

**RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO THE
“INDUCTION PLAN GUIDELINES”
TO ASSURE A HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHER IN EVERY CLASSROOM**

Presented to the
State Board of Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Prepared and presented by
Andrew B. Bitz, Diana Campbell, Robin Eckert, Kristle F. Evans,
Donna K. Milanovich, Judith A. Swigart, and Marilyn J. Wells

Fellows, Class of 2010 – 2011
Pennsylvania Educational Policy Fellowship Program (EPFP)

May 20, 2011

Project Team:

Mr. Andrew B. Bitz

Assistant Principal
Mechanicsburg Area Senior High
500 S. Broad St.
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055
(717) 691-4530
abitz@mbgsd.org

Ms. Diana Campbell

Director, Philadelphia Teacher Residency
Philadelphia Education Fund
1709 Benjamin Franklin Pkwy.
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 665-1400 ext. 3325
dcampbell@philaedfund.org

Ms. Robin Eckert

Associate Professor Early Childhood
Education
Reading Area Community College
10 S. 2nd St.
Reading, PA 19603-1706
(610) 372-4721
reckert@racc.edu

Ms. Kristle F. Evans

Director of Human Resources/Community
Relations
Lampeter-Strasburg School District
1600 Book Rd., P.O. Box 428
Lampeter, PA 17537
(717) 464-3311 ext. 1010
kristle_evans@l-spioneers.org

Dr. Donna K. Milanovich.

Superintendent of Schools
Moon Area School District
8353 University Blvd.
Moon Township, PA 15108
(412) 264-9440
dmlanovich@moonarea.net

Ms. Judith A. Swigart

Superintendent of Schools
Greater Latrobe School District
410 Main St.
Latrobe, PA 15650
(724) 539-4204
judy.swigart@glsd.k12.pa.us

Dr. Marilyn J. Wells

Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for
Academic and Student Affairs
Pennsylvania State System of Higher
Education
2986 North Second St.
Harrisburg, PA 17110
(717) 720-4200
mwells@passhe.edu

Recommended Revisions to the Induction Plan Guidelines To Assure a Highly Effective Teacher in Every Classroom

by

*Andrew Bitz, Dianna Carroll, Kristle Evans, Donna Milanovich, Judy Swigart, and Marilyn J. Wells
Fellows, Pennsylvania Educational Policy Fellowship Program*

May 3, 2011

INTRODUCTION

“There are certain things we know about teacher quality. A correlation exists between a teacher's verbal ability and student achievement. Teachers who have majored in the subject they teach are better teachers of that subject than those who have not. Pedagogy, particularly content-based pedagogy, has a positive impact on student achievement, and teachers with considerable experience are likely to make a greater contribution to student learning than teachers with few years of teaching experience,” (Fallon, 2003). However, since the implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, most school districts have met the mandate of providing a “highly qualified” teacher to all students, by Federal definition, and have shifted their focus to ensuring that there is a “highly effective” teacher in each classroom. It is increasingly clear that being considered “highly qualified”; i.e., having the qualifications and certifications necessary to teach in a particular teaching position, does not necessarily predict that **highly effective** teaching is occurring, the teaching that research has shown to improve student learning.

Although there should be a continued emphasis on teacher preparation standards, research shows that teachers without induction support leave the profession at rates almost 70 percent higher than those who receive it,” (USDOE, 2000) “With about one-third of new teachers leaving the classroom within three years and nearly one-half within five years,” (NCTAF, 2003), Pennsylvania should develop a comprehensive state-wide program that incorporates standards for induction programs in order to ensure a highly effective teacher in every classroom.

➤ Recommendation #1

Current Requirement:

II. Induction Plan Requirements (page 5)

Induction plans must include among the following:

- 1. First-year teachers and educational specialists are required to participate in the program.**

Recommended Revision:

First through third-year teachers and educational specialists are required to participate in the program.*

** Note: The induction program should be designed so that it may lead toward level II certification for inductees.*

Supporting Research:

A 2010 US Department of Education study, *Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction*, examined the impact of a comprehensive two-year induction program on student achievement. Student achievement data were collected for three consecutive years for a group of teachers in the two-year comprehensive induction program and a control group of teachers who received one year of induction support. Findings indicate a positive and statistically significant impact on student achievement in year three for the teachers who received the two-year induction program. Data indicated that the average student improved 8 percentile points in math and 4 percentile points in reading. (Glazerman, S., Dolfin, S., Bleeker, M, et al., 2010).

According to Wood and Stanulis (2010) in *Quality Teacher Induction: "Fourth-Wave" (1997–2006) Induction Programs*, "A quality induction program enhances teacher learning through a multi-faceted, multi-year system of planned and structured activities that support novice teachers' developmentally-appropriate professional development in their first through third year of teaching" (Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE), 2004; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Stanulis, Burrill, & Ames, 2007).

Villar, Fletcher, and Strong (2007), of the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz, examined the relationship between comprehensive mentoring for beginning teachers and student achievement in English language arts and mathematics. The researchers conducted four separate studies of school districts throughout the state, examining the impact of program (comprehensive mentoring) and non-program schools on student achievement. In the first study, results indicated that students taught by new teachers in a comprehensive, two-year mentoring program had achievement gains in literacy

exceeding or comparable to students in the state. In two other studies, students in program schools (comprehensive, multi-year program, with an elaborated math model), the researchers found significant and positive effects in math and reading gains, with math outpacing reading effects, compared to students in schools where new teachers did not receive the comprehensive, multi-year mentoring program.

➤ Recommendation #2

Current Requirement:

II. Induction Plan Requirements (page 5)

Induction plans must include among the following:

3. A list of goals and competencies for the induction program.

Recommended Revision:

A list of current district induction program goals and elements, in addition to the list of comprehensive, state-wide, induction program standards and elements.*

** Note: A task force comprised of representatives of public school constituencies (e.g., superintendents, teachers, etc.), educational policy experts (e.g., Educational Policy Leadership Center, etc.), higher education teacher preparation programs (e.g., PASSHE, etc.), and others should be established to develop comprehensive state-wide induction program standards and elements, centered on research-based models and best practices (Appendix A). Standards may include a focus on differentiated instruction, student learning, classroom management, and school improvement approaches, with an evaluation component that is aligned to professional standards. Program elements may also include extra support systems needed for new teachers, such as scheduling of classes, student population, and extra-curricular limitations. Professional standards should be used then to guide new teacher learning and growth in meaningful ways, by helping these novices set clear, significant, and achievable goals; reflect upon and articulate successes and challenges; identify effective practices in their own classrooms and others'; guide new learning and next steps; and recognize the complexity of good teaching and the need for career-long professional development. The task force also should explore collaborative efforts for delivery of professional development with inductees by institutes of higher education in accordance with Title 22, Education Appendix I §354.26. Collaborative Programs (c).*

Supporting Research:

“If the beginning teachers of North Carolina are going to be able to meet the state’s professional teaching standards, impact the learning of all students in distinguished ways, choose to remain in the profession and become future master teachers, teacher leaders and skilled administrators and superintendents, then a quality induction program to support the instructional growth of

beginning teachers must be in place in each of the 115 school districts in the state," (North Carolina Mentor Task Force, December, 2009).

Additional research on selected research-based models for induction programs, with standards and program elements, is presented in Appendix A.

➤ **Recommendation #3**

Current Requirement:

II. Induction Plan Requirements (page 5)

Induction plans must include among the following:

4. A description of how the needs of inductees will be assessed.

Recommended Revision:

A description of how the needs of inductees will be assessed, utilizing the portfolio prepared by the inductees in their teacher education program as a starting point for assessment of needs.

Supporting Research

According to Chapter 49, Certification of Professional Preparation Personnel, § 49.14 (4) (ix), "Institutions [approved teacher-preparing] shall provide ongoing support for novice educators in partnership with local educational agencies during the induction period, including observation, consultation and assessment", and §49.16 (c), "The induction plan shall reflect a mentor relationships between the first-year teacher, long-term substitute or educational specialist, teacher educator and the induction team." Further, according to § 354.33 professional competency, "The preparing institution shall have a procedure to confirm that a candidate's competency to begin the candidate's professional role in schools is assessed prior to completion of the program and recommendation for professional educator certification. The evidence that this standard is met includes: (1) The preparing institution shall have a published set of criteria and competencies for exit from each professional education program, which are based on Chapter 49 (relating to academic standards and assessment) and professional educator program specific guidelines, and the following learning principles" .

➤ Recommendation #4

Current Requirement:

II. Induction Plan Requirements (page 5)

Induction plans must include among the following:

5. A description of how mentors were selected.

Recommended Revision:

A description of how mentors will be selected and trained, according comprehensive, state-wide, induction program standards for mentor selection and training.*

** Note: A task force comprised of representatives of public school constituencies (e.g., superintendents, teachers, etc.), educational policy experts (e.g., Educational Policy Leadership Center, etc.), higher education teacher preparation programs (e.g., PASSHE, etc.), and others should be established to develop comprehensive state-wide induction program standards for selection and training of mentors, centered on research-based models and best practices (Appendix A). Standards for selection and training of mentors may include: career ladder rank, teacher evaluation, past collaborative successes, leadership of adults, people-to-people interaction skills, principal recommendation, peer recommendation based upon observation of teaching, and years of experience, among others. Further, the mentor training should be designed to merit ACT 48 credit. The task force also should explore collaborative efforts for delivery of professional development with inductees by institutes of higher education in accordance with Title 22, Education Appendix I §354.26. Collaborative Programs (c).*

Supporting Research

"Effective teachers don't always know what it is about their teaching that is effective. Many mentors are also surprised to find that translating knowledge to students is not the same as translating knowledge to adults. High quality and ongoing training, as well as a professional learning community, are needed to help mentors develop the skills to identify and translate the elements of effective teaching to beginning teachers." (New Teacher Center, 2010)

"The mentor's knowledge of how to support new teachers and skill at providing guidance are also crucial" (Evertson & Smithey, 2000).

"Both sets of respondents believe principals should offer systematic, district-wide, professional development training throughout the first three years for new mentors and beginning teachers. District-wide training establishes common mentoring practices so novice teachers assigned new schools their second or third year have familiar mentoring experiences. Specifically, training is necessary in four areas: (1) observation techniques, (2) methods to identify classroom issues, (3) establishing expectations for the school year and (4) communicating these

expectations (Moir, 2003; Ingersoll and Smith, 2004; Wong, 2004; Boss, 2006; Alexander, 2007).

Nearly every study, program description or article we reviewed spoke to the critical need for mentor preparation and ongoing professional development. In fact, several asserted that the most significant component of any mentoring program is the quality of the mentor (Moir, 2000; Krull, 2005; Curran & Goldrick, 2002; Hoffmeyer, Millirim, & Eckstein, 2005; Suters & Kershaw, 2002; Howe, 2006; Brimijoin & Alouf, 2003). Other studies reported that even after mentor training, nearly 20% of the mentors felt that they could still use additional direction, support and resources to carry out their roles (Suters & Kershaw, 2002), which supports the need for ongoing mentor development. Simply having years of teaching experience, then, is insufficient either to be an effective mentor.

Appendix A

Teacher Induction Program Standards and Essential Components:

A Selected List of Research-Based Program Models

➤ **Beginning Teacher Support Program Standards/NC Standards for Mentors**

by the North Carolina Mentor Task Force
North Carolina Professional Standards Teaching Commission
Retrieved May 1, 2011 from <http://www.ncptsc.org/>

New Mentor Standards! At the January 2010 meeting, the North Carolina State Board of Education adopted the revised Beginning Teacher Support Program Standards and the North Carolina Standards for Mentors.

➤ **“Quality Induction: An Investment in Teachers”**

by Ellen Moir and Janet Gless
in *New Teacher Center – Launching the Next Generation*
Retrieved May 1, 2011 from <http://www.newteachercenter.org/articles.php?p=1> .

“Ideally, an investment in teacher quality starts at the earliest stages of a teacher's career and continues throughout a professional lifetime. The time has come for universities and schools, administrators, teachers, unions, and teacher educators to break set by coming together to build a comprehensive model of teacher development that begins in preservice and continues throughout a teacher's entire career. This work is about establishing system-wide norms and practices of professionalism, career-long learning, and inquiry into the practice of teaching.

In such systems, induction not only serves as an engine to drive educational reform but also offers veteran teachers new professional roles that capitalize on their wisdom and expertise. Mentoring a new teacher helps the veteran learn and grow as never before. The veteran teacher has a chance to step out of their classroom and observe in many different teaching situations. This broadens their perspective of effective teaching, allows them to put into words the expertise they have developed over their career, and gives them a chance to reflect on their own practice.

Thus, quality induction programs act as a catalyst for changing school cultures and improving the teaching profession. Powerful new models of teacher induction offer points of intersection where veterans and novices learn together as they reinvent the way teachers interact with one another. This kind of shared learning and collaboration is contagious. Hand in hand, mentors and their new teacher partners are leading school communities in providing high quality and equitable instruction for all students.”

NCTAF/GSU Induction Project (August 2008): *Final Report*

by Linda Black, John H. Neel, & Gwen Benson

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) and Georgia State University (GSU)

Retrieved May 1, 2011 from

http://www.nctaf.org/resources/research_and_reports/nctaf_research_reports/index.htm

“National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) and Georgia State University (GSU) developed a model for induction of new teachers in urban high need schools. This model has been funded by the Wachovia Foundation and implemented in high needs schools in metropolitan Atlanta. The goals of the model are to support new teachers with current technological aids, opportunities for professional development, and a supportive community that enhances teaching ability and careers. The expected outcomes of this support for teachers are a higher retention rate for teachers and increased student achievement. “

➤ **Quality Teacher Induction: “Fourth-Wave”(1997–2006) Induction Programs**

by Ann L. Wood, *California State University, Los Angeles*, and Randinevins Stanulis, Michigan State University

in *The New Educator*, 5:1–23, 2009

Copyright © The City College of New York

ISSN: 1549-9243 online

“The purpose of this essay is to describe quality teacher induction that has evolved from “fourth-wave” (1997–2006) teacher induction program development and research. A definition of quality induction is proposed, and a set of induction goals and components are outlined. Understandings gained from fourth-wave programs are described, including ways in which quality induction programs are delineated by their comprehensive systems of organized, educative mentor assistance, professional development, and formative assessment of novice teachers in their first-through-third years of teaching. More empirical studies are needed on the effects of induction on novice teacher performance and student achievement, and on subject-based and urban teacher induction.

➤ **MLRN's Recent “Mentorings”
Some Tentative Mentoring Program Standards**

by Raymond J. Dagenais

in *The Mentoring Leadership and Resource Network*.

Retrieved May 1, 2011 from

<http://www.mentors.net/03ocasspapers/mstandards.html>

“As we have come to understand more about teaching and learning in recent years, the responsibility of engaging would-be and practicing educators in the process of incorporating these ideas into their work has assumed renewed importance. One time-tested approach to this challenge is mentoring. However, “mentoring” means different things to different people. The information presented in

this article was collected through survey responses provided by mentoring program leaders. It was analyzed to identify critical dimensions of successful mentoring programs. Mentoring Program Standards were formulated using these critical dimensions as a foundation."

References

- Alexander, J. T. D. (2007). *Investigation of middle school principal's and novice teacher's attitudes and beliefs about mentoring programs*. Doctoral dissertation, University of St. Mary's, Minneapolis, MN.
- Alliance for Excellent Education (AEE). (2004). *Tapping the potential: Retaining and developing high-quality new teachers*. Washington, DC: Strumbos, D.
- Bartell, C. (2005). *Cultivating high-quality teaching through induction and mentoring*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Boss, S. (2006). "Effective practices in new teacher induction." *Principal's Research Review*, 1(1), 1-5.
- Brimijoin, K. & Alouf, J. (2003). *New dimensions for building expertise in mentoring and differentiation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans, Jan 24-27, 2003.
- Curran, B. & Goldrick L. (2002). *Mentoring and supporting new teachers*. Issue Brief. National Governors' Association, Washington, D.C. Center for Best Practices.
- Evertson, C., & Smithey, M. (2000). "Mentoring effects on protégés' classroom practice: An experimental field study." *Journal of Educational Research*, 93(5), 294–304.
- Fallon, D. (2003). *Case Study of a Paradigm Shift (The Value of Focusing On Instruction)*. Education Commission of the States.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change (3rd ed.)*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ganser, T. (1995). *Principles for mentor teacher selection*. *Clearing House*, 68(5), 307-308.
- Glazerman, S., Dolfen S., Bleeker M., Johnson A., Isenberg E., Lugo-Gil J., Grider M., & Britton E. "Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study." NCEE 2010-4028. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, 2010.
- Hoffmeyer, Milliren, & Eckstein (2005). "The Hoffmeyer mentoring activity checklist: Invitations to professional growth." *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, 11, 54-62.
- Howe, E.R. (2006). "Exemplary teacher induction: An international review." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(3), 287-297.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2004). "Do teacher induction and mentoring matter?" *NASSP Bulletin*, 88(638), 28–40.

Krull, E. (2005). "Mentoring as a means for supporting student and beginning teachers' practice-based learning." *Trames*, 9(59/54), 2, 143-158.

Moir, E. (2003). "Launching the next generation of teachers through quality induction." Paper presented to; *National Commission on Teaching and America's Future*, Denver, CO.

National Center for Education Statistics, *Progress Through the Teacher Pipeline: 1992-93 College Graduates and Elementary/Secondary School Teaching as of 1997* (U.S. Department of Education: Washington, D.C., 2000).

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, *No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America's Children* (Washington, D.C.: NCTAF, 2003): 24.

New Teacher Center (2010). *High quality mentoring and induction practices*. Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center.

Stanulis, R. N., Burrill, G., & Ames, K. (2007). "Fitting in and learning to teach: Tensions in developing a vision for a university-based induction program for beginning teachers." *Teacher Educator Quarterly* (online article, June 22).

Suters, L.A. & Kershaw, C. (2002). *Mentoring: Findings from a Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Chattanooga, TN, Nov. 6-8, 2002.

Sweeny, B. (2008). *Possible criteria for mentor selection*. Retrieved May 1, 2011 from <http://www.teachermentors.com/MselectCriteria.php>

Villar, A., Fletcher, S., & Strong, M. (2007, October). "Examining the relation between comprehensive mentoring for beginning teachers and student achievement in English language arts and math." Presented at the *National Commission on Teaching and America's Future Conference on the Induction of Science and Mathematics Teachers into Professional Learning Communities*: Racine, WI.

Wong, H. K. (2004). "Induction programs that keep new teachers teaching and improving." *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(638), 5-27.

Wood, A.L., & Stanulis, R. (2009). "Quality teacher induction: 'fourth wave' (1997-2006) induction programs." *The New Educator*, 5:1–23.