Analyzing State Policies and Programs for Beginning Teacher Induction: A Comprehensive Framework

Aubrey H. Wang
Alyson Tregidgo
Venus Mifsud
Analyzing State Policies and Programs for Beginning Teacher Induction:
A Comprehensive Framework

Aubrey H. Wang, Alyson Tregidgo, and Venus Mifsud

Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ

October 2002
Research Reports provide preliminary and limited dissemination of ETS research prior to publication. They are available without charge from:

Research Publications Office
Mail Stop 10-R
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541
Abstract
This study developed a framework for evaluating beginning teacher induction policies and programs. This framework consists of three main categories: 1) Legislation and Funding, 2) State, District, and Union Roles, and 3) Program Components. Comparison of these three categories reveals 1) the differences in priority states currently place on beginning teacher induction, 2) the extent of shared responsibilities between state and school districts on overseeing and evaluating the beginning teacher induction program, and 3) the extent of alignment between the beginning teacher induction program and state standards, between eligibility criteria and compensation for beginning teachers, and between the incentives used to attract qualified mentor teachers and the specified qualifications of these mentor teachers. Application of this framework to the current policy guidelines of sixteen heterogeneous states in terms of state activities in educational initiatives found that funded mandatory policies on beginning teacher induction: a) are less fragmented, b) have a stronger state role, c) are heterogeneous in their program features, d) have a narrower definition of what constitutes a beginning teacher, and e) generally provide stronger incentives for mentor teachers to participate.
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Introduction

As charged by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA) of 2001 and the Higher Education Act of 1998, state and local decision makers need to increase and retain qualified teachers. The NCLBA defines what it means to be a qualified teacher and requires all teachers in core academic subjects be highly qualified (with full state certification and solid content knowledge of the subjects they teach) by the end of the 2005-06 school year. In addition, the act requires public disclosure of the qualifications of teachers from state departments and public schools.

But fulfilling the requirements of the NCLBA will not be simple for educators and policymakers as teacher retention and teacher quality are both significant challenges in the United States. Even using a minimal standard for qualified teachers—those holding a college minor in the field in which they teach—the numbers of out-of-field teachers are striking; for instance, one third of all secondary school teachers of mathematics have neither a major nor a minor in mathematics (Ingersoll, 1999). Furthermore, a sizable proportion of teacher turnover occurs in the first three years of teaching, ranging from 20.3% to 22.6% nationally between the years 1987 to 1995 (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997).

With the mandated public disclosure of teachers’ professional qualifications, now is the time for state and local decision makers to review, revise, and redirect state policies on teacher education, induction, certification, professional development, and compensation in meeting the national imperative of increasing and retaining highly qualified teachers. Beginning teacher induction programs can be helpful in addressing both retention and quality issues (Gold, 1996; Britton, Raizen, Paine, & Huntley, 2001; Serpell & Bozeman, 1999). Thus, many states have initiated policies and programs that support such programs. This study develops and illustrates the use of a comprehensive framework as a tool for state policy and local decision makers to use in the evaluation of their policies and programs on beginning teacher induction. By using this framework, policymakers can analyze and compare the comprehensiveness and appropriateness of their policies and programs with other states and districts in meeting the goals of increasing teacher qualifications and retaining qualified teachers.
Background on Policies for Beginning Teacher Induction

The number of states providing some level of policy support for beginning teacher induction has grown significantly in the last 15 years. Prior to the 1980s, few programs supported beginning teacher induction. But since then, support for such programs has grown substantially, to a current count of 38 states with some kind of policy and/or program for beginning teacher induction (Hirsch, Koppich, & Knapp, 2001). However, overall, state and local decision makers have not fully realized the potential of policies and programs of this type. Despite evidence pointing to the positive impact of induction programs on teacher retention, most states’ programs and policies on induction have been initiated, expanded, reduced, restricted, or terminated over time depending on the availability of funding (National Commission on Teaching & America’s Future, 1996; Furtwengler, 1995). This has frequently resulted in policy guidelines that are a hodgepodge of suggestions and requirements and programs that are cobbled together from multiple state and local funding sources and are sometimes inadequately funded. It is worthwhile to examine an array of state policies and programs for beginning teacher induction in order to track trends, identify promising practices, and become more aware of the challenges and inconsistencies states are facing in implementing induction programs.

A New Framework for Evaluating Induction Policies and Programs

This study of selected states’ policy guidelines on beginning teacher induction programs develops an evaluation framework for state and local decision makers to review their policies on beginning teacher induction and how these policies may relate to other teacher preparation policies within their own state and how they compare to other states.

At the center of this project is the development of a framework for analysis of the major components of induction policies and programs based on previous research. We reviewed works by Sclan and Darling-Hammond (1992), Furtwengler (1995), Education Commission of the States (1999), Education Week (2000), and the American Federation of Teachers (2001). We pooled all the dimensions investigated by these studies and organized them into three main categories, with each containing multiple dimensions. This framework is more comprehensive than previous ones and is easier to use because the three main categories capture the most
important features of the policy environment and the subcategories and dimensions further break out important details that can impact the effectiveness of policy and programs.

The three main categories are: 1) legislation and funding; 2) state, district, and union roles; and 3) program components. We further broke down the last category, program components, into three subcategories to make this complex category more useful. The three subcategories are a) design features; b) beginning teacher support and resources; and c) roles for mentor teachers and other supporters. The last of these three subcategories is appropriate because a majority of beginning teacher induction programs utilize a mentor teacher model as one of the most important “agents” of learning for the new teacher. See Table 1 for an overview of the framework.

Legislation and funding is a key category because it provides an informative description of the legislation, funding level and source, and the current and future plans on linking the beginning teacher induction program to the state’s teacher certification process. A comparison across states on this main category reveals the difference in priority states are currently placing on beginning teacher induction programs.

State, district, and union roles is another key category as it provides detailed description of the responsibilities shared among the state agencies and district on overseeing and implementing beginning teacher induction programs. Additional information, such as required program evaluation and teacher union’s financial and verbal support are also included. Comparison across states on this category reveals the extent of shared responsibilities between state and school districts on overseeing, implementing, and evaluating beginning teacher induction programs.

The program components category provides detailed information on the beginning teacher induction program, from design features to beginning teachers and the mentor teachers. Due to the complexity of this category, it is broken down into three subcategories, including: design features, beginning teacher support and resources, and roles for mentor teachers and other support providers. Comparison across states on the design features subcategory reveals differences in the alignment between the beginning teacher induction program and activities and the state standards. Comparison across states on the beginning teacher supports and resources subcategory reveals differences in eligibility criteria and compensation for beginning teachers. Comparison across states on the roles for mentor teachers and other supporters subcategory reveals differences in how states attract qualified mentor teachers to participate in this program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation and funding</th>
<th>State, district, and union roles</th>
<th>Program components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Current and future status of the state guidelines on the specific beginning teacher induction program</td>
<td>• Key players and major activities of state’s involvement in overseeing and implementing the beginning teacher induction program</td>
<td>• Design features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total state funding and source of funding (including grants available from Title II) appropriated to the state’s beginning teacher induction program</td>
<td>• Key players and major activities of district’s involvement in overseeing and implementing the beginning teacher induction program</td>
<td>• Standards for teacher quality associated with the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current and future plans for linkage to teacher certification of the state’s beginning teacher induction program</td>
<td>• Key players, roles, and format of the evaluation process of the beginning teacher induction program</td>
<td>• Formal or informal nature of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Available financial support and/or verbal endorsement from the state teacher union(s) for the beginning teacher induction program</td>
<td>• Major activities of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Beginning teacher support and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eligibility criteria (teaching status and years of teaching experience) used to identify beginning teacher participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Status and amount of release time available to beginning teachers to participate in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Duration and minimum interaction time between beginning teachers and mentor teachers for the beginning teacher induction program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Roles for mentor teachers and other supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Selection criteria of and available training for mentor teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Availability and amount of stipend for mentor teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Availability and amount of release time for participation in program-related activities. Individuals other than mentor teachers from local schools and districts who assist the beginning teacher with program-related activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applying the Framework to a Sample of Sixteen States

As an illustration, the proposed framework was used in the review of current policy guidelines on beginning teacher induction of 16 selected states. This research team and the funding agency jointly decided on the selection of 16 states to include a heterogeneous mix of states in regard to the level of activity in enactment of policies on beginning teacher induction programs. We included states that have been bellwether states on teacher preparation policies, such as California (see Hirsch, Koppich, & Knapp, 2001) and North Carolina (Hirsch et al), and states that have been undergoing major changes in state policies, such as Virginia (Hirsch et al), Georgia (Hirsch, et al.; Blair, 2001b), Oklahoma (Hirsch et al.), Ohio (Hirsch et al.; Blair, 2001c), Iowa (Blair, 2001a), Michigan (Hirsch et al.), Florida (Sandham, 2001) and Texas (Blair, 2001d). Finally, we included a set of states (e.g., Idaho, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, New York, Vermont, and Wisconsin) that have been less visible, but represent an interesting cross-section of demographics and policies in education.

The remainder of this report will focus on the most interesting patterns we uncovered in our review of these 16 states’ policies and programs on beginning teacher induction in publicly available documents and research reports. We should note that our review was focused on the policies in place during the period between November 2001 and January 2002. It is possible that policies and programs have changed since the completion of our review.

Evaluating Legislation and Funding of State Policies

Not surprisingly, we found variations across states in their legislation and structure of beginning teacher induction programs. Comparing states on legislation and funding, we found differences in the priority placed on beginning teacher induction programs. Compared to the others, four states (California, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Virginia) place high priority on beginning teacher induction programs as they each appropriated millions of dollars to fund them. Among these four states, the lowest appropriated amount is Virginia’s $2.75 million and the highest appropriated amount is California’s $104.7 million. Oklahoma and North Carolina appropriated $3.1 million and $3.5 million respectively. This finding supports previous findings of inconsistent funding across states on beginning teacher programs (Hirsch et al., 2001; National Commission on Teaching & America’s Future, 1996; Furtwengler, 1995). These four states are, however, divided in the assistance or assessment nature of their beginning teacher
induction programs. For instance, Oklahoma and North Carolina link their beginning teacher induction programs to the state’s teacher certification process, demonstrating the assessment nature of these programs. On the other hand, California and Virginia’s beginning teacher induction programs are designed to assist beginning teachers and are not linked to the state’s teacher certification process. This has not changed from the 50-state survey conducted by the Education Commission of the States in 1999.

**Evaluating State, District, and Union Roles**

The main pattern that we found in our comparison in the state, district, and union roles category is that the guidelines of states with mandatory policies on beginning teacher induction programs revealed a stronger state role in overseeing and implementing the programs. These states tend to have at least one major state agency, such as the Department of Education, involved in the administration of the programs. Usually, more than one state agency works collaboratively with the Department of Education in the administration of these programs. For instance, California has two state agencies, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the Department of Education, jointly administer the beginning teacher induction program. Similarly, Oklahoma has two state agencies, the Department of Education and the Commission for Teacher Preparation, interacting with teacher education institutions and school districts in the administration and development of beginning teacher induction programs.

Compared to other states, these states with funded mandatory policies on beginning teacher induction programs have clearer descriptions of how states and local school districts share this responsibility in overseeing, implementing, and evaluating the beginning teacher induction programs. For instance, California’s Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Department collects information from all participants of the beginning teacher induction program using an online statewide survey. North Carolina’s Department of Public Instruction collects the annual reports from the local education agencies. Virginia’s State Board of Education collects ongoing evaluation information from local school boards.
Evaluating Program Components

**Design Features of Beginning Teacher Induction Programs**

When comparing states on the subcategory of beginning teacher induction program features, there is no clear pattern between the states that have mandatory policies on beginning teacher induction programs and those states that have other types of policies. Across the 16 states investigated, five states link their beginning teacher induction programs to at least one set of state standards. These standards may be state standards on teacher induction programs (e.g., California and Texas), standards for instructional personnel on learning and technology, other teacher standards (e.g., Virginia, Wisconsin, and Texas), and/or standards on domains of knowledge or learner-centered proficiencies (e.g., Ohio and Texas). One state, Florida, developed a pilot beginning teacher induction program based on standards developed by a foundation.

Only four (California, North Carolina, Ohio, and Iowa) of the 16 states reviewed have formal programs of beginning teacher induction with specified events and activities. These states may have mandatory or voluntary policies on beginning teacher induction programs. Another finding that supports the fragmented status of state policies on beginning teacher induction programs is the wide range of activities on each list. These activities range from developing an individual growth plan and preparing and completing a performance-based product (e.g., North Carolina) to learning classroom management, obtaining instructional resources, assessing students, and adjusting to teaching environments (e.g., Iowa). The fragmented nature of many beginning teacher induction programs has been described by the National Commission on Teaching & America’s Future (1996) and Hirsch et al. (2001).

**Beginning Teacher Supports and Resources**

The main pattern found among states on the beginning teacher support and resources subcategory is that those states with funded mandatory policies on beginning teacher induction programs have narrower inclusion criteria. For instance, to become eligible for the beginning teacher induction program in Virginia, one has to be a full-time teacher with less than one year of teaching experience. Eligibility requirements for the California beginning teacher induction program call for fully prepared teachers with less than two years of teaching experience. In contrast, the following eligibility criteria are noticeably more inclusive for states with
unsupported mandatory policies on beginning teacher induction programs: any teachers within first three years of teaching (Michigan), all teachers under categories 1, 2, and 3 with less than 3 years of teaching in the district (Idaho), and all full- and part-time regularly employed teachers and educational specialists engaged in initial teaching experience (Pennsylvania).

A possible explanation for narrower inclusion criteria is cost containment. A narrower definition, however, excludes alternatively prepared teachers who comprise a large part of the teaching force in some states (SRI International, 2001).

**Roles for Mentor Teachers and Other Supporters**

The main pattern found in the subcategory of roles for mentor teachers and other supporters is that states with funded mandatory policies on beginning teacher induction programs provide clearer financial and/or further education incentives to mentor teachers. For instance, North Carolina is willing to train and compensate mentor teachers up to $1,100. Oklahoma supports up to $500 per mentor teacher. In contrast, Idaho and Pennsylvania, two states with unsupported mandatory policies on beginning teacher induction, offer some training but no financial support for mentor teachers. This conclusion supports the findings from a 50-state survey conducted by the American Federation of Teachers (2001).

**Using the Framework to Assess Key Aspects of Beginning Teacher Induction Programs**

The No Child Left Behind Act requires states and school districts to think critically about their policies and practices with regard to teacher retention and quality. State and local decision makers can use this framework to (1) evaluate the overall cohesiveness and appropriateness of their own policies on beginning teacher induction; (2) make comparisons to other states’ approaches, track trends, and identify promising practices; and (3) become more aware of the challenges and inconsistencies states are facing in implementing beginning teacher induction programs.

By using the categories, subcategories and dimensions of the framework, policymakers and practitioners can gain an idea of the areas to consider in establishing or revising policies or programs. The framework and the information from our review of 16 states also will shed light on the relationships between such elements as funding, program design, and connection to state certification requirements.
Table 2 on Legislation and Funding can be used to determine the adequacy of support for the legislated policy on beginning teacher induction and potential sources for additional funding. Policymakers can use this table to compare their current and future plans for linking beginning teacher induction programs to the teacher certification process to plans in other states.
## Table 2

**Legislation and Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Program name</th>
<th>Future plan</th>
<th>Total state funding</th>
<th>Source for funding</th>
<th>Linkage to teacher certification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104.7 million for FY 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Mentor Teacher School Program (MTSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1 million for FY 2001-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Mentor Teacher Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.25 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 2+ evaluations in each contract year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Beginning Teacher Mentoring and Induction Program</td>
<td>Becomes mandatory on July, 1, 2003</td>
<td>$2.4 million for FY 2001-02</td>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>New Teacher Induction/Teacher Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Minnesota New Teacher Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1 million for FY 2000-01</td>
<td>Competitive grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Mentor-Teacher Internship Program</td>
<td>Becomes mandatory 2004-05</td>
<td>$5 million for FY 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Program name</th>
<th>Future plan</th>
<th>Total state funding</th>
<th>Source for funding</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Beginning Teacher Induction Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
<td>FY 1997-98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evaluation of performance-based product leads to licensure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Entry Year Program/Ohio First</td>
<td>Full implementation expected in 2002</td>
<td>$4.6 million allotted in FY 01-02. Propose $30.7 million for FY 2002-03</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tied to obtaining an initial professional teaching license.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>The Residential Teacher Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.1 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Upon completion, program certification is awarded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Must participate to receive next level of certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Texas Beginning Educator Support System (TxBESS)</td>
<td>If available, varied amount per district by number of teachers and type of teaching permit. No total amount given.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Program name</td>
<td>Future plan</td>
<td>Total state funding</td>
<td>Source for funding</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Required to have a mentoring system by September 2002</td>
<td>$3.2 million</td>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.75 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected to fully implement the Teacher Education Program and Licenses in 2004</td>
<td>$3.1 million available</td>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Participation in program part of a three stage licensure system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 presents State, District, and Union Roles. State and local decision makers can use this table to determine the extent and type of responsibilities shared by stakeholders in designing, implementing, and evaluating beginning teacher induction programs. With greater public scrutiny on teacher qualifications, a well thought out division of shared responsibilities among state, district, and union, may facilitate the production of accurate and timely information.

Table 4a presents the Design Features of the beginning teacher induction programs. This table can be used to evaluate the alignment of the beginning teacher induction programs with other state and local level educational goals. These goals are often expressed as teaching and learning standards. By comparing the nature of the activities in the beginning teacher induction program against these educational standards, state and local decision makers can pinpoint specific activities that are not in alignment.

Table 4b focuses on Beginning Teacher Support. It can be used to determine if the inclusion criteria are appropriate for identifying the beginning teachers who are in need of support. For instance, in states with alternative certification programs, the inclusion criteria for beginning teacher programs should include those alternatively trained beginning teachers. If inclusion criteria are written too broadly, however, it is possible that there will be inadequate resources to spread among all teachers. This table also allows examination of the adequacy of the structural resources provided to beginning teachers. In order to fully participate in a formal induction program, both beginning teachers and mentor teachers need release time from other duties. Furthermore, state and local decision makers can evaluate the adequacy of the program duration in achieving the intended goals.

Table 4c, addressing Roles of Mentor Teachers and Other Supporters, can be used to evaluate the recruitment, selection, training, and support of mentor teachers and other similar professionals. Mentor teachers need to have incentives for wanting to participate in the beginning teacher induction program. These incentives can include stipends, release time, and or further training. State and local decision makers can use this table to determine the appropriateness of the desired qualifications for mentor teachers. They can also use this table to determine the adequacy of the training and supervision provided to mentors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Key players</th>
<th>Major activities</th>
<th>District role</th>
<th>Program evaluation</th>
<th>Union role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), Dept. of Ed. (DOE)</td>
<td>CTC &amp; DOE administer the Beginning Teacher Support &amp; Assessment (BTSA).</td>
<td>Local school district (LSD), county offices of education (COE), institutes of higher education (IHE)</td>
<td>BTSA uses evaluation to inform local programs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>State program director (SPD)</td>
<td>SPD oversees pilot sites. State contributes to evaluation, supports local districts, assists in securing funds, &amp; allocates funds.</td>
<td>Local school district (LSD), superintendent</td>
<td>LSDs implement standards, involve superintendent, annually self-audit, develop &amp; collect data.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
### Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Key players</th>
<th>Major activities</th>
<th>Key players</th>
<th>Major activities</th>
<th>Key players</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Endorsement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Dept. of Ed. (DOE)</td>
<td>DOE receives info regarding participation of Beginning &amp; mentor teachers.</td>
<td>Local school district (LSD), school based committee (SBC)</td>
<td>LSDs develop written plan of operation, report to DOE, verify requirements are being met, evaluates program, &amp; appoints SBC. SBC selects mentors &amp; accounts for funds.</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Reports on program effectiveness submitted to DOE.</td>
<td>Annual, Summative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Dept. of Ed. (DOE)</td>
<td>DOE formulates guidelines, approves programs, &amp; establishes procedures for submission &amp; approval of programs.</td>
<td>Local school district (LSD)</td>
<td>LSDs provide administrative &amp; supervisory support, mentoring, peer assistance, &amp; professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State role</th>
<th>District role</th>
<th>Program evaluation</th>
<th>Union role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Major activities</td>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Major activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Dept. of Ed. (DOE), Board of Ed. (BOE)</td>
<td>DOE coordinates programs. BOE adopts rules for program approval &amp; reports on progress of program.</td>
<td>Local school boards (LSB), Local school district (LSD)</td>
<td>LSBs provide program. LSDs develop &amp; submit program plan, prepares plans for each new teacher, &amp; engages board-appointed facilitator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Dept. of Ed. (DOE)</td>
<td>DOE monitors each district &amp; verifies new teachers receive sufficient mentoring &amp; professional development.</td>
<td>Local school district (LSD), institutes of higher education (IHE), teacher union (TU)</td>
<td>LSDs w/IHEs &amp; TBGs develop operational guidelines for implementing mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Board of Teaching (BOT), Commission of Children, Family, &amp; Learning (CCFL)</td>
<td>BOT establishes &amp; oversees programs &amp; provides resources &amp; assistance to new programs. CCFL approves programs.</td>
<td>Local school district (LSD)</td>
<td>LSDs submit plan to CCFL for approval &amp; report to BOT on program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Major activities</td>
<td>District role</td>
<td>Key players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Local school district (LSD),</td>
<td>LSDs define program outcomes, participant roles, &amp; activities. Coordinator</td>
<td>Local education agency (LEA), local school board</td>
<td>Dept. of Public Instruction (DPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinator</td>
<td>oversees program.</td>
<td>(LSB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Board of Ed. (BOE), Joint</td>
<td>BOE reports to JLOC impact of program on retention of teachers.</td>
<td>Local school districts (LSD), lead mentor</td>
<td>DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Legislature Oversight Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(JLOC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Dept. of Ed. (DOE), Commission</td>
<td>DOE &amp; CTP administer &amp; develop programs. BOE approves them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Teacher Preparation (CTP),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Ed. (BOE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State role</th>
<th>District role</th>
<th>Program evaluation</th>
<th>Union role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Major activities</td>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Major activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Dept. of Ed. (DOE), Board of Ed. (BOE)</td>
<td>BOE sets criteria for program approval. DOE approves programs.</td>
<td>Local school (LS), local school district (LSD), induction council</td>
<td>LS submits program plan for approval. LSDs fund, develop, monitor, &amp; evaluate programs. Council helps to develop &amp; operate program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Virginia    | Board of Ed. (BOE) | BOE established guidelines for programs & serves as fiscal agent for participating school boards. | Local school board (LSB) | LSBs administer program, define roles, develop mentor training program, create evaluation plan, & allocate resources. | Ongoing evaluation | | | | | | | (Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State role</th>
<th>District role</th>
<th>Program evaluation</th>
<th>Union role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Major activities</td>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Major activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local school (LS), local school district (LSD)</td>
<td>LSs &amp; LSDs apply for grants &amp; provide initial educators with induction program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Link to standards</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Based on the <em>Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs</em></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Varies; there are around 145 beginning teacher induction programs under the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Based on the Teacher Advancement Program proposed by Milken Family Foundation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Classroom management, obtaining instructional resources, planning and organizing instruction, assessing student progress, effective teaching methods, dealing with individual student needs, communicating with parents, adjusting to teaching environment and role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Knowledge of community, classroom management, parent interaction, alignment of curriculum, classroom diversity, networking, knowledge of teacher evaluation, use of volunteers, time management, how to use resources, knowledge of legal issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Development of individual growth plan, preparation, completion of performance-based product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Based on <em>Ohio’s Standards on Knowledge About the Domains and Criteria</em> and the framework for teaching as described in <em>Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching</em> (Danielson, 1996)</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Training of program administrators and mentors, materials for beginning teachers and mentors to guide them through analyzing the teaching practice of the beginning teacher, specific criteria for what constitutes good teaching, description of levels of accomplished teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Link to standards</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Orientation to community and to school policies, professional responsibilities, teacher development, classroom management, instructional delivery, student assessment, engaging students, working with students and parents, personal skills (time management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Based on Texas Beginning Educator Support System (TxBESS) Performance Standards, Texas Learner-Centered Proficiencies, and Texas Beginning Educator Support System Standards</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Beginning teacher induction program must incorporate the Standards of Learning and Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Based on the 10 Teacher Standards</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Understands subject matter, children's broad range of ability, adapting instruction, instructional strategies, individual and group motivation, and formal and informal assessment and also effectively uses verbal and nonverbal communication, organizes and plans systematic instruction, fosters relationships, and is a reflective practitioner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Teaching status</td>
<td>Years of teaching experience</td>
<td>Eligibility criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Fully prepared teachers</td>
<td>With less than 2 years experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>With fewer than 3 years experience or identified as in need of help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>With less than 3 years experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Teacher under category 1, 2, or 3 contract</td>
<td>With less than 3 years experience at the school district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Initial provisional certified and classroom teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Any teacher</td>
<td>With less than 3 years experience, including school counselors, librarians, and speech pathologists who are new to the profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>With less than 2 years experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>With less than 1 year experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Initially certified teachers</td>
<td>With less than 3 years experience in initial license area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
Table 4b (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Eligibility criteria</th>
<th>Release time</th>
<th>Program length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Teacher With 0 years experience</td>
<td>Yes Unspecified</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Every teacher With 0 years experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year 72 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>All full and part-time regularly employed teachers and educational specialists Engaged in their initial teaching experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Teachers With less than 2 years experience</td>
<td>Yes Recommended</td>
<td>2 years 30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Teacher With less than 1 year full-time experience or a teacher who is not performing at an acceptable level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Teacher who is licensed in a level or category for the first time and have successfully completed an approved program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4c

*Roles of Mentor Teachers and Other Supporters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Selection criteria</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Stipend Availability</th>
<th>Stipend Amount</th>
<th>Release time Availability</th>
<th>Release time Amount</th>
<th>Support team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree, full certification, 5 years teaching experience, NBPTS certification (or selected as teacher of the year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Teacher Support certification, 3 years teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Full certification, 4 years teaching experience</td>
<td>Training available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$500 minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5 years teaching experience</td>
<td>Ongoing training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Special consideration to NBPTS certified teachers</td>
<td>Prep courses provided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Preference to career status teachers and those with 24+ hours mentor training</td>
<td>Training available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,100 maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor, principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Initial and ongoing training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Selection criteria</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Stipend</th>
<th>Release time</th>
<th>Support team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Minimum 2 years experience as a certified classroom teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Mentor, school administrator, faculty member from college or university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Recommended certification in the same subject area/grade level as beginning teacher</td>
<td>Training available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals, mentors, inductees, other support people as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Experienced teacher, mentor, principal, representative from teacher program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Continuous contract status, 3 years teaching experience</td>
<td>Training available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Teacher of same subject &amp; grade level (who is not the mentor), administrator, &amp; higher education representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

In conclusion, policymakers in many states have initiated policies on beginning teacher induction programs in response to the need for creating an adequate cadre of qualified teachers. Policymakers realize that beginning teacher induction programs have the potential to help retain teachers and improve teaching quality. However, due to uneven implementation across states and within states (frequently due to funding issues), the full potential of beginning teacher induction programs is yet to be realized. With the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1998 and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, renewed hope exists for beginning teacher induction programs as a viable approach to improve teacher pipeline issues. However, only with carefully crafted, adequately funded policies that support thoughtfully designed programs can we expect to see the full effect of beginning teacher induction programs. We hope that the framework and the data presented in this paper can be a useful tool in analyzing and improving policies and programs related to beginning teacher induction.
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