness across the 21 schools. The original selection of MCT members was one issue. At the beginning, many administrators selected teachers to be on the teams who were either “available” or someone they simply chose to attend the workshops. In some schools, the initial teams were able to function effectively. In others, the teams were not as successful. When administrators asked to add additional key mentors to their teams, they were able to strengthen their programs. A few administrators did not realize that their teams were not as effective as they could be.

7) Not all MCT members elected to continue in their roles. Some of the team members, due to the stipends initially provided by the state grant, simply wanted the extra compensation. When the compensation was no longer available, they resigned from the teams. Other team members, in some schools, did not carry out their expected roles and elected to leave the teams. However, in all of the 21 schools, a small cadre of the original teams maintained the focus. By allowing the teams to “add” new members each year, we were able to keep the teams large enough to carry out the plans they had developed.

8) Schools that view reducing the revolving door of novice teachers in their schools as equally important as any other initiative to improve student learning have made the induction program a priority. When school leaders have realized this correlation, they have supported the MCTs more directly than their colleagues who did not have the same understanding.

9) Finding time to mentor remains a concern, but the schools that have made induction a priority have found ways to compensate mentors and novices for their time (e.g., unscheduled in-service credit, compensatory time, substitute teachers to provide release time for collaboration, and limited additional duties).

10) In the schools where induction and professional development are becoming the cultural norm, both mentors and novices report positive perceptions of the school culture and the support they have received from colleagues. In the schools where reasons for

teacher turnover have been documented, it has become apparent that fewer teachers were requesting transfers to schools at the same school level (“movers” according to Johnson and Birlreland, 2003).

11) MCTs, in many schools, have expanded their focus to include school-wide professional development. Approaches vary from one-on-one coaching of experienced teachers to assuming a leadership role in designing various aspects of their learning communities.

12) The impact of the MCTs performance is directly related to the level of support provided by building and system administrators. This underscores the need for administrators to be active members of the MCT. The relationship is reciprocal as well. In their interviews, administrators who had developed strong MCTs viewed them as a support system for the total faculty. Furthermore, they noted that the effectiveness of the MCT had resulted in fewer demands on their time to deal with day-to-day needs of novice teachers. The MCTs had allowed them to focus more on the larger issues and had given them a vehicle for improving the overall school culture.

13) The voices of our participants are telling the story of the success of this initiative. Included are a small representation of numerous comments from mentors, novices, and administrators.

- ✓ As one first year teacher stated, *“I can’t tell you how many times I thought that I had made a huge professional mistake. My mentor made me realize that I was not a failure... just a beginning teacher who was learning to blend the theory I have learned with the reality of teaching in an urban school.”*
- ✓ In an urban school where the most experienced teacher in the science department had three years of experience, the feelings were similar. This novice mentor told us, *“I wasn’t sure if I could be a good mentor. But with the support of our Mentor Core Team, I was able to give the “right” kind of help. I wasn’t all on my shoulders. And...I can’t believe what I have learned about my own practice as a result!”*
- ✓ According to an experienced mentor who has worked with both pre-service and novice teachers, *“I have been a mentor for twenty-five years. It is something I’ve always done because I believe we have to give back to our profession. I think I have always been a good supporter for my novices, but I really didn’t know what I should be doing beyond ‘being there’ for them. With the clear expectations and resources that I now have, I am a far better mentor – for both novices and my more experienced colleagues.”*

14) Four years into the partnership, the mentoring and induction strategies are making a positive impact on the retention of both novice and experienced teachers. Mentors have reported satisfaction with their opportunities for teacher leadership that do not take them out of the classroom. Novices report that, despite the excessive workload they face as beginning teachers in high need schools, they feel that they have a support system to help them. In examining teacher turnover data, high attrition rates continue to be reported. However, the majority are due to: marriage, move, pregnancy, promotion to another position, or retirement. Fewer are leaving the school for another school within the system at the same school level. Since the system’s source of new hires is primarily teachers who are just exiting their teacher preparation programs, they are likely to continue leaving for the reasons that have been identified in these data.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we are finding that we are building what Feiman-Nemser (2003, 29) calls “authentic professional learning communities” on a school-by-school basis based on a model of induction, professional development, and mentoring. These emerging practices are proving to be critical to novice teacher induction and veteran teacher revitalization. Our stakeholders are telling us that the program components provide the structure to initiate an induction program tailored to fit the needs of novice teachers, flexibility to build and sustain the effort, and stimulation to promote the professional development of experienced faculty.

We are well aware that there are additional structures that could be included to strengthen the model and are continuing the revision, refinement, and ongoing development process. Ideally, the lead mentors should assume a greater role and should include school system leadership. They could function, as many induction programs have suggested, in an external capacity for schools across the school system. Aligning this level of induction support with Mentor Core Teams established at each school level would, in our view, “raise the bar” for induction, teacher performance, and, ultimately, student achievement. Without funding that currently does not exist, however, this is not a likely possibility. It does merit continued research and pursuit of funding, however.

The findings suggest that we are creating a “work environment that will continue to draw the bright, committed new teachers we need—and will keep them enthusiastic, energetic, and productive throughout their careers” (Tye & O’Brien, p.24). URBAN IMPACT can promote the type of school environment every teacher needs and deserves; one that is cooperative and orderly, where students are successful and teachers experience a high sense of satisfaction with their work and their profession.

References

- Bolich, A.M. (2001). Reduce your losses: Help new teachers become veteran teachers. SREB, ED Document 460121.
- Costa, A. & Garmston, R. (1994). Cognitive coaching: A foundation for Renaissance Schools. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Deal, T. (May 1993). Exits and Entrances. *Executive Educator* 15(5), 26-28.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (May 2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership* 60(8), 6-13.
- Delpit, L. (1998). *Other people’s children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (May 2003). What new teachers need to learn. *Educational Leadership* 60(8), 25-29.

- Gordon, S. (1991). *How to help beginning teachers succeed*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Guskey, T.R. (March 2002). Redesigning Professional Development, *Educational Leadership*, 59(6), 45-51
- Howey, K. (March, 2000). *A review of challenges and innovations in the preparation of teachers for urban contexts: Implications for state policy*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Ingersoll, R. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Ladsen-Billings, G. (1998). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers.
- Ladsen-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers.
- Johnson, S. M. & Birkeland, S. E. (May 2003). The schools that teachers choose. *Educational Leadership* 60(8), 20-24.
- Johnson, S. M. & Kardos, S. (March 2002). Keeping new teachers in mind. *Educational Leadership* 59(6), 12-16.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Moir, E. & Bloom, G. (May 2003). Fostering leadership through mentoring. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 58-60.
- Sagor, R. (2003). *Motivating Students and Teachers in an Era of Standards*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- The NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education: Establishing High-Quality Professional Development (Summer 2002). *Using data to improve teacher induction programs*. No. 4, 1-7.
- Tye, B. & O'Brien, L. (September 2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession. *Kappan*, 84(1) 24-32.
- Wong, H. (August 8, 2001). Mentoring can't do it all. *Education Week*, 20(43) 46-50.

Appendix A.

Novice Teacher Perceptions of the Mentoring Experience

School _____
 How many years (including this year) have you taught? _____ In this school? _____

This survey will help us determine the effectiveness of our Mentoring Program in addressing your needs as a beginning teacher. Please rate the following components of our program in terms of their impact on your growth as a professional this year.

Section I Directions: Circle the number that most accurately reflects your perception for each statement. If you did not experience an item, circle “NA.”

Scale:

4 = strongly agree; 3 = agree; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree; and “NA” = did not experience

Perceptions of the Mentoring Experience					
	Scale				
1. Mentors at my school helped me understand the professional expectations for teachers related to:					
a. Fulfilling classroom responsibilities	1	2	3	4	NA
b. Assuming grade level or departmental responsibilities	1	2	3	4	NA
c. Assuming appropriate school level responsibilities (e.g., extra-curricular, committees)	1	2	3	4	NA
d. Knowing and following school and school system policies and procedures (e.g., paperwork, Special Education requirements, emergency procedures)	1	2	3	4	NA
e. Addressing standards (national, state, system, INTASC)	1	2	3	4	NA
f. Completing the TN Teacher Evaluation Process (e.g., professional expectations, evaluation criteria, paperwork, timelines)	1	2	3	4	NA
2. Mentors helped me learn how to establish and maintain effective professional relationships:					
a. With students	1	2	3	4	NA
b. With parents and caregivers	1	2	3	4	NA
c. With colleagues	1	2	3	4	NA
d. With administrators and other school/school system leaders	1	2	3	4	NA
e. With community members	1	2	3	4	NA
3. The following mentoring activities helped me develop as an educator:					
a. Regularly scheduled conferences during the school day with mentor(s) to plan, discuss issues, or celebrate accomplishments	1	2	3	4	NA
b. Informal conferences with mentor(s)	1	2	3	4	NA
c. Coaching by my mentor (e.g., observations, promoting reflection, providing feedback, encouraging new strategies)	1	2	3	4	NA
d. Observing mentor(s) and other faculty members	1	2	3	4	NA
e. Informal meetings with other faculty	1	2	3	4	NA
f. Informal “get togethers”	1	2	3	4	NA
g. Learning opportunities at the school (e.g., sharing of effective strategies, workshops, special sessions on topics of interest to novice teachers, study groups)	1	2	3	4	NA
h. Encouragement to attend system-wide learning opportunities (e.g. in-service sessions, new teacher orientations, new teacher workshops)	1	2	3	4	NA

4. Mentors impacted my professional development by:	SD	D	A	SA	
a. Serving as professional role models	1	2	3	4	NA
b. Accepting me as a professional colleague	1	2	3	4	NA
c. Making time for me when I needed assistance	1	2	3	4	NA
d. Providing the specific support and assistance I needed	1	2	3	4	NA
e. Listening to my concerns and helping me identify solutions	1	2	3	4	NA
f. Being flexible and open-minded in assisting me	1	2	3	4	NA
g. Helping me get to know other faculty and staff	1	2	3	4	NA
h. Linking me with faculty who could assist me in addressing my concerns	1	2	3	4	NA
i. Helping me acquire the resources I needed	1	2	3	4	NA
j. Helping me develop a repertoire of effective instructional strategies	1	2	3	4	NA
k. Helping me design a supportive learning environment and effective classroom management system	1	2	3	4	NA
l. Helping me learn strategies to address the diverse needs of my students	1	2	3	4	NA
m. Helping me develop interpersonal and relationship building skills	1	2	3	4	NA
n. Helping me understand the organization and culture of the school	1	2	3	4	NA
o. Helping me understand the school community and its issues, strengths, and resources that impact our students	1	2	3	4	NA
p. Linking me with community resources that are available to address the diverse needs of my students	1	2	3	4	NA
q. Helping me learn to balance my own life responsibilities with the demands of teaching	1	2	3	4	NA
r. Helping me become a more reflective teacher	1	2	3	4	NA
s. Making me aware of my development as an educator and assisting me in setting goals for my continued professional growth.	1	2	3	4	NA

Section II Directions: Describe or give examples of your perceptions for each sentence stem or question. Be as specific as possible. Feel free to write on the back of this survey if you need additional space.

1. I most appreciated the Mentoring Program for:

2. The Mentoring Program addressed my specific needs as a new teacher by:

3. How has your participation in the Mentoring Program affected your attitudes and behaviors as a teacher?

4. How has your participation in the Mentoring Program (i.e., knowledge and skills you derived) affected the teachers, parents, community, and students in your school?

5. My suggestions for improving the Mentoring Program would be

Appendix B: The Model for Teacher Induction and Mentoring

