



POLICY PAPER

Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction

February 2012

AUTHORS:

Liam Goldrick, Policy Director

David Osta, Associate Director, Policy

Dara Barlin, Associate Director, Policy

Jennifer Burn, Policy Analyst

Table of Contents

List of Tables	ii
Executive Summary	iii
Criterion 1: Teachers Served—State policy should require that all new teachers receive induction support during their first two years in the profession.....	1
Findings/Analysis	1
Selected State Policy Examples.....	2
State Policy Recommendations	3
Criterion 2: Administrators Served—State policy should require that all school administrators receive induction support during their first two years in the profession	4
Findings/Analysis	4
Selected State Policy Examples.....	5
State Policy Recommendations	6
Criterion 3: Program Standards—The state should have formal program standards that govern the design and operation of local teacher induction programs	7
Findings/Analysis	7
Selected State Policy Examples.....	8
State Policy Recommendations	9
<u>“MENTOR QUALITY”</u>	
Criterion 4: Mentor Selection—State policy should require a rigorous mentor selection process.....	10
Criterion 5: Mentor Training—State policy should require foundational training and ongoing professional development for mentors	10
Criterion 6: Mentor Assignment and Caseload—State policy should address how mentors are assigned to beginning teachers, allow for manageable mentor caseloads, and encourage programs to provide release time for mentors	10
Findings/Analysis	10
Selected State Policy Examples.....	13
State Policy Recommendations	16

Criterion 7: Program Delivery—State policy should identify key induction program elements, including a minimum amount of mentor-new teacher contact time, formative assessment of teaching practice, and classroom observation 17

 Findings/Analysis 17

 Selected State Policy Examples..... 19

 State Policy Recommendations 21

Criterion 8: Funding—The state should provide dedicated funding to support local educator induction programs 22

 Findings/Analysis 22

 Selected State Policy Examples..... 24

 State Policy Recommendations 25

Criterion 9: Educator Accountability—The state should require participation in and/or completion of an induction program to advance from an initial to professional teaching license 26

 Findings/Analysis 26

 Selected State Policy Examples..... 27

 State Policy Recommendations 28

Criterion 10: Program Accountability—The state should assess or monitor program quality through accreditation, program evaluation, surveys, site visits, self-reports, and other relevant tools and strategies 29

 Findings/Analysis 30

 Selected State Policy Examples..... 30

 State Policy Recommendations 31

Conclusion..... 32

Notes 33

Endnotes 34

List of Tables

Table

1. State Policy: New Teacher Induction Requirements1

2. State Policy: New School Administrator Induction Requirements5

3. State Policy: Induction Program Standards.....8

4. State Policy: Mentor Training/Professional Development 12

5. State Policy: Induction Funding..... 23

Executive Summary

We must transform the way we bring our newest educators into our schools. It is critical to the success of our schools, to the development of teaching as a learning profession, and to the achievement of our students. ‘Sink-or-swim’ and other lesser approaches to teacher induction exact a high price on beginning teachers, their students, and their school communities. Regardless of the quality or source of their preparation, new teachers encounter a steady stream of distinct challenges in their initial years in the classroom. Many struggle in isolation to navigate the steep learning curve characteristic of these early years. Likewise, new principals and superintendents experience similar professional challenges the first time they take the reins of a school building or district.

Beginning teachers are, on average, less effective than more experienced ones.¹ High-quality induction programs accelerate new teachers’ professional growth, making them more effective faster. Research evidence suggests that comprehensive, multi-year induction programs accelerate the professional growth of new teachers, reduce the rate of new teacher attrition, provide a positive return on investment, and improve student learning.²

The latest evidence suggests that beginning teachers are more common in our schools today than at any other time in at least the last twenty years. In 1987-88 the typical (or modal) teacher had 15 years of teaching experience; by 2007-08, the typical teacher was in her first year.³ High-quality induction programs are needed more than ever. State policy must meet the need for them by creating a supportive context and establishing a strong expectation that comprehensive support will be provided to every beginning educator.

In practice, state policy broadly—and in certain cases, more specifically—influences the design and scope of induction and mentoring programs. States with more comprehensive policies provide local programs enhanced opportunities and guidance to implement a high-quality approach to new educator induction, including universal assistance and support.

New Teacher Center’s *Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction* provides the first comprehensive look at induction policies in each of the 50 states. For each state, NTC summarizes existing policies related to 10 key criteria most critical to the provision of universal, high-quality induction and mentoring support for beginning educators. The state summaries capture all relevant policies, statutes, regulations, induction program standards, and other guidance on new teacher induction and mentoring.⁴

Today, more than half the states require new teachers to participate in some form of induction or mentoring and, as a result, more new teachers receive mentoring or induction support than ever before.⁵ While the comprehensiveness and funding of these state policies vary widely, they have been enacted to ensure the provision of induction support and the assignment of a mentor or coach, thereby enhancing the quality of teaching and increasing student learning.

The latest evidence suggests that beginning teachers are more common in our schools today than at any other time in at least the last twenty years. High-quality induction programs are needed more than ever.

Our analysis of state policies on teacher induction suggests that there is much work to be done by state policymakers to construct high-quality policies supporting comprehensive new teacher induction. While we are able to identify state exemplars on each of our 10 state policy criteria and while several states show strengths across multiple criteria, no single U.S. state has perfected its induction policy to ensure the provision of high-impact, multi-year induction support for all beginning educators. And half the states still don't require all beginning educators to receive induction or mentoring support.

The insufficiency of state induction policies comes to light when we compare states across multiple policy criteria. For example, our analysis determined that 27 states require some form of induction or mentoring support for new teachers (and 11 require two or more years of induction support), that 22 states require

Only 3 states require schools and districts to provide multi-year induction support to beginning teachers, require teachers to complete an induction program to obtain a professional teaching license, and provide dedicated state induction funding.

completion of or participation in an induction program for advanced teaching certification, and that 17 states provide some dedicated funding for teacher induction. However, **only 3 states**—Connecticut (CT), Delaware (DE) and Iowa (IA)—require schools and districts to provide multi-year induction support to beginning teachers, require teachers to complete an induction program to obtain a professional teaching license, and provide dedicated state induction funding. Only three. Further, like many other states, each of these three have shortcomings in their policies governing induction for beginning school principals (not required in CT, required for only one year in DE and IA), adoption of induction program standards (only in CT), policies governing on-going mentor professional development (only in CT), and limitations on full-time mentors (in CT and DE). It is not our intention

to be overly critical of these three states as they certainly are among the leaders in this policy area. It is simply to show the need to strengthen state policies on new educator induction across the board—and even in states at the head of the pack.

State induction policy is best considered as a work in progress. Our collective challenge is to dramatically improve state policy to truly meet the needs of our newest educators and their students—and to fully embrace the power of comprehensive, multi-year induction programs to accelerate new teacher development as part of an overarching human capital and teaching effectiveness policy. Our hope at NTC is that this analysis and the example of leading states will serve as a road map to assist state policymakers and program leaders better prioritize the needs of new teachers and design stronger policies to accomplish it.

Purpose

This policy paper and the 50 individual state policy reviews (available on the NTC web site)⁶ aim to assist policymakers and program leaders in making informed decisions as they design and seek to enact state policies on new educator induction and mentoring. NTC made an intentional decision not to grade or rank states against these policy criteria. Instead, we are choosing to share this information with state leaders and other interested stakeholders in an effort to provide a clear assessment of state policy and to suggest areas where states can learn from others. We look forward to opportunities to work with states in taking a closer look at their existing policies, transforming the ones they have in place, and helping them craft new ones that better meet the needs of new educators.

The Need for High-Quality Induction

'Sink-or-swim' and other lesser approaches to new teacher induction exact a high price on new teachers, their students, and their school communities. Regardless of the quality or source of their preparation, beginning teachers encounter a steady stream of distinct challenges in their initial years in the classroom. Too many new teachers struggle in isolation to navigate the steep learning curve characteristic of these early years. We know teachers in their initial years are, on average, less effective than more experienced ones.

High-quality induction programs can overcome this challenge by accelerating new teachers' professional growth and making them more effective faster. Research evidence suggests that comprehensive, multi-year induction programs reduce the rate of new teacher attrition, accelerate the professional growth of new teachers, provide a positive return on investment, and improve student learning. A federally funded, randomized controlled trial found that new teachers who received two years of comprehensive induction support produced greater student learning gains in mathematics and reading compared to peers who were provided prevailing and less intensive support.⁷

Efforts to improve new teacher induction, and teacher effectiveness generally, must address teacher working conditions—including the critical role of school leadership, opportunities for teacher leadership and collaboration, and customized professional development—that greatly impact teachers' chances of success.⁸ Inducting new teachers into a weak professional community will limit the impact of high quality induction. Weak professional environments rob new teachers of the opportunity to achieve their full potential, or push good new teachers to schools with a stronger professional community or out of the teaching profession entirely.

'Sink-or-swim' and other lesser approaches to new teacher induction exact a high price on new teachers, their students, and their school communities.

While all schools and students can benefit from more effective teachers, the power of high-quality induction has special significance for hard-to-staff schools that serve a disproportionate number of low-income and minority students. In such schools, teacher turnover is generally higher—and sometimes rampant—and inexperienced and out-of-field teachers comprise a disproportionate percentage of the faculty. High-quality induction programs help to provide the specialized support needed for new teachers in these challenging professional environments. They also can contribute to the transformation of these hard-to-staff schools into strong professional communities where educators want to stay and work—and where they can be successful practitioners.

The Role of State Policy

Although today's education policy often may stress being "tight on ends, and loose on means," in the words of U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan, new teacher induction and mentoring is an area where the means are critically important in order to get us to the desired ends, such as more effective teaching and greater student learning. Existing induction programs vary in quality from old-fashioned "buddy systems" that provide limited emotional and logistical support to comprehensive, systematized initiatives that utilize carefully selected and trained mentors and provide structured time for interaction focused on improving new teachers' content knowledge, classroom management, and instructional skills.

Today, 27 states require new teachers to participate in some form of induction or mentoring and, as a result, more new teachers receive mentoring or induction support than ever before.⁹ While the comprehensiveness and funding of these state policies vary widely, they have been enacted to ensure the provision of induction support and the assignment of a mentor or coach, thereby enhancing the quality of teaching and increasing student learning.

Simply requiring that new teachers be assigned a mentor without regard to mentor or program quality will not accelerate new teacher development, reduce teacher attrition or significantly impact student learning. Too many states that mandate induction do so in the absence of key policy elements like dedicated funding, strong program standards or mentor selection and training requirements.

NTC research reveals that few states have comprehensive policies requiring high-quality induction for beginning teachers—and the state policies that do exist are implemented too sporadically. Among the 316,000 U.S. educators NTC surveyed in 2010 and 2011 through our Teaching & Learning Conditions Initiative,¹⁰ a sizeable percentage (between 7 and 30 percent)¹¹, of first- and second-year teachers reported that they were not formally assigned a mentor, even in states that had a mentoring requirement. Many new teachers were assigned a mentor but never planned instruction with them, observed them, or received support analyzing student work.

Comprehensive state policies have a broad influence on supporting the development of local induction programs. Specifically, state policies can provide school districts requirements, guidance and support to implement a high-quality induction program.¹² While the absence of strong state policies does not necessarily hinder the development of comprehensive teacher induction programs, a National Staff Development Council analysis of 2007-08 Schools and Staffing Survey data suggests that new teachers in states with more comprehensive induction policies—including an active induction mandate—are often more likely to be assigned a mentor and receive key induction supports.¹³

Today, 27 states require new teachers to participate in some form of induction or mentoring and, as a result, more new teachers receive mentoring or induction support than ever before.

For our state policy analysis, we developed 10 policy criteria that work in concert to support and guide local school districts to design and implement high-quality induction programs. We contend that states that come closest to meeting all 10 criteria will raise the likelihood that every new educator receives a sufficient level of induction and mentoring support, will ensure that local programs are comprehensive and include key quality components, and will enjoy the resulting benefits, including enhanced teacher effectiveness.

State Induction Policy Criteria

1. **Teachers Served**: State policy should require that all teachers receive induction support during their first two years in the profession.
2. **Administrators Served**: State policy should require that all school administrators receive induction support during their first two years in the profession.

3. **Program Standards**: The state should have formal program standards that govern the design and operation of local teacher induction programs.
4. **Mentor Selection**: State policy should require a rigorous mentor selection process.
5. **Mentor Training**: State policy should require foundational training and ongoing professional development for mentors.
6. **Mentor Assignment and Caseload**: State policy should address how mentors are assigned to beginning teachers, allow for manageable mentor caseloads, and encourage programs to provide release time for mentors.
7. **Program Delivery**: State policy should identify key induction program elements, including a minimum amount of mentor-new teacher contact time, formative assessment of teaching practice, and classroom observation.
8. **Funding**: The state should provide dedicated funding to support local educator induction programs.
9. **Educator Accountability**: The state should require participation in and/or completion of an induction program to advance from an initial to professional teaching license.
10. **Program Accountability**: The state should assess or monitor program quality through accreditation, program evaluation, surveys, site visits, self-reports, and other relevant tools and strategies.

For our state policy analysis, we developed 10 policy criteria that work in concert to support and guide local school districts to design and implement high-quality induction programs.

State induction policies strongly influence local induction programs. Ultimately, to be effective, these policies must be strategically designed and continuously assessed to meet the needs of new teachers, mentors, induction program leaders, and school districts. The mere existence of such policies is not a guarantor of universal access to such programs.

While our assessment is that the presence of strong state policies enables successful program development and sustenance, it is not sufficient.¹⁴ States also must support policy implementation and local program development by:

- Communicating program vision,
- Building state program infrastructure,
- Developing program tools and modeling effective program design,
- Providing training to mentors, program leaders, and school administrators,
- Supporting program improvement through technical assistance (particularly for struggling programs and during periods of scale up),
- Incorporating induction program data into state accountability systems and oversight processes, and
- Evaluating the efficacy of local program models and the overall statewide induction policy.¹⁵

A Summary of State Induction Policies¹⁶

States have much work to do to on their induction and mentoring policies. Most fall short on the majority of our policy criteria, and a few fail to meet any of them. Certain states demonstrate strength with respect to one or more of our criteria, but may not meet a number of others. A small group of states rise to the top in that they codify an expectation that every new educator should receive induction support, require new educators to participate in an induction program as a condition of licensure, and establish high expectations for program quality through standards, administrative code or regulations.

Criterion 1

Teachers Served—State policy should require that all new teachers receive induction support during their first two years in the profession.

In determining whether a state requires new teacher induction, we use an expansive lens, generally allowing for any articulated definition of new teacher induction, mentoring, professional development or other type of support within state policy. It is important, then, to note that the specifics of what individual states require vary considerably. We detail those specific nuances in our subsequent policy criteria.

We focus on the presence of a state induction requirement for all first- and second-year teachers in Criterion 1 because of the research evidence that suggests benefits may accrue to teachers and their students only from a multi-year course of professional support.¹⁷

Findings/Analysis:

In total, 27 states require some form of induction or mentoring for all beginning teachers, but most of them require it only during the first year. Eleven (11) states meet Criterion 1 by requiring induction and mentoring for all first- and second-year teachers. [See Table 1] **California, Connecticut, Iowa, Maine and Missouri** require induction for all first- and second-year teachers. Six states (**Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, Utah**) require an induction period of greater than two years—typically three.

Table 1. State Policy: New Teacher Induction Requirements			
Required, but with no minimum program length	Required for 1 year	Required for 2 years	Required for more than 2 years
Colorado	Arkansas	California	Delaware
Rhode Island	Kansas	Connecticut	Louisiana
Wisconsin	Kentucky	Iowa	Maryland
	Massachusetts	Maine	Michigan
	New Jersey	Missouri	North Carolina
	New Mexico		Utah
	New York		
	Ohio		
	Pennsylvania		
	South Carolina		
	Tennessee		
	Virginia		
	West Virginia		
3 states	13 states	5 states	6 states

Three additional states require new teacher induction but do not provide a minimum program length, so cannot be said to meet our stated criterion. **Colorado** allows school districts to determine the length of induction, “up to three years.” **Rhode Island** state law simply requires school district strategic plans to “include a process for mentoring of new teachers.” **Wisconsin** state law requires school districts to provide a qualified mentor to each beginning teacher during a “mentoring period” that “may be for less than 5 years.”

At least 10 additional states address new teacher induction in state policy, but recognize it as optional and leave it up to individual school districts. None of these states are counted among the 27 with universal induction requirements for new teachers. **Illinois** is not considered to require induction either because it links its statutory requirement to a level of state funding (\$1,200 per beginning teacher) not currently provided universally. The states of **Nebraska** and **Oklahoma**, which have temporarily suspended their induction requirements, also are not counted among the 27 states.

Eleven states meet Criterion 1 by requiring induction and mentoring for all first- and second-year teachers.

Certain states require a minimum induction period but provide in policy for optional additional years. For example, **Iowa** requires two years of support, but also provides for an optional third year (at the expense of the district or area education agency). Some states have differing minimum induction program length for teachers with different preparation experiences. For example, **Arkansas** requires one year of induction for most new teachers, but requires alternatively certified teachers to receive two years of mentoring. There is also variability in state policy based upon the subject area taught. **Alaska**, for example, is not among the 27 states with a universal induction/mentoring mandate (although it does require that teachers who have a subject matter expertise limited teacher certificate be provided a mentor in their first year). In the case of **Connecticut**, we counted the state as requiring two years of teacher induction even though it requires only one year for a handful of smaller subject areas (such as agricultural education and technical education).

It also is important to note that in a select number of cases the absence of an induction requirement in state policy does not prevent states from supporting new teachers. In **Alabama** and **Alaska**, for example, induction is not required in policy but often happens in practice. The Alabama Teacher Mentoring program provides first-year teachers mentoring assistance within the first month of school. The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development has partnered with the University of Alaska to create among the most comprehensive state-level induction programs in the nation: the Alaska Statewide Mentor Project.¹⁸ Participation, however, is not required and the ASMP does not serve the entire state.

Selected State Policy Examples:

- **California** requires all first- and second-year teachers to participate in an induction program: the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) System. If the employing school district verifies that induction support is not available, the new teacher must complete an approved university Clear Credential program (similar to BTSA induction).
- **Delaware** provides support for all new teachers during their first three years in the profession in addition to providing support to experienced teachers new to the state or new to a licensure category during their first year of employment.

- **Maine** requires all new educators to engage in an action-planning process overseen by a mentor and certified educators during their first two years in the profession. Mentors are a part of a district's local certification committee, Professional Learning Community Support Services (PLCSS), along with other professional educators and at least one administrator.
- **North Carolina** requires all beginning teachers to participate in a three-year induction program.
- **Utah's** Entry Years Enhancement (EYE) in Quality Teaching program provides all new teachers induction support during their first three years in the profession.

State Policy Recommendations:

1. Establish a multi-year induction requirement for all new teachers.
2. Short of establishing a universal induction mandate for new teachers, states should consider implementing a grant program that supports the development of comprehensive, high-quality local induction program models that can serve as pilots and exemplars.

Criterion 2

Administrators Served—State policy should require that all school administrators receive induction support during their first two years in the profession.

In determining whether a state requires induction for new school administrators, we use an expansive lens, generally allowing for any articulated definition of induction, coaching, mentoring, professional development or other type of support within state policy. It is important, then, to note that the specifics of what individual states require vary considerably.

States are far less likely to require induction or mentoring for new school administrators than for beginning teachers. Only three states require induction or mentoring for first- and second-year school administrators.

We focus on the presence of a state induction requirement for all first- and second-year school administrators in Criterion 2 because of the research evidence that supports the importance of school leadership for student achievement.¹⁹ In the life of a new teacher, the school principal can be a key facilitator or inhibitor of their professional trajectory. Similar to comprehensive new teacher induction, beginning school principals and superintendents also need customized, on-the-job support during their first two years. Through professional development and direct coaching, school and district administrators need an opportunity to build leadership capacity while creating school conditions that support teacher development and student learning.

Findings/Analysis:

States are far less likely to require induction or mentoring for new school administrators than for beginning teachers. Whereas 27 states require some form of induction or mentoring for all beginning teachers, only 16 states require some form of professional support for all first-time school principals. Only three states (**Indiana, Missouri, New Jersey**) meet Criterion 2 in that they require induction or mentoring for first- and second-year school administrators. **Illinois** state policy requires two years of support for new district superintendents, but that mandate is contingent upon state funding that has never materialized. Eleven states require one year of induction (**Alabama** requires it for district superintendents only), two others require it without setting a minimum program length (**Colorado, Wisconsin**), and one (**Pennsylvania**) requires it for new school principals but allows program completion to occur up to five years after initial employment. [See Table 2].

Table 2. State Policy: New School Administrator Induction Requirements		
Required, but with no minimum program length	Required for 1 year	Required for 2 years
Colorado	<i>Alabama (superintendents only)*</i>	Indiana
Pennsylvania	Arkansas	Missouri
Wisconsin	Delaware	New Jersey
	<i>Illinois (principals only)*</i>	
	Iowa	
	Louisiana	
	Massachusetts	
	New York	
	South Carolina	
	Utah	
	West Virginia	
3 states	11 states*	3 states

At least five additional states address but do not require new administrator induction in state policy, and either make it optional for school districts or actively operate a support program. For example, the **Hawaii** Department of Education provides support for new vice-principals through the Administrator Certification for Excellence (ACE) program and for new principals through the New Principals Academy. The **Maryland** State Department of Education operates the Maryland Principals’ Academy that provides a one-year-long professional development experience for participants who are in their first five years of experience as principals. **New Mexico** has established a “school leadership institute” which provides “a comprehensive and cohesive framework for preparing, mentoring and providing professional development for principals.” None of these states are counted among the 16 that have induction requirements for new school administrators.

Certain states require a minimum induction period but provide in policy for optional additional years. For example, **Delaware** requires administrators to participate in a one-year mentoring program, but allows for additional mentoring support in years 2 and 3 at the discretion of the district. **Iowa** requires school districts to provide a qualified mentor to each beginning school administrator (and superintendent) for a minimum of one year; a second year is optional if determined to be necessary to meet Iowa standards for school administrators.

Selected State Policy Examples:

- **Missouri** requires all new school administrators to participate in a district-provided induction program during their first two years.
- **New Jersey** requires all new principals to participate in a two-year residency program for principal certification. New Jersey Leaders to Leaders provides trained mentors and a range of continuing professional development programs and services to support new school leaders in successfully completing the state-required two-year Residency for Standard Principal Certification.

State Policy Recommendations:

1. Establish an expectation that all new school administrators will receive on-the-job induction support during their first two years in the profession. This requirement should include all principals, superintendents, and other school and district administrators.
2. Short of establishing a universal induction mandate for new school administrators, states should implement a grant program that supports comprehensive, high-quality induction and coaching program models that can serve as pilots and exemplars.

Criterion 3

Program Standards—The state should have formal program standards that govern the design and operation of local teacher induction programs.

Program standards establish a statewide vision for the purpose of induction and articulate the design elements that comprise a strong induction program. They provide the criteria and common language by which programs can develop, improve and be held accountable across a state system. A comprehensive set of *foundational, structural* and *instructional* program standards makes for a strong set of program standards. Foundational elements include program vision, administration and evaluation. Structural elements include mentor roles, mentor selection and training, beginning teacher assessment, and beginning teacher professional development. Instructional elements include a focus on teaching practice and on equity for students.²⁰ Ideally, program standards provide sufficient flexibility to allow for induction programs to be customized to meet local needs.

A governing or regulatory body—such as a state board of education or educator licensing board—that has the authority over induction program design and operation, should formally adopt such standards. Alternatively, states should consider providing statutory authority to the state department of education to design and enforce such standards.

Program standards establish a statewide vision for the purpose of induction and articulate the design elements that comprise a strong induction program.

Many states provide regulations or informal guidance (resources, toolkits, models, etc.) to inform the development of induction programs. While these forms of guidance are necessary, program standards are preferable because they are written as criteria and lend themselves to the development of other state infrastructure components in support of program development and improvement—as opposed to serving solely as a compliance-driven mechanism.

Finally, it is worth noting that just because a state labels its program guidance “standards” does not necessarily mean it actively functions as a set of program requirements. The inverse also is true. In at least one instance, state program guidelines function as requirements. The ideal answer to the question, “When are standards standards?” is when they both inform and govern the design of local induction programs across a state as a matter of practice in a way that strengthen the quality provision of new educator support.

Findings/Analysis:

At least 15 states had formalized induction program standards as of the 2010-2011 school year. [See Table 3]. In most cases, program standards have been approved by the state board of education (such as in **Michigan**, **North Carolina** and **Rhode Island**) or an educator licensure board (such as the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in **California** and the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board in **Illinois**). Some state laws, such as in **Connecticut**, **Missouri** and **South Carolina**, require the state department of education to develop such standards. Two states (**Arizona** and **Hawaii**) have drafted induction program standards, but had not formally adopted them as of June 2011.²¹

Another 20 states provide some detailed program requirements in administrative code, in regulations (not in the form of standards), or through informal program guidelines. For example, some states incorporate requirements for induction program design or operation into rules for teacher certification. These regulations range in their level of detail and specificity from broad requirements to standards-like guidance. Some of the most detailed guidance provided through regulations or rules can be found in **Arkansas, Delaware, Kentucky and Maryland.**

Table 3. State Policy: Induction Program Standards

State has formally adopted induction program standards	
California	New Jersey
Connecticut	New York
Idaho	North Carolina
Illinois	Ohio
Kansas	Rhode Island
Maine	South Carolina
Michigan	Virginia
Missouri	

Selected State Policy Examples:

- **California’s** six Induction Program Standards focus on effective design principles and providing opportunities for participants to demonstrate effective teaching.
- **Connecticut** program guidance articulates the responsibilities of all induction program stakeholders and describes the five professional growth modules that provide a framework of support for new teachers.
- **Illinois** has teacher induction program standards approved by the State Teacher Certification Board comprised of nine elements, including program goals and design, development of beginning teacher practice, and mentor selection and assignment.
- The **North Carolina** State Board of Education approved new Beginning Teacher Support Program Standards in January 2010. In addition, the state also has specific standards for mentor teachers.
- **Virginia’s** Requirements of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Mentor Programs in Hard-to-Staff Schools features ten requirements for mentoring programs in hard-to-staff schools.

State Policy Recommendations:

1. Formally adopt induction program standards to guide the design and operation of local programs and to serve as a tool for program improvement and accountability.
2. States with existing induction program standards or guidelines should review them to ensure that they address a comprehensive set of foundational, structural and instructional program elements.

“MENTOR QUALITY”

Criterion 4

Mentor Selection—State policy should require a rigorous mentor selection process.

Criterion 5

Mentor Training—State policy should require foundational training and ongoing professional development for mentors.

Criterion 6

Mentor Assignment and Caseload—State policy should address how mentors are assigned to beginning teachers, allow for manageable mentor caseloads, and encourage programs to provide release time for mentors.

Effective mentors are at the heart of every high-quality induction program. The selection, training, ongoing support and thoughtful utilization of teacher mentors is critical to the provision of impactful, instructionally focused support to beginning educators. Mentor selection and training is critical given that the skills and abilities of an effective mentor are different from those of an effective classroom teacher. These

Effective mentors are at the heart of every high-quality induction program.

include facilitation of adult learning, classroom observation, and leading reflective conversations. Foundational mentor training and on-going professional development are important tools to ensure the provision of quality support aligned with program goals. In addition, pairing mentors with beginning teachers of similar teaching and/or school assignments is another important consideration. Finally, mentors need time to do their jobs well. Short of restructuring the school day to increase professional

learning time for all teachers, employing full-time mentors or providing regular release from classroom teaching duties are effective strategies to provide them with dedicated time to excel in their professional role, including interactions with and observation of beginning teachers during the school day.

Findings/Analysis:

Slightly more than half of the states have specific policies in place that address mentor selection and training. At least 29 states clearly define who is eligible to serve as a mentor teacher, and 45 states address mentor selection broadly within their policies. Thirty-one states require mentor training, but only 15 of those states require training plus ongoing mentor professional development. Fewer than half of the states (22) address mentor assignment within their policies.

Mentor Selection

The most typical factors used by states to determine mentor qualifications include teaching experience, communication and interpersonal skills, and teaching excellence. At least 29 states use teaching experience and/or holding a professional teaching license as a foundational requirement for serving as a mentor.²² Many typically require a minimum of three-to-five years of classroom teaching experience, although Louisiana requires ten years of in-state experience in order to qualify to serve as a mentor teacher.

Several states articulate a specific definition of teaching effectiveness or excellence as a mentor selection criteria. **Arkansas** requires prospective mentor teachers to “show evidence of ongoing professional growth.” In **Delaware**, a mentor must “have satisfactory teaching evaluations,” and beginning in 2011, lead mentors must successfully complete a series of questions and observations in order to qualify for the position. **Kansas** allows recent evaluations and professional recognition through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards as criteria to determine ‘exemplary teaching’. **Montana’s** Teacher Mentor Program Development Template recommends a mentor to have “a proven track record of positive effect on student achievement.” Finally, in the state of **Washington**, mentors must be “superior teachers based on their evaluations.”

Eight states’ policies affirmatively allow retired teachers to serve as mentors.²³

Two states require a special certification for mentors. **Georgia**, for instance, requires a Teacher Support Specialist licensure endorsement. **Montana** defines mentoring as a “special competency area.” **South Carolina’s** policy is unique in that it articulates a set of 12 specific skills and abilities upon which a mentor teacher must be evaluated, including knowledge of beginning-teacher professional development and effective adult learning strategies, familiarity with the state’s performance assessment system, and the willingness and the ability to engage in non-evaluative assessment processes, including planning and reflective conversations with beginning teachers about their classroom practice.

Several states articulate a specific definition of teaching effectiveness or excellence as a mentor selection criteria.

Mentor Training

Among the 31 states that require mentor training²⁴, state policy has little to say about its content or delivery. The few states²⁵ that do articulate specific training elements include such components as: knowledge of state teaching standards, formative assessment of new teacher performance, classroom observation, reflective conversations, and adult learning theory. Some states offer mentor training or license mentor training providers, while others devolve responsibility for training mentors to local programs.

Only 15 states require both foundational mentor training and on-going professional development for mentor teachers following their initial training. [See Table 4]. Setting a minimum amount of time for on-going mentor learning is important however. The NTC national induction model provides for 12 full days of mentor professional development in years 1 and 2 and 9 full days in year 3, and half-day mentor learning forums every week or every other week in each year. While such intensive mentor professional development may not be warranted as a state requirement, mandating some on-going support to deepen and develop mentor knowledge is key.

Table 4. State Policy: Mentor Training/Professional Development

State requires foundational mentor training and ongoing professional development	
Arkansas	Missouri
California	New Jersey
Colorado	North Carolina
Connecticut	Ohio
Illinois	Rhode Island
Kansas	South Carolina
Maine	Utah
Maryland	

Mentor Assignment and Caseload

Fewer than half of state policies address the deployment of mentors. Of those 22 states that most clearly articulate mentor assignment requirements, the timing of the assignment of a mentor to beginning teachers is a primary issue. **California** requires each teacher induction program to ensure that mentors are assigned to each beginning teacher “within the first 30 days of initial teacher participation in the induction program.” **New Jersey** requires that each novice teacher must be “assigned a mentor at the beginning of the contracted teaching assignment.” **North Carolina** requires mentors to initiate contact with beginning teachers and learn about their needs “before or near the start of school or at the time of hire if later in the year.” **South Carolina** says that districts must assign mentors to beginning teachers “in a timely manner, before the teachers start teaching—or, in the case of late hires, not more than two weeks after their start date.”

Some states have especially prescriptive policies regarding mentor assignments. For example, **Arkansas** requires that mentors be assigned to new teachers by three categories (in order of priority): same building, same grade and same subject area. **Kentucky** state law prescribes priorities for selecting and matching resource teachers to beginning teacher interns, in the following order: (1) Teachers with the same certification in the same school; (2) Teachers with the same certification in the same district; (3) Teachers in the same school; (4) Teachers in the same district; and (5) Teachers in an adjacent school district. It is unclear whether such assignment requirements are beneficial or overly restrictive. Given the limited research-based guidance on assigning mentors, it may be more appropriate for state policies to guide local program leaders to be attentive to such assignment criteria, but not prescribe a specific approach to pairing mentors with beginning educators.

Mentor Release Time

NTC believes that the strategy of utilizing full-time mentors, released from all classroom-teaching duties, provides for the greatest amount of flexibility to meet with, observe and provide feedback to beginning teachers.²⁶ It allows mentors to focus exclusively on their critical role in supporting beginning educators. In addition to freeing mentor teachers from balancing mentoring duties with a full (or reduced) teaching load, employing fewer full-time mentors allows induction program to be more selective and choose the highest quality candidates for this important role.

Some states affirmatively allow for fully released mentors within their policies. These include **Hawaii**, **Maryland** and **Washington**. In addition, the **Alaska** Statewide Mentor Project utilizes full-time mentors who visit new teachers in person every month and communicate with them weekly through Skype, e-mail and phone. Other states require districts to provide release time to mentor teachers on a periodic basis for teaching observations and other induction-related activities. States that have such policies include **Connecticut**, **Iowa**, **Massachusetts**, **North Carolina** and **Virginia**.

While the strongest state policies address mentor release time and allow the use of full-time mentors, unfortunately at least 10 states prohibit full-time mentors by restricting mentors from working with more than one-to-three beginning teachers (BTs) at a time. For example, the states of **Alabama**, **Arkansas** and **Illinois** (in its state-approved programs only²⁷) do not allow current classroom teachers to mentor more than one BT. **Connecticut** limits a mentor teacher's caseload to two or three BTs; **Kansas**, **Kentucky**, **Mississippi** and **South Carolina** to two BTs; and **Delaware** to three BTs. **North Dakota's** Teacher Support System Grant Program allows only one BT per mentor.

Selected State Policy Examples:

Mentor Selection

- **Connecticut** requires mentor teachers to demonstrate: (1) effective teaching practice; (2) ability to work cooperatively as a team member to aid the professional growth of a beginning teacher; (3) professional commitment to improving the induction of beginning teachers; (4) ability to relate effectively to adult learners; and (5) ability to be reflective and articulate about the craft of teaching.
- **New Jersey** state law establishes minimum criteria for mentor selection. Criteria include: (1) a minimum of three years experience in the district; (2) teacher commitment to the goals of the local mentor plan; (3) confidentiality with the new teacher; (4) demonstrated exemplary command of content area knowledge and of pedagogy; (5) experience and certification in the subject area in which the novice teacher is teaching; (6) knowledge about the social and workplace norms; (7) knowledge about the resources and opportunities in the district; (8) letters of recommendation; and (9) agreement to complete comprehensive mentor training.
- **South Carolina** requires each district to evaluate the performance of each mentor teacher on: (1) knowledge of beginning-teacher professional development and effective adult learning strategies; (2) familiarity with the state's performance assessment system; (3) knowledge of researched-based instructional strategies and effective student assessment; (4) understanding of the importance of an educator having a thorough command of the subject matter and teaching skills; (5) understanding of the importance of literacy in the classroom; (6) record of exemplary teaching and professional conduct; (7) effective interpersonal and communication skills; (8) demonstrated commitment to his or her own professional growth and learning; (9) willingness and the ability to participate in professional preparation to acquire the knowledge and

At least 10 states prohibit full-time mentors from working with more than one to three beginning teachers at a time.

skills needed to be an effective mentor; (10) willingness and ability to engage in non-evaluative assessment processes, including the ability to hold planning and reflective conversations with beginning teachers about their classroom practice; (11) willingness and ability to work collaboratively and share instructional ideas and materials with beginning teachers; and (12) willingness and ability to deepen his or her understanding of cultural, racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cognitive diversity.

Mentor Training

- In **California** mentors must receive “initial and ongoing professional development to ensure that they are knowledgeable about the program and skilled in their roles.” Mentor training must include the development of knowledge and skills of mentoring, the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, California Induction Program Standards, and the appropriate use of the instruments and processes of formative assessment systems.
- **Illinois** induction program standards require mentors to: (1) participate in foundational training; (2) participate in an ongoing professional learning community that supports their reflective practice and their use of mentoring tools, protocols, and formative assessment; and (3) engage in self-assessment to reflect on their own development as teachers and mentors.
- **Maryland** requires school districts to provide initial and ongoing mentor training that includes: (1) The essential characteristics of mentoring adults and the duties and responsibilities of a mentor; (2) Addressing the specific and varied performance needs of mentees; (3) Models of effective instructional practices that address the identified needs of mentees; and (4) Identification and coordination of appropriate resources to address the performance needs of mentees.
- **North Carolina** requires programs to provide initial training to mentors regarding their role and responsibilities, ongoing training “to advance their knowledge and skills,” and “opportunities to participate in professional learning communities of mentoring practice.”
- **Rhode Island** requires at least 10 hours of initial mentor training that includes a focus on adult learning, reflective questioning, the role of the mentor, setting expectations, stages of teacher development, and trust and confidentiality. On-going mentor professional development must address cognitive coaching, individual professional development plan support, parent connections, performance assessment, teaching standards, standards-based instruction, and trust and confidentiality.
- **South Carolina** offers initial mentor training in collaboration with the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention and Advancement (CERRA). The state’s required mentor professional development program consists of: (1) initial mentor training; (2) advanced mentor training for selected mentors; and (3) continuous professional development for all mentors.

Mentor Assignment and Caseload

- **California** Induction Program Standards require the assignment of mentors “using well-defined criteria consistent with the provider’s assigned responsibilities in the program.”
- **Idaho** Mentor Program Standards suggest that mentors should be assigned to beginning teachers in a timely manner, taking content, grade level, pedagogical needs and local context into account.
- **Illinois** Induction Program Standards guide programs to match beginning teachers and mentors according to relevant factors, including certification, experience, current assignments and/or proximity of location.
- **Rhode Island** Mentor Program Standards requires local programs to provide “criteria and a clearly delineated process for successfully matching mentors and mentees.”
- **West Virginia** state law defines a mentor as “an experienced classroom teacher at the school who teaches the same or similar subject and grade level as the beginning teacher.”

Mentor Release Time

- **Connecticut** state law requires local school boards to “ensure substitute teacher coverage for mentors and beginning teachers to participate in the activities and modules” required in the district’s three-year teacher education and mentoring plan and to ensure that its schools “coordinate the activities and schedules of mentors and beginning teachers to ensure faithful implementation of the district plan.”
- **Hawaii** law explicitly allows for the utilization of full-time teacher mentors by requiring the establishment of “a standardized statewide teacher induction program” with a new teacher-to-mentor ratio no greater than fifteen to one.
- **Maryland** state policy requires school districts, as part of their comprehensive teacher induction program, to establish “a cadre of full-time or part-time mentors to support teachers during their comprehensive induction period.” To the extent practicable given staffing and fiscal concerns, district induction programs must not exceed the maximum ratio of mentors to mentees (one mentor to 15 mentees).
- **North Carolina’s** Beginning Teacher Support Program Standards (January 2010) require programs to provide time to mentors “to work with beginning teachers during and outside of the school day” and to provide mentors and beginning teachers “protected time to engage in required mentoring and induction-related activities.”

State Policy Recommendations:

1. Establish explicit mentor selection criteria, including evidence of teaching excellence and an ability to serve effectively as a mentor.
2. Provide or require foundational mentor training prior to assignment and on-going mentor professional development.
3. Ensure that mentors receive sufficient foundational training and on-going professional development in classroom observation. [See Criterion #7]
4. Require programs to ensure that mentor assignments occur in a timely manner, at or prior to the start of the school year or a teacher's initial assignment; attend to, but not be overly restrictive with regard to subject area, school building etc.
5. Require programs to provide regular release time for classroom teachers serving as mentors to meet with and observe beginning teachers during the school day.
6. Allow for flexibility in mentor caseloads depending on the teaching workload of the mentor. Allow the use of full-time mentors who are able to support larger caseloads of beginning teachers.

Criterion 7

Program Delivery—State policy should identify key induction program elements, including a minimum amount of mentor-new teacher contact time, formative assessment of teaching practice, and classroom observation.

The aim of state policy should be to develop and sustain local induction programs that develop new teachers' practice and accelerate their effectiveness in the classroom. It must raise expectations by articulating research-based program elements. Such elements include: (1) a minimum amount of mentor-new teacher contact time; (2) formative assessment of new teacher practice; and (3) opportunities for new teachers both to be observed in their classrooms and to observe effective, veteran teachers in their school and district.

Findings/Analysis:

Contact Time

One of the program design elements most associated with impacts on teaching effectiveness and student learning is the frequency and duration of mentor-mentee contact time.²⁸ NTC typically recommends 1.25-2.5 hours per week of “protected time” for interactions between each mentor and mentee.²⁹ Without sufficient time to develop a mentoring relationship characterized by frequent and substantive interactions, policy and programmatic intent is undermined and the likelihood of improved new teacher effectiveness and student achievement is greatly lessened. Unless specific requirements around time are in place, competing priorities at the school site tend to overshadow time for interactions between mentors and mentees. This often yields limited or no time for meaningful instructional conversations and classroom observations, and therefore diminishes (or negates altogether) effects on student and teacher outcomes.

One of the program design elements most associated with impacts on teaching effectiveness and student learning is the frequency and duration of mentor-mentee contact time.

Yet most states have nonexistent or minimal expectations regarding mentoring time. Nearly 30 states mention the issue of mentoring time within their policies in some fashion.³⁰ A small number of more comprehensive state policies on time take one of two tacks. First, 11 states (**Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Dakota, Oregon, Tennessee, West Virginia**) establish a minimum amount of contact time between a mentor and a beginning teacher, either on a weekly, a semester or an annual basis.³¹ (In only five of these states, however, do these requirements apply statewide; in the others, they apply only to limited-reach state induction grant programs or to a subset of new teachers.) **Michigan** state law requires “15 days of professional learning” for beginning teachers during their first three years. **Montana** encourages a mentor to observe the new teacher at least twice per quarter and meet with him or her once per week.

Second, states include strong program requirements governing mentor-mentee interactions within their policies and program standards, without quantifying a minimum amount of time. This includes states with specific standards for mentors as well as state policies that aim to protect mentors from being assigned additional responsibilities that may infringe upon their time. States that represent strong examples of this approach include **California, Maryland** [see below], **Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Utah and Virginia** [see below]. Among the criteria that **Kansas** uses for induction program approval is “a description of activities including contact time.” While **Hawaii** and **Washington** don’t explicitly address mentoring time, their allowance of full-release mentor models is a nod to its importance.

A third approach, articulated as an *option* (not a requirement) within five states’ policies, is a reduced teaching load for beginning educators. **California** allows state program funding to be used for this purpose. **Maryland** and **Massachusetts** encourage programs to reduce the teaching load of beginning teachers. **North Carolina** requires the provision of “optimum” working conditions for beginning teachers, including limited preparations, limited non-instructional duties, and no extracurricular assignments unless requested in writing by the beginning teacher. In induction program applications, **Mississippi** requires school districts to describe the amount and nature of each eligible beginning teacher’s classroom and extracurricular duties and provide assurance that these duties are not unreasonable.

Formative Assessment

Critical to teacher development is the practice of capturing and using assessment data to guide the support of beginning teachers. Formative assessment not only helps beginning teachers to identify and strive for high levels of classroom instruction, but also to establish professional norms of inquiry and continuous learning. It helps beginning teachers assess their emerging practice to identify areas of strength and areas for professional growth. Formative assessment is very different from other types of professional assessments. It involves an ongoing process of data collection and analysis to inform next steps. Such data are not used for evaluation. The mentor and beginning teacher collaboratively determine its selection and use.

Critical to teacher development is the practice of capturing and using assessment data to guide the support of beginning teachers.

Formative assessment has three essential elements: (1) Standards that describe best practice and against which a teacher assesses his or her instructional practices; (2) Criteria that enable the teacher to measure growth and development; and (3)

Evidence that demonstrates the achievement.³² NTC Formative Assessment System is an example of such a comprehensive approach that helps to support the work of mentors and guide a beginning teacher’s growth and development.³³

At least 16 states address formative assessment within their policies. The strongest policy focus emerges in **California, Delaware, Idaho, North Carolina, South Carolina and Utah**. In addition, the **Hawaii** Department of Education’s New Teacher Induction Program uses a formative assessment system, adapted in part from NTC. The **Oregon** Department of Education supports the training of mentors in formative assessment. Formative assessment is one area where implementation is of paramount importance. Its inclusion in state policy is only really meaningful if it materializes at the core of the work of mentors and helps to impact individual teacher performance.

Classroom Observation

Classroom observation is a critical tool for mentor teachers to observe the practice of beginning educators and for those new teachers to observe the classroom of the mentor or other effective veteran peers. A sustained cycle of repeated observations, feedback and discussion is a necessary induction component if the intent is to advance beginning teacher development. To observe intentionally and effectively, mentors should receive foundational training in data collection, analysis, and interpretation skills and obtain experience with classroom observation and formative assessment protocols that become the foundation of coaching.

At least 25 states address classroom observation, either by and/or of the beginning teacher, within their policies.³⁴ Some comprehensive state policy examples include **California, Delaware, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina and West Virginia**. In the form of program guidelines, **Montana and Vermont** also provide some substantial guidance on observation, including a recommended amount of time. At least eight states (**Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, North Carolina, Utah, West Virginia**) have set in policy a minimum number of observations that the mentor must conduct of the beginning teacher.

Nine states (**Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina**) address all three elements identified in Criterion 7: *contact time, formative assessment and classroom observation*. The comprehensiveness of these states' induction policies varies, but each has taken at least an initial step to codify expectations around time for mentoring interactions and to establish a vision for teacher induction clearly focused on improving the instruction of beginning teachers.

Selected State Policy Examples:

Contact Time

- **Arkansas** requires two hours of weekly contact time between mentors and new teachers and requires each mentor to provide 25 additional hours of support to the beginning teacher each semester.
- **Kentucky** state law requires each mentor teacher to spend a minimum of 70 hours working with a beginning teacher. Twenty (20) of these hours must be in the classroom and 50 hours in consultation outside of class or attending assessment meetings.
- **Maryland** state policy requires induction programs to include “a cadre of full-time or part-time mentors to support teachers.” It requires ongoing support from a mentor, including regularly scheduled meetings during non-instructional time, and regularly scheduled opportunities for new teachers to observe or co-teach with skilled teachers. It encourages programs to consider reducing the teaching loads of beginning teachers and/or reducing or eliminating non-instructional responsibilities of mentor teachers.
- **Virginia's** Guidelines for Mentor Teacher Programs require opportunities for communication and feedback among program leaders, mentors and beginning teachers. They also require the provision of adequate release time for mentor teachers during the contract day.

Nine states address all three elements identified in Criterion 7: contact time, formative assessment and classroom observation.

Formative Assessment

- **California** induction program standards require programs to utilize “an inquiry-based formative assessment system.” It has three core elements: (1) state teaching standards; (2) evidence of practice (multiple measures including self-assessment, observation, analyzing student work, and instructional planning and delivery); and (3) an assessment tool identifying multiple levels of teaching practice. Participating teachers and mentors collaboratively develop an individual induction plan that guides the activities to support the professional growth of the new teacher.
- **South Carolina’s** induction program requirements include a mentor-guided formative assessment process that includes opportunities for each new teacher and mentor to collaborate on a regular basis to reflect upon teaching, areas of identified need, and school procedures and concerns, and to plan for professional development. In addition, they require the mentor and new teacher to create a written professional growth and development plan based upon the new teacher’s identified professional strengths and areas of need related to the state’s teacher performance standards.

Classroom Observation

- **Delaware** utilizes an induction program model focused on formative assessment and including mentor observations of teacher practice. The overall program is built upon a three-year mentoring framework divided into cycles, which include observations, post-observation meetings, video review, workshops, and self-analysis and reflection.
- **Kentucky** state law requires that the mentor teacher must conduct three official observations with each observation lasting one hour in duration or one class period; or two observations followed by an observation of the teacher intern’s videotaped classroom lesson. In addition, the classroom observations must be preceded by a pre-observation conference and lesson plan review and followed by a post-observation conference.
- **Maine** requires each new teacher to prepare an Initial Professional Certification Action Plan in consultation with the mentor or support team. The plan must include no fewer than three annual classroom observations by the assigned mentor during the first two years of teaching.
- **West Virginia’s** beginning teacher internship program requires joint planning periods for the mentor and first-year teacher throughout the school year and mentor observation of the beginning teacher (for at least one hour per week during the first half of the school year and at least one hour every two weeks during the second half of the school year).

State Policy Recommendations:

1. Create sanctioned time for interactions between mentors and beginning teachers. This could include quantifying a minimum amount of time or could include creating robust requirements for mentor performance and programs standards that explicitly require sufficient time and for mentor-mentee interactions.
2. Require the use of a formative assessment system, including regular classroom observations, within induction programs to ensure a focus on accelerating beginning teacher development and customizing feedback and support.
3. Encourage the provision of reduced teaching loads for beginning educators.

Criterion 8

Funding—The state should provide dedicated funding to support local educator induction programs.

Funding is a key strategy for states to establish new teacher induction and mentoring as an educational priority. Funding legitimizes the state’s central role in accelerating new teacher effectiveness by regulating and supporting the quality of local induction programs—and recognizes the real costs associated with comprehensive, high-quality induction programs. State funding for induction also recognizes its status as a requirement during the initial stage of teacher licensure.

Comprehensive induction programs can cost thousands of dollars per beginning teacher. States cannot and should not be expected to fund the full cost of induction programs, but state funding provides a critical base of support for local programs—especially for school districts, often high-need, that employ large percentages of new teachers. A combination of state, federal and local resources can help take a program from good to great. Research shows that it is an investment worth making. A 2007 analysis determined that the return on investment of a teacher induction program after five years was \$1.66 for every dollar spent.³⁵ High-quality induction pays dividends through reduced teacher turnover costs, higher teacher retention rates, and greater teaching effectiveness.

Funding legitimizes the state’s central role in accelerating new teacher effectiveness by regulating and supporting the quality of local induction programs.

Findings/Analysis:

During the 2010-11 school year, 17 states provided dedicated funding for induction and mentoring.³⁶ [See Table 5]. States meet Criterion 8 when funding is dedicated for the purpose of induction. Also, consistent with the criterion, states must actually appropriate and not just authorize funding in order to meet this criterion.

If state resources are available only through a competitive induction grant program, funding is considered dedicated under our analysis. At least four states (**Illinois, North Dakota, Oregon, Texas**) made funding available to all districts in this manner during the 2010-11 school year.³⁷ (Because induction is not a requirement in those states, they do not meet our Criterion 1 however.) Ideally, state funding should be available to all districts, so these states have work to scale-up their programs statewide.

Table 5. State Policy: Induction Funding

State provides dedicated funding for induction programs (2010-11 school year)	
Alabama*	New Jersey*
Alaska	North Dakota
Arkansas*	Oregon
Connecticut	South Carolina
Delaware*	Texas
Illinois	Virginia
Iowa	West Virginia*
Kansas*	Wisconsin
Kentucky	

*State reserves all funding for mentor stipends

Only 11 states³⁸ provide induction funding to all of its school districts, and among them only four states (**Iowa, South Carolina, Virginia, Wisconsin**) provide funding for local induction program costs. (As discussed below, these other states reserve induction funding for mentor stipends exclusively.) Iowa provides \$300 (plus a \$1,000 mentor stipend), South Carolina \$750 and Wisconsin \$375 per beginning educator in state funding. Virginia appropriates funding for four separate induction programs (including \$1 million for the Mentor Teacher Program), which are not broken down on a per teacher basis.

California is currently unique in that it makes funding available for teacher induction, but from a source that may be used for “any educational purpose.” In the 2008–09 school year, state induction funding totaled \$128.6 million—\$4,069 for every first- and second-year teacher. Due to budgetary constraints, state budget law devolves numerous categorical programs—including for induction—to ‘Flexibility Tier III,’ allowing school districts to redirect the funds. In addition, a \$2,000 local contribution per beginning teacher is no longer required by the state. As such, California does not meet our funding criterion.³⁹

Mentor Stipends

Six of the 17 states that provide funding for teacher induction (**Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Kansas, New Jersey, West Virginia**) reserve all of it for mentor stipends, leaving nothing remaining for induction program funding. **Iowa** requires \$1,000 of the \$1,300 per beginning teacher allotment to go toward mentor compensation. **Illinois** also requires mentors who provide 60 hours of face-to-face mentoring assistance annually to be paid a \$1,200 stipend from state grant funds. **Connecticut** pays a \$500 stipend per mentor from its \$4.1 million program appropriation that also supports mentor and administrator training. State-supported mentor stipends range from \$500 to \$1,200 per year.

Six of the 17 states that provide funding for teacher induction reserve all of it for mentor stipends, leaving nothing remaining for induction program funding.

In a positive sense, designating funds for such stipends has the benefit of honoring the work. In a negative sense, mentor stipends may be necessary as an incentive because states and programs are not providing a supportive context for the work of mentors; namely, mentors too often are not provided dedicated time to support beginning teachers during the school day. In these instances, the discretion to use state funding for other programmatic purposes that may be equally or more beneficial is removed. For example, state funding could help to fund mentor training, mentor release time, reduced teaching loads for beginning teachers, beginning teacher professional development, or any number of other programmatic purposes.

Authorized Funding, Not Appropriated

At least 8 states (**Georgia, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Washington**) authorize induction funding in statute, but do not currently provide it. In our analysis, we did not count these states as funding induction. For example, Georgia state policy allows for the provision of stipends to mentors who provide for up to 45 hours of mentoring support annually. Similarly, Mississippi state law authorizes a \$1,000 mentor stipend per beginning teacher supported. In North Carolina, state law requires the State Board of Education to “allot funds for mentoring services” to local school districts. The funds must be used “to provide mentoring support” based upon a program plan filed with the state. New Mexico and North Carolina funded teacher induction as recently as 2010, but currently do not provide any state resources for this purpose. In December 2010, a special session of the Washington state legislature eliminated funding mid-year for its Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST) grant program.

Illinois is a unique case. It supports a state-funded induction grant program that funded 301 of the state’s 868 school districts in 2010-11. State law says that, when sufficient funding is available, public schools will receive \$1,200 per beginning teacher annually for two years for: (1) mentor teacher compensation; (2) mentor teacher training or new teacher training, or both; and (3) release time.

Selected State Policy Examples:

- **Alaska**—State funding of the Alaska Statewide Mentor Project for FY 2010 totaled \$3.9 million for program implementation, mentor training, program evaluation, and other program-related costs. The flexibility to use the funds for a variety of programs needs is notable.
- **Connecticut**—The 2010-11 school year marked the first year of implementation of the Teacher Education And Mentoring (TEAM) program. State funding of \$4.1 million supported mentor stipends, mentor and administrator training, and training for reviewers of TEAM reflection papers. The set-aside money for key program elements is notable.

- **Iowa**—Iowa provides statewide induction funding of \$1,300 per new teacher, \$1,000 of which is reserved for a mentor stipend.
- **Oregon**—Through the state’s competitive Beginning Teacher and Administrator Mentoring grant program, a local induction program may receive up to \$5,000 annually (adjusted each biennium based on the Consumer Price Index) for each full-time equivalent beginning teacher and administrator.

State Policy Recommendations:

1. Provide dedicated funding for induction programs. Do not restrict state funding to mentor stipends exclusively.
2. States that cannot successfully provide statewide induction program funding should consider creating a targeted or limited grant program to create local exemplar programs and eventually scale up to a statewide program.
3. States should not take on the entire funding responsibility for local induction programs, but should share the investment. One funding strategy might include a required local match. For example, California previously required a \$2,000 in-kind match as part of its funding for the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program.

Criterion 9

Educator Accountability—The state should require participation in and/or completion of an induction program to advance from an initial to professional teaching license.

The induction period is a distinct phase of teacher development, which coincides with the initial years of teacher certification.⁴⁰ Requiring induction and mentoring to advance to a professional teaching licensure honors the importance of beginning teacher development and promotes a continuous professional growth orientation for teachers as they enter the profession. It also creates mutual accountability for new teachers, schools, districts and states to acknowledge and plan for the induction period. For teachers, it creates a responsibility to engage in induction activities to meet the licensure requirements. For schools and districts, it creates an obligation to provide an induction program so teachers in their district can meet the licensure requirement. And for states, it creates an obligation to create the program infrastructure (including funding) necessary for the licensure system and an obligation to support district implementation of induction programs.

The induction period is a distinct phase of teacher development, which coincides with the initial years of teacher certification.

When induction is comprehensive, required as a condition of licensure, and the successful completion of a performance assessment is required at the end of the induction period, states have the opportunity to develop a truly performance-based system of licensure. An induction requirement also recognizes the importance of providing beginning teachers with the necessary induction and mentoring support to help them strengthen their teaching practice. Groups such as the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium are working on developing such tools for initial licensure.⁴¹

Likewise, a performance assessment for moving from initial to professional licensure is desirable as part of acknowledging that new teachers develop and grow over time and should reach higher levels of performance at the conclusion of the induction period.

Findings/Analysis:

At least 22 states require participation in or completion of an induction program to advance from an initial to professional teaching license.⁴² This count includes states that require induction for less than two years (Criterion #1). Only 10 states (**California, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Utah**) require induction for certification/licensure and also require a program of at least two years in length.

The distinction between completion of and participation in an induction program is sometimes a subtle one within state policy. In the clearest examples, successful “completion” includes a performance assessment or a comprehensive evaluation, whereas “participation” may mean that the teacher was supported within an induction program. Some states require the submission of documentation to verify induction program participation.

Several states (including **Colorado** and **Maine**) incorporate or make explicit the development of professional growth plans as part of their induction and licensure requirements. The development of individual growth plans creates the advantage of focusing attention to the individual educator's development. Similar to allowing for an additional year of induction (in Criterion #1), some states (**Iowa** and **West Virginia**) allow teachers additional time to meet certification requirements. Allowing an additional year permits a focus on reaching a standard of practice while also providing support to reach that standard. Considering the relatively high levels of inter- and intra- district mobility among new teachers, allowing an extra year to meet the standard of practice is an appropriate level of discretion for local districts.

Selected State Policy Examples:

- **Arkansas** requires new teachers to participate in an induction program for at least one year and pass the Praxis III performance assessment to advance to a standard teaching license. The Arkansas Teacher Licensure Accountability System (ATLAS) helps to manage the mentoring process. The system records all mentoring hours, what was done during the meeting time and which teaching domains their work addresses. ATLAS issues a grant to the school district for the mentoring, if all the requirements are met.
- **California** requires induction programs “to determine, prior to the recommending of a candidate” for a professional teaching credential, “that the candidate has completed the approved induction program.” A 1998 law created a new two-tier credentialing system for California teachers, under which they earn the second “level” only after participation in an approved induction program. A 2004 law codified induction as the preferred method for earning a professional teaching credential.
- **Delaware** requires new teachers to complete mentoring requirements, including a prescribed number of contact hours with a mentor, to advance to a Continuing license. Mentors must submit contact log documentation accounting for all mentoring activities provided during the specified time period to the state at the end of the school year.
- **Iowa** requires the successful completion of a two-year induction program in order to advance to the career-level teaching certificate. This includes a comprehensive evaluation at the end of the induction period to determine whether a teacher meets the expectations to move to the career level. There also is a provision to provide a third year of support for the teacher to meet the expectations for a standard license.
- **Ohio** began issuing Resident Educator licenses in January 2011 and these license holders will be required to successfully complete the state's Resident Educator Program that requires participation in induction and mentoring and successful completion of a performance based assessment to advance to a Professional Educator License.

- **Utah** requires all beginning teachers to fulfill the requirements of the state Entry Years Enhancement (EYE) program to advance to a Level 2 teaching license. All new teachers must satisfactorily collaborate with a trained mentor, pass a required pedagogical exam (Praxis II), complete three years of employment and evaluation, and compile a working portfolio.
- **West Virginia** requires school principals to verify that new teachers have completed the beginning teacher internship program, to make a final evaluation of the performance of the beginning teacher, and to recommend full professional status, continuing internship status, or to discontinue employment.

State Policy Recommendation:

1. Require successful completion of a multi-year educator induction program as a condition for earning advanced professional certification.

Criterion 10

Program Accountability—The state should assess or monitor program quality through accreditation, program evaluation, surveys, site visits, self-reports, and other relevant tools and strategies.

State induction policies are most successful when they create an environment where local programs can thrive. To assess the extent to which state policies are successful in achieving this goal, it is critical for states to develop thoughtful, robust program accountability systems. In doing so, the state can accomplish four key features of program quality.

First, states can assure program compliance with state laws, regulations and policies. State oversight of program design and operation can provide assurance that local induction and mentoring programs are meeting state requirements including, for example, the operation of a program, the provision of mentoring support to new teachers, and utilization of trained mentors.

Second, states can lessen the disconnect between policy and implementation. The gap between policy intent and program implementation can diminish or negate state efforts. By integrating thoughtful accountability systems, states can determine whether districts are implementing programs in alignment with the state's priorities. Further, as information from implementation pitfalls surface, states can problem-solve and seek to address systemic or common obstacles that are getting in the way of effective programming.

State induction policies are most successful when they create an environment where local programs can thrive.

Third, states can focus on program improvement. When an accountability system allows for an honest analysis of program strengths and challenges, and enables opportunities for rich feedback and discussion (as opposed to compliance-only systems), it provides a platform for enabling all programs throughout the state to improve. This ensures that the impact of the targeted policies will continue to grow over time.

Fourth, states can assess the influence of induction programs on student and teacher outcomes. In order to expand and sustain support for induction program funding, states should be able to demonstrate that programs are positively influencing teacher effectiveness and student learning and reducing teacher turnover costs. By supporting efforts to measure the outcomes of local programs, states will have a better assessment of the effects of their policies and more leverage to sustain programs over the long term.

Findings/Analysis:

At least 22 states can be said to clearly meet our stated criterion on induction program accountability in that they have a clear focus on program quality and program improvement.⁴³ These states are actively engaged in some of the following activities: review mentoring activities and time, administer new teacher or program surveys, conduct program audits or site visits, use program information for accreditation purposes, ensure programs adhere to state program standards, support induction program improvement, require programs to submit evaluation data. Some of the strongest examples of state policies on induction program evaluation are offered below. They include **Alaska** that is actively engaged in academic research on induction program outcomes, **California** that has included induction programs within its statewide accreditation system, and **West Virginia** that looks at program implementation as part of its performance audits of school districts.

Six states create the tightest linkage between program evaluation and the state's induction program standards.

Six states among the 22 (**California, Connecticut, Illinois, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina**) create the tightest linkage between program evaluation and the state's induction program standards. They look at how well programs are implemented against the state's standards. Illinois and North Carolina, with support from NTC, have developed program continuum (similar to a rubric) that allow induction programs to self-assess their success in meeting program standards.

Another 12 states require local programs to submit program plans, verify the provision of induction and mentor support or require some evaluation activities at the local level, but appear to take a more compliance-focused approach.⁴⁴ Of the remaining 16 states, half provide some guidance on program evaluation to local programs but don't require it or take an active role, and half don't provide any leadership or requirements for induction program accountability.

Two states worth highlighting reserve a portion of state funding specifically for induction program evaluation. **Illinois** law requires the state to contract with an independent party to conduct an evaluation of new teacher induction programs every three years. **Oregon** state law reserves 2.5 percent of program funding for evaluation.

Selected State Policy Examples:

- The **Alaska** Statewide Mentor Project, through its partnership with the University of Alaska, ensures that research is funded and supported. It includes evaluations of mentor professional development; surveys of new teachers, mentors, and principals; summaries of new teacher growth and practice; and investigations into teacher retention. More recently, a statistical analysis of mentoring and student achievement gains has been conducted and results distributed.
- **California** includes BTSA induction programs within its statewide accreditation system (which also covers teacher preparation programs). The system features ongoing data collection and a seven-year cycle of activities, including at least one program site visit. Additional requirements of induction programs include biennial reports and a program assessment.

- **Delaware** conducts an annual evaluation of induction programs in partnership with the Institute for Public Administration at the University of Delaware.
- **North Carolina** requires the state, every five years, to formally review Beginning Teacher Support Programs to review evidence and verify that program proficiency is demonstrated on all program standards.
- **Oregon** state law holds the state department of education responsible for the regular and ongoing evaluation of educator mentoring programs. The law reserves 2.5 percent of program funding for evaluation. It may include assessments of the effectiveness of the programs in retaining beginning teachers and administrators and their impact on student performance.
- **South Carolina** administers an annual survey of beginning teachers, mentors, and school administrators. Districts must analyze the results and use them as a basis for program improvement. In addition, the state requires district administrators to evaluate annually the implementation of their induction program and the quality of their induction trainings and professional development offerings.
- **West Virginia** monitors implementation of the beginning teacher internship program requirements through the state's education accreditation system. The state Office of Education Performance Audits specifically looks at internship program implementation within its audits of individual schools and districts.

State Policy Recommendations:

1. Develop robust, thoughtful accountability structures that go deeper than compliance-oriented systems and move toward a focus on program improvement and the measurement of program outcomes. Such structures should both provide for local program accountability and an evaluation of the state policy or program as a whole.
2. Provide dedicated funding for induction program evaluation at the local and/or state level. Ensure that evaluations are oriented around the induction program standards established by the state. If appropriate, tie evaluations to accreditation of programs and/or funding streams so that districts are incentivized to focus on implementation and results.
3. Survey all new teachers (and possibly mentors and principals) annually about the provision and quality of induction support and mentoring assistance.
4. Conduct site visits of programs, interviewing program leaders and participants, to get a more realistic sense of program operation and impact.

Conclusion

NTC analysis of state policies on teacher induction suggests that there is much work to be done by state policymakers to construct high-quality policies supporting comprehensive new teacher induction. No single U.S. state has perfected its induction policy to ensure the provision of high-impact, multi-year induction

support for all beginning educators, and half the states still don't require all beginning educators to receive induction or mentoring support. And new teacher development and support looms as an often-overlooked issue amidst state efforts to strengthen educator effectiveness policies, including preparation, certification, compensation and evaluation.

If we recognize that new teachers are more common in our schools today than any time in recent history, it makes sense for policy to pay special attention to their unique professional needs.

If we recognize that new teachers are more common in our schools today than any time in recent history, it makes sense for policy to pay special attention to their unique professional needs. As states embark upon legislative sessions, launch policy task forces and otherwise address teaching policies, they should work to ensure

that all beginning educators are provided the professional support necessary for them to become effective and successful practitioners. Given the mounting evidence on the impact of teachers and the benefits of high-quality induction, a strong state focus on this aspect of teaching policy could well determine whether current state education reforms succeed or fail.

Notes

The state policy data we used for our analyses were accurate during the 2010-11 school year.

Individual state induction policy reviews are available on the New Teacher Center web site at: <http://www.newteachercenter.org/policy/policy-map>.

Authorities in all 50 states reviewed the state policy summaries. For 49 states (all but Texas), the information was verified by state authorities prior to publication.

Endnotes

1. Hanushek, E., Kain, J. F. et al. (2005.) "The Market for Teacher Quality." NBER Working Paper 11154. National Bureau of Economic Research: Cambridge, Mass.
2. Ingersoll, R. & Strong, M. (June 2011). "The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research." *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233.
3. Carroll, T. and Foster, E. (January 2010). *Who Will Teach? Experience Matters*. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Ingersoll, R. & Merrill, E. (2010). "Who's Teaching Our Children?" *Educational Leadership*, 67: 14-20. University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. (Fall 2010). "The Changing Face of the Teaching Force." *A Review of Research*, Vol. 7, No. 3: 1, 7-8.
4. State policy data and summary information is accurate as of the 2010-11 school year.
5. Wei, R.C., Darling-Hammond, L. & Adamson, F. (2010). *Professional Development in the United States: Trends and Challenges*. National Staff Development Council: Dallas, Texas.
6. New Teacher Center, *Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction*. <http://www.newteachercenter.org/policy/policy-map>.
7. Glazerman, S., et al. (June 2010). *Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences: Washington, D.C.
8. New Teacher Center. (Retrieved from NTC web site on Jan. 31, 2012). "Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey Key Findings." <http://www.newteachercenter.org/teaching-learning-conditions-survey/key-findings>.
9. Wei, R.C., Darling-Hammond, L. & Adamson, F. (2010).
10. NTC Teaching & Learning Conditions initiative. <http://www.newteachercenter.org/teaching-learning-conditions-survey/key-findings>.
11. Includes statewide Teaching, Empowering, Leading & Learning (TELL) surveys in Colorado, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina and Tennessee, during calendar years 2010 and 2011.
12. We use the term "program" to encompass induction programs run by states, school districts, area education agencies, universities, consortia, and other educational entities.
13. Internal NTC analysis utilizing data from: Wei, R.C., Darling-Hammond, L. & Adamson, F. (July 2010). *Professional Development in the United States: Trends and Challenges (Technical Report)*. National Staff Development Council: Dallas, Texas.

14. Carver, C. & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2008). "Using Policy to Improve Teacher Induction: Critical Elements and Missing Pieces." *Education Policy*, 23(2): 295-328.
15. Johnson, L., Goldrick, L. & Lasagna, M. (November 2010). *New Teacher Excellence: The Impact of State Policy on Induction Program Implementation*. New Teacher Center: Santa Cruz, Calif.
16. NTC *Summary of State Policies on Teacher Induction* is based on data and information that was accurate as of and verified by states during the 2010-2011 school year.
17. Glazerman, et al. (2010). Fletcher, S., Strong, M. & Villar, A. (2008). "An investigation of the effects of variations in mentor-based induction on the performance of students in California." *Teachers College Record*, 110(10), 2271-2289.
18. The ASMP launched during the 2004–2005 school year with 22 full-time mentors serving 332 new teachers from around the state. In the 2010–2011 school year, ASMP trained 28 full-time mentors to serve more than 400 new teachers located in 185 of the state's 506 schools and in 43 of 54 school districts. Overall, the ASMP has served 1,630 new teachers in more than 60 percent of the state's schools and in 50 of 54 Alaska school districts. Alaska Statewide Mentor Project website:
<http://www.alaskamentorproject.org>.
19. Leithwood, K., et al. (2004). *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. The Wallace Foundation: New York, N.Y.
20. New Teacher Center. (2011). *Induction Program Standards: A Guiding Framework for Teacher Induction Program Leaders*. New Teacher Center: Santa Cruz, Calif.
21. Arizona created draft program standards in 2005, and although they are utilized by some K-12 and postsecondary entities, they never were approved. Hawaii formalized its induction program standards in October 2011, after the period of our initial policy review.
http://hawaiiidoereform.org/_literature_103926/Hawaii_Teacher_Induction_Program_Standards
22. The 28 states include: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.
23. The 8 states are: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi.

24. The 31 states are: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. The states of North Dakota and Oregon require mentor training within their state-funded grant programs only. The Alaska Statewide Mentor Project provides training to its mentors. Tennessee requires trained mentors in induction programs provided through non-traditional teacher preparation programs only.
25. These states include: California, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin.
26. Fletcher, S. & Strong, M. (2009). "Full-Release and Site-Based Mentoring of New Elementary Grade Teachers: An Analysis of Changes in Student Achievement." *The New Educator*, 5, 329–341.
 Mitchell, D.E. & Scott-Hendrick, L. (2007). *California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment and Intern Alternative Certification Evaluation Study: Technical Report*. University of California-Riverside: Riverside, Calif.
27. New Teacher Center. (2011). *State Policy Review: Teacher Induction (Illinois)*.
<http://www.newteachercenter.org/state/illinois>
28. Glazerman, S., et al. (June 2010). Mitchell, D.E. & Scott-Hendrick, L. (2007).
29. New Teacher Center. (2010). *High-Quality Mentoring and Induction Practices*.
<http://www.newteachercenter.org/products-and-resources/high-quality-mentoring-and-induction-practices>
30. These states include: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia.
31. Oklahoma's policy that requires mentor teachers to support each beginning teacher "a minimum of seventy-two (72) hours per year in classroom observation and consultation" is currently suspended.
32. New Teacher Center. (Fall 2004). "On The Move With Formative Assessment." *Reflections*, Vol. VII, No. 2. New Teacher Center: Santa Cruz, Calif.
33. NTC Formative Assessment System, <http://www.newteachercenter.org/services/fas>.
34. The 25 states are: Arkansas, California, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia.

35. Goldrick, L. (Fall 2007). *New Teacher Support Pays Off: A Return on Investment for Educators and Kids*. New Teacher Center: Santa Cruz, Calif. Villar, A. & Strong, M. (Summer 2007). "Is Mentoring Worth the Money? A Benefit-Cost Analysis and Five-Year Rate of Return of a Comprehensive Mentoring Program for Beginning Teachers." *ERS Spectrum*, v. 25, n. 3, pp. 1-17.

36. The 17 states are: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin. (At least two of these states cut funding in advance of the 2011-12 school year.)

37. Texas eliminated funding for its Beginning Teacher Induction and Mentoring (BTIM) grant program at the end of the 2010-11 school year. Illinois reduced its state appropriation for teacher induction to \$1 prior to the 2011-12 school year. For the period of this review, however, both Illinois and Texas are counted as funded states.

38. The 11 states are: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, New Jersey, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

39. Due to budgetary constraints, the 2009 Budget Act and related legislation (Education Code §42605) devolved numerous categorical programs—including BTSA—to 'Flexibility Tier III,' allowing school districts to redirect the funds toward "any educational purpose" for a five-year period ending June 30, 2013. The 2009 law also allocates funding during this period based on 2008–09 LEA funding levels rather than previous factors used in the funding formulas, such as the number of new teachers. In addition, the \$2,000 local contribution per participating teacher is no longer required by the state.

40. Moir, E. & Gless, J. (2001). "Quality induction: An investment in teachers." *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 109-115.

41. Website of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education:
<http://aacte.org/index.php?/Programs/Teacher-Performance-Assessment-Consortium-TPAC/teacher-performance-assessment-consortium.html>

42. The 22 states are: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia. Both Nebraska and Oklahoma require induction as part of licensure in state policy, but these mandates are temporarily suspended.

43. The 22 states are: Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia.

44. The 12 states are: Colorado, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio (under the Transition Resident Educator Program that was operative in the 2010-11 school year), Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah. (Ohio features a stronger focus on program accountability and program improvement under its new Resident Educator Program that began in the 2011-12 school year.)

ABOUT NEW TEACHER CENTER

New Teacher Center focuses on improving student learning by accelerating the effectiveness of new teachers. NTC partners with states, school districts, and policymakers to design and implement systems that create sustainable, high-quality mentoring and professional development; build leadership capacity; work to enhance teaching conditions; improve retention; and transform schools into vibrant learning communities where all students succeed.

TheJoyceFoundation

The authors wish to acknowledge the Joyce Foundation for generously providing support for this paper. Based in Chicago, the Foundation invests in initiatives to improve public education and works to close the achievement gap by improving the quality of teachers in schools that serve low-income and minority children.



New
Teacher
Center

725 Front Street, Suite 400 Santa Cruz, CA 95060
T. 831.600.2200 info@newteachercenter.org
www.newteachercenter.org



The text of this publication is printed on 40% post consumer waste recycled paper. The cover is printed on 10% post consumer waste recycled paper. The printing plates are processed chemistry free and the ink is vegetable based.