THE QUALITY OF STATE MANDATED MENTORING AND THE IMPACT ON PROVISIONAL TEACHERS

by

McKell S. Withers

A clinical research study submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Department of Educational Leadership and Policy

University of Utah

December 2005

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH GRADUATE SCHOOL

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a dissertation submitted by

McKell S. Withers

This dissertation has been read by each member of the following supervisory committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

4/20/04 — Chair: Gary M. Crow

4/20/04 — Diana G. Pounder

4/20/04 — David J. Sperry

4/20/04 — Danny Talbot

4/20/05 — Dale Baker

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH GRADUATE SCHOOL

FINAL READING APPROVAL

To the Graduate Council of the University of Utah:

I have read the dissertation of McKell S. Withers in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographic style are consistent and acceptable; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the supervisory committee and is ready for submission to The Graduate School.

7/29/2005
Date

Gary M. Crow
Chair: Supervisory Committee

Approved for the Major Department

Diana G. Pounder
Chair/Dean

Approved for the Graduate Council

David S. Chapman
Dean of The Graduate School

ABSTRACT

The State of Utah requires mentoring for all provisional teachers in the state. The provisional years of teaching (first 3 years) are essentially the first and best opportunity for the school district to reinforce and help develop good and successful teaching behaviors and strategies. The school district participating in this study typically hires over 200 new teachers each year. All provisional teachers and principals were surveyed to answer the primary and auxiliary research questions focused on the elements, qualities, and characteristics of mentoring relationships within the district.

From the responses of the provisional teachers, the findings of this clinical research study include the following: Only 55% of the provisional teachers are working in an assignment consistent with the expectations of Utah law; a majority of provisional teachers (56%) have met 10 or fewer times during the 2001-2002 school year with their assigned mentor; 48% of the provisional teachers have not received any formal mentoring; 49% of the provisional teachers have never been observed by their assigned mentor and 45% have never had their mentor demonstrate a teaching method; there is a significant positive correlation between the perception of receiving help and support from an assigned mentor and staying in the profession of teaching; elementary and first year provisional teachers are more likely to be assigned a mentor than secondary or second and third year provisional teachers; and the "ideal" mentor is portrayed as caring, supportive, honest, friendly, and professional, with the knowledge, skills, and confidence to be

helpful and available when needed. Principals report that 25% of the assigned mentors receive no formal training with 99% receiving 10 hours or fewer of any formal mentor preparation. Recommendations from this study include designing and implementing teacher preparation programs, school induction processes, and ongoing professional development priorities that are coordinated and collaboratively implemented by universities and school districts with a singleness of purpose. An argument is made relative to recognizing that if mentoring is to be used as any part of a long-range reform strategy for better teaching, more attention needs to be paid to identifying effective teachers to become mentors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank all of those who strive to become thoughtful public school educators and positive role models for our young people. You daily provide opportunities for students to learn and grow in a free society that is the envy of the rest of the world. I appreciate the faculty and staff of the College of Education at the University of Utah who continue to help future teachers and leaders see what is possible and work toward establishing better practice; and, submit the final written product (thanks Marilynn). I especially thank my family (eternal thanks to Hollie) for their love, support, encouragement, and sacrifice to help this public school educator to become better prepared to serve children.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The State of Utah requires mentoring for all provisional teachers in the state. As an unfunded mandate in the educator evaluation law, the state expects all beginning teachers to be assigned a mentor that

> shall assist the provisional educator to become effective and competent in the teaching profession and school system, but may not serve as an evaluator of the provisional educator. Where possible, the mentor shall be a career educator who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional educator and has at least three years of educational experience. (Utah Code 53A-10-108)

Often, new teachers are assigned to the neediest students in schools with the least resources. The provisional years of teaching (first 3 years) are essentially the first and best opportunity for the school district to reinforce and help develop good and successful teaching behaviors and strategies. After the provisional period ends, the levels of support and evaluation decrease and the obstacles for correcting poor practice and/or terminating a poor teacher increase. Research has found that mentors have a positive impact on teacher retention, but there is no generalized understanding of what mentors should do (assist, assess, or both), what they actually do (training and how time is spent with the provisional teacher), and what beginning teachers learn as a result of being with a mentor (chosen or assigned mentor and what was modeled and practiced).

The school district participating in this study typically hires over 200 new teachers each year. The Board of Education has five primary long-range objectives of which to "improve educator quality and effectiveness" is one. Two "indicators of success" in meeting this objective include "continuous monitoring of educator performance" and "increased support for new teachers." All provisional teachers and principals were surveyed to answer the primary and auxiliary research questions focused on the elements, qualities, and characteristics of mentoring relationships within the district.

From the responses of the provisional teachers, the findings of this clinical research study include the following:

- only 55% of the provisional teachers are working in an assignment consistent with the expectations of Utah law;
- a majority of provisional teachers (56%) have met 10 or fewer times during the 2001-2002 school year with their assigned mentor;
- 48% of the provisional teachers have not received any formal mentoring;
- 49% of the provisional teachers have never been observed by their assigned mentor and 45% have never had their mentor demonstrate a teaching method;
- there is a significant positive correlation between the perception of receiving help and support from an assigned mentor and staying in the profession of teaching;
- elementary and first year provisional teachers are more likely to be assigned a mentor than secondary or second and third year provisional teachers;

- provisional teachers received the highest quality of help and support from their mentors relative to general school operations and procedures, classroom management, and trying new ideas and methods;
- elementary teachers were significantly more likely to discuss *curriculum selection* and *new ideas and methods* with their assigned mentor than secondary teachers;
- the "ideal" mentoring relationship would include communication that is open, confidential, supportive, and purposeful;
- the "ideal" mentor is portrayed as caring, supportive, honest, friendly, and professional, with the knowledge, skills, and confidence to be helpful; and,
- the "ideal" mentor needs to be available when needed.

Principals report that 25% of the assigned mentors receive no formal training with 99% receiving 10 hours or fewer of any formal mentor preparation. Principals prioritize who they believe to be "the best teacher" when assigning mentors, yet report that only 41% (elementary level) and 48% (secondary level) of those assigned as mentors are viewed as "master teachers." With only two formal observations required to evaluate provisional teachers, most principals (58%) believe that the evaluation process is "adequate."

Recommendations from this study include designing and implementing teacher preparation programs, school induction processes, and ongoing professional development priorities that are coordinated and collaboratively implemented by universities and school districts with a singleness of purpose. An argument is made relative to recognizing that if mentoring is to be used as any part of a long-range reform strategy for better teaching,

more attention needs to be paid to identifying effective teachers to become mentors. With regards to teacher evaluation, it is recommended that all teachers be fully engaged in the formative evaluation processes of their work. Principals need to spend time preparing mentor teachers to be thoughtful observers, formative evaluators, and caring role models. Careful attention needs to be paid to the consequences of actions and inactions associated with ignoring unfunded mandates such as assigning mentors to provisional teachers. Resources need to be aligned to district goals and objectives or the problems associated with unfunded mandates are exasperated even further.

EXECUTIVE REPORT

Introduction

Preparing, selecting, and retaining good teachers is a challenge with many complex variables. There are healthy debates concerning the preservice training of teachers, the selection of teachers, the induction of teachers, the evaluation of teachers, the on-going training and support of teachers, and the retention of teachers. These phases of a teacher's preparation and work become even more complex when carefully studied to try and find the "right formulas" for either "finding" or "creating" a good teacher. It seems that the desire to be a good teacher is at least as important as any natural abilities to teach. Academic background and mastery is important, but only becomes dynamic if the teacher can convey such knowledge to students with effective and differentiated instructional practices. The evaluation of teaching technique is easier than the evaluation of the impact of any particular technique on a particular student. The perceived "best" teacher for one learner may be viewed as the "worst" teacher for another.

After selecting the best possible candidate to become a teacher, the first few years of teaching provide an opportunity, described as a "provisional" employment period for their first 3 years, for training, support, evaluation, correction of poor performance, reinforcement of good practice, and career decision making. Training in the cultural expectations of the organization (e.g., school and district), the techniques of good instruction, and providing for the personal/professional development of the new teacher

are all essential. Support and reinforcement from peers, administrators, parents, and students will affect the beginning teacher's development of strategies and talents that will likely last throughout their career. Thoughtful, thorough, and appropriate evaluation of the new teacher could provide data to support and/or correct various teaching behaviors. Career decision making, whether to strive to become the best possible teacher for 20 to 30 years or to seek other alternatives, will be determined within the first few years of teaching. For better or worse, the habits and practices developed in those first few years will become the roots for career long choices and behaviors in the classroom.

It is a fairly common practice throughout the United States (over 30 states require such) to "assign" a "mentor" for the beginning teacher (Bolich, 2001). This mentor becomes responsible, at some level, for the on-going support and training of the new teacher. Attention to this assignment and the characteristics of the mentor-novice relationship are critical issues for schools and districts to prioritize. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) found that mentored teachers tend to be more effective earlier in their career (focused on student learning) and are more likely to stay in the teaching profession.

This study analyzes the qualities and implications of teacher mentoring within a large urban/suburban school district in Utah. Over 500 teachers within this district are in their first 3 years of teaching. The state of Utah requires mentoring for provisional teachers (during their 3-year provisional status period) as a part of the state's educator evaluation law (Utah Code, Title 53A. State System of Public Education, Chapter 10. Educator Evaluation). These mentors are excluded by statute from participating in the evaluation of the new teacher, yet there are clear expectations, both explicit and implicit,

that the mentor will help the neophyte become a successful "career educator." By primarily focusing on the perceptions of the provisional teachers relative to their assigned mentors, the collected data can be used to inform practice in terms of the successes and limitations of mentoring, as well as the perceived qualities of assigned mentors. The quality, training, and expectations of the mentors, and the resulting experiences of the novice teachers to whom they are assigned, are critical issues for thoughtful investigation. The perceptions of the beginning teachers relative to their mentors (both assigned and informal) constitute the reality of the practices within this particular large urban/suburban public school district.

The U.S. Department of Education estimates that over 2 million teachers will be hired in the next decade (Cutlip & Shockley, 2000). This does not include any efforts to add more teachers to reduce current class sizes. An abundant amount of research confirms the anecdotal evidence and long held common sense belief that aside from early childhood experiences in the home, good teaching is the single most important factor in determining student achievement (Grosso de Leon, 2001). Teacher preparation and teacher selection are critical to ensure that capable teachers are available for our children.

The literature on beginning teachers and teacher induction suggests that the first few years of teaching establishes career-long habits for the teacher (Grant & Murray, 1999). These "habits" directly relate to the perceived and measurable effectiveness of the teacher. If assigned mentors are representative of what the district/school/principal expects of good teachers, then the relationship between beginning teachers and their mentors has both immediate and long-range implications for the new teacher, the young

people they teach, and the school district.

Problem

In 1988, the Utah Legislature enacted expectations and procedures for teacher evaluations and required "provisional and probationary educators" to be evaluated "at least twice each school year" (UCA 53A-10-104). Provisional educator means "any educator employed by a school district who has not achieved status as a career educator within the school district." The minimum provisional time period was extended from 2 to 3 years beginning July of 2000. To assist provisional educators, the code also requires the assignment of a mentor "who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional educator and has at least 3 years of educational experience. The mentor shall assist the provisional educator to become effective and competent in the teaching profession and school system, but may not serve as an evaluator of the provisional educator." The principal or immediate supervisor of a provisional educator "shall assign a mentor to the provisional educator" (UCA 53A-10-108).

Effective April 30, 2001, the law was amended to replace the earlier term "consulting educator" with "mentor" and to further define the mentor's responsibility by substituting "effective and competent in" for "informed about" the teaching profession and school system. These provisions are all a part of the "Educator Evaluation" chapter in the state statute. Also in the code, a "legislative findings" statement is provided to clarify legislative intent. "The Legislature recognizes that the quality of public education can be improved and enhanced by providing for systematic, fair, and competent evaluation of public educators and remediation of those whose performance is inadequate." Further the

> desired purposes of evaluation are to allow the educator and the school district to promote the professional growth of the teacher, to identify and encourage *teaching strategies (part of the 2001 amendment replacing 'teacher behaviors')* which contribute to student progress, to identify teachers according to their abilities, and to improve the education system. (53A-10-101)

Studies have documented the need for evaluation, continued training, and a provisional period of time in which additional help and support are needed for the beginning teacher (WestEd, 2000). The assigned mentor may or may not be of help to the beginning teacher. In the large urban/suburban school district participating in this study, as well as the state as a whole, there has been little, if any, systematic evaluation of the mentoring practices used, the effects of mentoring on beginning teacher performance (especially in terms of provisional teacher evaluations), nor the efforts to insure that each new teacher has a good teacher assigned to them as a mentor.

Research Questions

The six primary research questions evolved from the literature, the requirements of state law, and the observations of practice with provisional teachers. The auxiliary research question provides for the collection of additional data needed to inform practice relative to the perceptions of the provisional teachers and the administrative assignment of mentor teachers.

Primary Research Questions

- How do provisional teachers describe the elements, qualities, and characteristics of their formal assigned mentoring relationships?
- How do provisional teachers assess the effectiveness of their formal

mentoring relationships?

- Are there informal mentoring relationships between the provisional teacher and other unassigned mentors that are perceived by the provisional teacher as helping guide their teaching career and classroom practice?
- How do formal mentoring relationships differ by level (elementary school, junior high school, and high school)?
- How do formal mentoring relationships differ by number of provisional teaching years (first, second, and third)?
- Which elements, qualities, and characteristics of formal mentoring relationships can be used to differentiate between effective and ineffective mentoring relationships?

Auxiliary Research Question

- How do principals perceive their role of assigning mentors, their assessment of the quality of the assigned mentors, their assessment of the provisional teachers working in their school, and their characterization of the provisional teacher evaluation process?

Significance

Often, new teachers are assigned to the neediest students in schools with the least resources. This pattern will comprise the majority of the teaching force in our country over the next decade (Weiss & Weiss, 1999). Induction programs that include sustained feedback in collaborative settings have been demonstrated to be valuable in retaining these new teachers as well as preparing them to become the next generation of mentors.

How the current mentoring relationships and practices are perceived by provisional teachers is the focal point of this clinical research study, along with a critical look at the principals' assignment of mentors to provisional teachers and the effects of mentoring on beginning teacher performance and retention.

A Tennessee study (Sanders & Rivers, 1996) documented equally matched (in math achievement) second graders can be separated by as much as fifty percentile points by the time they reach fifth grade. Reviewing this study, Daniel Fallon (2001), the Carnegie Corporation's Chair of the Education Division, stated that "there is only one variable that can persuasively explain the large systematic difference in student achievement, and it is the quality of the teacher" (p. 2).

The first 3 provisional years of teaching are essentially the first and best opportunity to reinforce and help develop effective and successful teaching behaviors and strategies. After the provisional period ends, the level of support and evaluation decreases, and the obstacles for correcting poor practice and/or terminating a poor teacher increase. Many career-long habits are formed during these first few years that either limit or enhance the teacher's ability to positively influence their students.

If good role models are available (mentors that could be assigned), attention to finding ways to enhance the relationship between beginning teachers and their mentors is critical. If the assigned mentors add to the challenges faced by beginning teachers rather than help address them, a system should be in place to identify and correct such problems.

The district participating in this study typically hires over 200 teachers each year; the majority of this number being first time regular classroom teachers. A recent look at retention rates with the beginning teachers in this school district (Dickson, 2000) found

that 28% leave teaching before completing their third year in the classroom. Some efforts have been piloted to enhance the quality of mentoring within the district, with some anecdotal evidence that the provisional teachers at least appreciate those efforts. Even with this increased district attention relative to the mentoring processes for first year teachers, there is no systematic approach to mentoring for all three provisional teaching years, nor system-wide performance standards for provisional teacher evaluations. The findings of this study provide data to positively influence both policy and practice relative to provisional teacher support from assigned mentors, retention of beginning teachers, and evaluation processes for new teachers.

Literature Review

The primary bodies of research reviewed for this study came from the literature on mentoring, teacher induction, and teacher mentoring. A more detailed review of the literature is presented in Appendix A. A brief introduction to each of the three general areas is presented here along with a description as to how each area relates to the problems and questions in this study.

Mentoring

The first "Mentor" was a trusted friend of Odysseus who educated, watched over, and cared for Odysseus' son Telemachus. This 20-year relationship between Mentor and Telemachus is described in Homer's epic story *The Odyssey*. So influential was this character that we continue to use the term "mentor" to define our trusted counselors, guides, coaches, or role models for which we give credit to influencing, perhaps even directing, our lives. Few people will ever have life-long mentors who approach the level

of interaction characterized in the Mentor-Telemachus relationship. Most of us will be influenced and socialized by many different people that we presume to have more experience and thus the ability to help us learn from that experience.

Mentors can play many different roles as they "guide" their charge. The descriptive term *protégé,* comes from the French term *protegere,* meaning one who is protected or trained or whose career is furthered by a person of experience, prominence, or influence. These mentor-protégé relationships can be described in many different ways. Odell (1990) used the work of others to differentiate between the various roles that mentors play: the trusted guide (Homer); the teacher (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978); the sponsor (Schein, 1978); the challenger (Daloz, 1983); and the confidant (Gehrke & Kay, 1984).

Mentor-protégé relationships. With various mentor-protégé relationships comes the question of whether or not these relationships are beneficial and to whom. The answer can be either, depending on the motivation and circumstances of the relationship. Muse, Wasden, and Thomas (1988) found that mentors may have personal agendas to follow that could be working against the best interests of others. If the mentor is more focused on prestige or status than helping and guiding, the protégé will not likely benefit from the relationship. Mentoring relationships can also be based on control and protection (Daresh & Playko, 1993). The mentor can limit the protégé's growth and development by distorting and/or controlling information and experiences. Mentoring may limit experience and understanding if the mentor is so entrenched in a particular style or approach as to ignore or avoid opportunities to help the protégé make his or her own decisions and/or solve his or her own problems. The perception of the mentor as either

expert or incompetent can lead to the generalization that all mentors have either no real answers or all right answers. Understanding that all mentors have strengths and weaknesses is important for the protégé. Mentoring can create an unhealthy dependency on the mentor. The protégé must be able to make reasonable decisions and take reasonable actions without the constant approval of the mentor. Mentoring can eliminate other perspectives. Hart (1993) argued that veteran mentors can limit innovation and virtually guarantee the reproduction of existing roles rather than supporting new roles.

If there were not benefits from mentoring relationships, they would not be so important to us. Mentors feel important and needed by both the protégé and the organization they belong to (i.e., company, institution, group, etc.). Mentors become more enthused about their work as they pass along important information to the protégé (Grant & Murray, 1999). Mentors gain new insights as questions are asked by the protégé and/or observations are made relative to the protégé's experiences (Intrator, 2002). Mentors benefit from the long-lasting relationships, and often friendships, formed with the protégé (Woodward, 1996). Being a mentor leads to the desire to continue being a mentor (Crow & Matthews, 1998) and thus the continuation of the benefits listed above.

Protégés gain greater insight into their own beliefs and priorities. They learn the expectations of the organization in a relatively protected way. They are filled with observations, insights, suggestions, and warnings from the mentor. In addition to these three somewhat universal benefits for the protégé, Crow and Matthews (1998) found that beginning school administrators also benefitted by their exposure to new ideas and creativity, their visibility with key personnel, their protection from damaging situations, their opportunities for challenging and risk-taking activities, their increased confidence

and competence, and finally their improved reflection of their own practice.

Functions of mentoring. In addition to the limitations and benefits of mentoring, there are functions of mentoring. Kram (1985) found two functions of mentoring in the corporate world: the career function and the psychosocial function. The career function focuses on learning the expectations of the workplace along with the career opportunities. These functions relate directly to aid in career advancement. The psychosocial function describes the development of individuals in their social environment. These functions affect the role identity of the individual on a very personal level.

Crow and Matthews (1998) identified a third function of mentoring. Where Kram (1985) included both career and professional issues of mentoring within the career function, Crow and Matthews distinguished between career development and professional development. This distinction is important in the study of school leadership because of the ever-changing nature of school leadership and the different career functions in schools as compared to other professions. These three functions of mentoring are: (a) *career development function*--focused on career satisfaction, career awareness, and career advancement; (b) *professional development function*--focused on the development of knowledge, skills, behaviors, and values; and, (c) *psychosocial development function*--which involves personal and emotional well-being as well as role expectation, clarification, and conflict.

The mentoring literature supports the practice of using mentors to assist beginning teachers. The most powerful mentoring relationships seem to come from a mutual need and/or desire between the mentor and the protégé. Mentors clearly influence and socialize those who view them (mentors) as being worthy of emulation in their own life.

Teacher Induction

Mentoring is a fairly common component of teacher induction. The induction of beginning teachers implies a planned and organized orientation procedure that typically lasts for 3 to 5 years. The intent of all induction programs is to help transform the new teacher into a competent career educator. Thoughtful and well-organized induction programs seem to be the exception rather than the rule. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) documented that informal or haphazard induction experiences have been associated with higher levels of attrition as well as lower levels of teacher effectiveness. First-year teachers are frequently left to "sink or swim" in their position with little support from colleagues and few opportunities for professional development (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996). The benefits of good induction programs include both reduced attrition rates among new teachers and improved teaching capabilities (Weiss & Weiss, 1999).

Schlechty (1985) notes that signs of effective induction programs can be observed in the faculty by looking at the support of school norms and the general conformity of teacher performance to those norms. He created a framework to evaluate induction programs by looking at four characteristics of the influence of other professions on teaching and four characteristics that apply directly to the needs of beginning teachers. This framework is intended to apply to vastly differing induction programs relative to both content and delivery structure. The four characteristics from other professions include: (a) the program explains to the inductees that the process of their selection is based on special requirements and that induction training is crucial to their future success,

(b) the induction process is divided into progressive stages of achievement, (c) the program cultivates mutual support within the peer groups, and (d) the training is oriented toward long-term career goals.

The needs of beginning teachers are met with the remaining four characteristics: (e) administratively-set expectations and norms of teacher conduct are clearly articulated and disseminated; (f) teachers must assimilate a professional vocabulary; (g) new teachers receive supervision, coaching, demonstration, and assessment; and (h) the responsibility for supervision should be distributed throughout the faculty in a tightly organized, consistent, and continuous program.

The general content of an induction program can come from multiple sources. The priority lists are often generated by surveys of senior teachers and administrators experienced in observing and/or dealing with the shortcomings of first-year teachers. With wide variance in degree, all programs contain elements of faculty and facility introduction, classroom management, student discipline, professional conduct, school and school district expectations, and professional obligations. Some programs instruct and assess the beginning teacher while others merely emphasize assistance for the beginning teacher. New teachers need exposure to a variety of teaching techniques as well as evaluation processes. Serious problems arise when evaluation is mistaken for assessment and induction programs are used as wash-out programs. New hirees in any field are hired with the expectation that they will survive the induction process and start on their way to full-term careers.

Relationship Between Mentoring and Induction

Since the mid 1980s, induction programs have increasingly used mentors to provide assistance to new teachers. These veteran educators help beginners learn the philosophy, cultural values, and established sets of behaviors expected by the schools where they are employed (Little, 1990). Some new teachers receive regular coaching and opportunities for collaboration, but others may see their mentor only on rare occasion. In the California New Teacher Project, the "intensity of the support and instruction . . . did differ across projects and had an impact on new teachers' perceptions of teaching and their performance in the classroom" (Gold, 1996, p. 550). The frequency and the quality of the support offered to beginning teachers are both important. Most programs do not provide training for mentors specifically, nor for the support teams established within the induction program (Weiss & Weiss, 1999). North Carolina is the only state that requires mentor teachers to hold a mentor license (Andrews & Andrews, 1998).

The teacher induction literature supports the assignment of mentors to assist beginning teachers. It seems clear that effective mentoring may not only help retain teachers, it may also help to better prepare teachers for successful careers in the classroom by providing support, relevant content and context for understanding one's work, and helping to meet the developmental needs of the new teacher.

Teacher Mentoring

Although it is difficult to always agree on who the best teachers are, it is easy to observe that all parents and students want to have the teachers that they perceive to be the best. The National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching (NPEAT,

2002), funded primarily by the United States Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement, has sought to place the improvement of teaching as the center of its efforts to improve schools. The NPEAT Policy Board (recently incorporated into the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future [NCTAF]) has representation from 30 national organizations and has articulated its goal as working to ensure that America will provide all students with access to competent, caring, qualified teachers in schools organized for success (NCTAF, 2003). As work continues to establish a set of strategies that hold promise for continuously improving the quality of teaching, NCTAF has provided principles and guidelines for the design of improved policy and practice.

For teacher preparation, NCTAF has outlined six dimensions of quality teacher preparation that include extensive clinical practice to develop effective teaching skills and entry level teaching support through residencies and mentored induction (p. 74). Improving the induction of new teachers into the profession can be seen as the single most cost-effective strategy for improving teaching. Further, providing the best initial preparation programs and recruiting the best teachers will likely be wasted unless schools are structured to provide ongoing professional development and appropriate teacher evaluation.

The most common characteristics of mentoring, that are provided as a part of a new teacher induction program, are helping the beginner learn the philosophy, cultural values, and established sets of behaviors expected by the schools where they are employed (Little, 1990; Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., 1999). Some teachers receive regular coaching and opportunities for collaboration, while others see their mentors

sporadically. Successful mentor programs are dependent on the quality of training afforded the mentors (Feiman-Nemser, 1996; Ganser, 1996a; Ganser & Koskela, 1997). Research indicates that beginning teachers who are mentored are more effective teachers in their early years, since they learn from guided practice rather than depending on trial-and-error alone.

In an ERIC Digest titled "Teacher Mentoring: A Critical Review," Sharon Feiman-Nemser (1996) reviewed the issues, promises, and limitations of mentoring programs. She notes that the enthusiasm for mentoring has not been matched by clarity about the purposes of mentoring. Mentoring has the potential to go beyond helping beginning teachers survive their first year of teaching. Mentoring can function as a strategy for school reform if it is linked to a vision of good teaching, an understanding of how beginning teachers learn to become successful career teachers, and is supported by practice and expectations that favor collaboration, communication, and inquiry.

There is a general recognition that mentors have a positive impact on teacher retention, but there is no generalized understanding of what mentors should do, what they actually do, and what beginning teachers learn as a result of being mentored. Mentors have been found to promote "conventional norms and practices," thus limiting reform (Feiman-Nemser, Parker, & Zeicher, 1993). Few mentor teachers practice the kind of "conceptually oriented, learner-centered teaching" advocated by reformers (Cohen, McLaughlin, & Talbert, 1993). Mentor teachers have little experience with the core activities of mentoring; observing, and discussing teaching with colleagues. If we want mentors to help novices learn the ways of thinking and acting associated with new kinds of teaching, then we have to place them with mentors who are already reformers in their

schools and classrooms (Cochran-Smith, 1991), or develop collaborative contexts where mentors and provisional teachers can explore and practice new approaches together.

As might be expected, the differences in mentoring relationships and expectations can create very different outcomes for the beginning teacher. If policy and practice related to mentoring is to be improved, there needs to be more direct studies of mentoring and its affects on teaching as well as teacher retention. Mentoring relationships are bound to be unpredictable. Yet the conditions and expectations for the provisional teacher require some systematic approach to induction into the profession of teaching.

There are three major issues in the mentoring literature that receive comment and debate but have yet to emerge with any clear consensus. First is the role of the mentor with regards to assistance versus assessment. Second is whether mentors should be chosen or assigned. The third issue is one of time; time to learn to be a mentor and time to thoughtfully mentor the new teacher. The Utah Code clearly addresses the first two and suggests that providing time (and pay) may be appropriate for districts to consider if "additional time is required" (UCA-53A-10-111).

Common sense and conventional wisdom has led many states, including Utah, to conclude that mentors should assist and not assess the provisional teacher. This belief is centered around the assumption that the new teacher is more likely to share problems and ask for help if the mentor does not evaluate them. The more dynamic and collaborative approaches to professional development require the evaluation process to include those most closely linked to daily practice, peers. While excluding the mentor from the formal evaluation process may seem necessary, it also removes the person who may have the best assessment of the needs of the beginning teacher from helping define the process to

meeting those needs.

Since mentoring relationships are unpredictable, does it matter if mentors are chosen or assigned? In Utah, the mentors are to be assigned by the principal or immediate supervisor, based on the criteria of finding someone "who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional educator and has at least 3 years of educational experience" (UCA-53A-10-108). There will likely be a difference between the "assigned" mentor relationships and the "adopted" mentor relationships developed throughout ones' career. Tauer (1995) argues that it may be more useful to focus on establishing optimal conditions for developing positive mentoring relationships rather than trying to make optimal assignments of mentors to novices. This suggests that attention needs to be paid to who the good models/mentors are and what conditions can help these relationships to be productive and effective.

Providing time to learn to be a mentor and to mentor seems like a simple and reasonable consideration. Across the country, mentoring programs use retired teachers, release teachers from some or all of their regular duties, or just expect the mentor to combine this responsibility with full-time teaching. Training ranges from none to formal courses that may include clinical supervision, research on effective teaching, beginning teacher concerns, and theories of adult learning. Those programs that provide training, normally conduct such prior to assigning the mentor to a novice. A better practice might include opportunities to discuss questions and problems that arise in the course of their work with provisional teachers.

Effective mentoring processes are built on a foundation of mutual trust with the primary objective of assistance. For trust to be built and good assessment to take place,

the mentor must be viewed by the provisional teacher as competent and worthy of emulation. The assignment of mentors with substantially the same duties as their protégé, while trying to judiciously consider common professional interests, expressed educational philosophies, and compatible personalities, seems like an impossible task.

As an interactive system, mentoring is seen as benefitting the mentor, the protégé, and the school system (Krupp, 1984). The mentors benefit from the questions of the beginning teachers that cause the mentors to reexamine their own classroom practices and the effects of accepted instructional strategies on the teaching/learning process. Provisional teachers are quickly assimilated into the school environment and begin to establish their own professional competence while recognizing that teaching can be a continually developing, lifelong career. The school district benefits when there is a positive mentoring relationship as the teacher attrition rate has been shown to decline (Driscoll et al., 1985). There is also evidence that if close supervision is a characteristic of this relationship, discouragement can be decreased and instructional problems can be corrected.

The teacher mentoring literature supports further investigation of the issues laid out in this clinical research study. The qualities of formal and informal mentoring relationships, the differences in mentoring by level (elementary, junior high, or high school) and by number of provisional teaching years (first, second, or third), the principals' mentor assignment practices, quality of assigned mentors, assessment of provisional teachers abilities, and the perceived effectiveness of provisional teacher evaluations are all in need of thoughtful analysis.

Methods

This study reports both quantitative data and qualitative comments (from surveys) to address the stated research questions. The perceptions of provisional teachers (first 3 years teaching) relative to their mentors were key to collecting data that inform practice about the qualities of mentoring relationships and the effectiveness of current practices. The perceptions of the principals are necessary to understand the mentor assignment practices, the perceived quality of the assigned mentors, the perceived abilities of the provisional teachers, and the characterization of the provisional teacher evaluation process. Surveys were selected as the most appropriate and efficient way to collect the perceptions of provisional teachers and school principals while maintaining confidentiality and asking questions related to compliance with state law. The survey questions were developed to address the research questions supported in the literature on teacher induction and mentoring.

Participants

All provisional teachers and all principals, assigned to the regular K-12 schools of the district, were provided the opportunity to participate in this study. The participants included all of the provisional teachers who responded (203 valid responses of 504 potential respondents) from the regular K-12 classrooms of the identified school district and all of the regular K-12 principals who responded (81 of 86 potential respondents). A single large urban/suburban school district was chosen for this study because of its size and diversity as well as its mixed efforts to address the induction of new teachers. The district serves over 70,000 students in 86 schools with over 2,500 teachers in the regular

K-12 classrooms of the district. The schools within the district include some of the poorest and wealthiest communities in the state, as well as some of the lowest and highest performing (standardized achievement tests) schools in the state. All schools had provisional teachers on staff, but there were proportionately more provisional teachers in Title I elementary schools. The communities range from small urban communities to larger suburban areas. This particular district was also willing to discover its level of compliance with the state law (relative to the assignment of mentors to provisional teachers) and to use any relevant data to better serve the beginning teachers in the district. The selection of a single district is supported in the literature in that there are clearly broad variations of mentoring practices between schools, let alone districts and states. If a district is to systematically address the challenges of finding, supporting, developing, and retaining quality teachers, any research that provides districtwide data relative to any of these issues, will benefit that district while also providing sufficient data for use in other school systems.

Sources of Data

This study used two survey instruments (see Appendix C); one for provisional teachers and one for principals. The survey questions were developed from the literature review, a pilot study with a significantly longer survey instrument in a neighboring school district, interviews with provisional teachers participating in the pilot study, and through consultation with teachers, assigned mentors, principals, and district-level administrators. The teacher survey centered on the formal mentoring relationship between provisional teachers and their assigned mentors. Perceptions were given relative value using a Likert

scale. Open-ended questions were used to collect data pertaining to the desired qualities of the ideal mentoring relationship. Fifteen specific topics were identified from the literature to compare time spent in discussing these topics with perceived help received from the assigned mentor in dealing with these issues. The provisional teachers were asked whether or not these topics were discussed with their assigned mentor. These same topics were used again, later in the survey, to collect perceptions relative to the "quality of help" that provisional teachers believed they had received from their assigned mentors with these issues. Additional questions about the formal mentoring relationship included the overall quality of the relationship, the characteristics of an ideal mentor, who initiates meetings, how similar are their teaching assignments, etc. A few questions focused on the characteristics of any mentoring relationships that have been established with an informal (unassigned) mentor. Demographic data were collected from the provisional teachers to examine appropriate comparative relationships (i.e., training, teaching assignment, sex, ethnicity, etc.).

The principal survey included questions relative to the numbers and qualities of provisional teachers, the considerations made when assigning mentor teachers to provisional teachers, the quality of the assigned mentor teachers, and the perceptions of the adequacy of the provisional teacher evaluation process. A Likert scale was used to indicate varying degrees of value.

Data Collection Procedures

Surveys were directly mailed to all participants at their school location. An envelope was provided to return the surveys anonymously through the district mail

system. The surveys were distributed near the end of the traditional school calendar year (mid-May), after all deadlines had passed for principals to return evaluations and to issue any nonrenewal notices for provisional teachers. With only slightly more than 2 weeks remaining in the traditional school calendar year when the surveys were distributed, surveys were expected to be returned prior to leaving the school for the summer break. Surveys were numbered and separated (provisional teachers from principals) as they were received. Surveys continued to be collected through the month of June 2002. All responses have been kept confidential.

Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed by coding survey responses to build a data base that could be explored using the SPSS 11.0 data mining software (see appendix C for survey questions and codes). Descriptive statistics were used to analyze each survey question. Comparative statistics were used to determine the significance of any relationships between variables.

Qualitative data were analyzed by first reading all the provisional teacher comments and then by coding and grouping the comments into general categories of similarity. The general categories where then further organized by themes, phrases, and specific words to establish the appropriate descriptors for analysis and comparison (see appendix C for a complete listing of responses to the open-ended questions).

Findings

The six primary research questions focus on the perceptions of provisional teachers relative to the elements, qualities, and characteristics of their formal (assigned)

and informal mentoring relationships. The one auxiliary research question is centered on the perceptions of principals relative to assigning mentors, the quality of assigned mentors, the ability of provisional teachers, and the adequacy of the provisional teacher evaluation process.

Characteristics of Respondents

Complete and valid surveys were returned by 203 provisional teachers and 81 school principals. Of the provisional teacher surveys, 86 were from first-year teachers (54 elementary and 32 secondary), 62 were from second-year teachers (41 elementary and 21 secondary), and 55 were from third-year teachers (42 elementary and 13 secondary). Of the principal surveys, 58 were from elementary school principals and 23 were from secondary school principals. Elementary provisional teachers and principals were from public elementary schools (grades K-6) and the secondary teachers and principals were from public junior high/middle schools (grades 7-9) and senior high schools (grades 10-12) within the same urban/suburban school district.

The total number of surveys sent to provisional first-, second-, and third-year teachers were 504. Even though the response rate for provisional teachers was only slightly over 40%, all groupings (i.e., level, year, gender, etc.) were representative of groupings in the population of potential respondents (see Table 1.1).

Findings by Research Question

Each research question is presented and followed by data that briefly addresses that particular question. Additional tables are provided in Appendix D.

Table 1.1

Response Rate for Provisional Teachers

	Potential Respondents	Actual Respondents
Total number of teacher surveys	sent, 504	returned, 203
• total 1st year surveys	sent, 181	returned, 86
elementary	*109*	*54*
secondary	*72*	*21*
• total 2nd year surveys	sent, 188	returned, 62
elementary	*109*	*41*
secondary	*79*	*21*
• total 3rd year surveys	sent, 135	returned, 55
elementary	*84*	*42*
secondary	*51*	*13*
• total surveys to females	sent, 421	returned, 176
• total surveys to males	sent, 84	returned, 26
Total number of principal surveys	sent, 87	returned, 81
elementary	*63*	*58*
secondary	*24*	*23*

How do provisional teachers describe the elements, qualities, and characteristics of their formal "assigned" mentoring relationships? By law in the State of Utah, all provisional teachers are to be assigned a mentor with substantially the same teaching assignment. With only 138 of the 203 (68%) provisional teachers responding that they have been "assigned" a mentor for the 2001-2002 school year, a compliance problem clearly exists. Of those with assigned mentors, 109 (79%) report that their mentor had substantially the same teaching assignment. This suggests another problem in the appropriate assignment of mentors to provisional teachers. Combining the assignment of a formal mentor with the report of how many of these mentors have substantially the same teaching assignment as their identified provisional teacher, only 54.7% (109 of the 203 responding) of the provisional teachers are working in a circumstance consistent with the expectations of law.

Provisional teachers with assigned mentors report that meetings with their formal mentors ranged from no meetings during the year to meeting nearly every school day. There were 33 (23.9%) of the provisional teachers with assigned mentors who report that they did not have any meetings with their mentor during the 2001-2002 school year. Combining the 65 provisional teachers without an assigned mentor, with the 33 provisional teachers that did not meet with their assigned mentor during the 2001-2002 school year, the study found that 98 provisional teachers (48.3% of the 203 responding) essentially received no formal mentoring during the entire school year. Fifteen (10.9%) of the provisional teachers reported nearly daily contact (approximately 160 meetings or more during a 180 day school year) with their assigned mentor; however, a majority of 77 (55.8%) provisional teachers only met 10 or fewer times during the year with their formal

mentors.

Provisional teachers report that they are most likely, 73.6% of the time, to initiate contact with their assigned mentor. Assigned mentors initiated contact 19.1% of the time with informal mentors initiating contact 7.3% of the time.

Nearly half, 68 of the 138 (49%) provisional teachers with assigned mentors, have "never been observed by their assigned mentor." Almost as many, 62 or 45%, have "never had their mentor demonstrate a teaching method." Even though state law excludes assigned mentors from participating in the formal evaluation of provisional teachers, 12 or 8.7% of those provisional teachers with assigned mentors, report that the mentor did participate in their formal evaluation, with 108 (78.3%) stating that there was no participation and 17 (12.3%) responding that they did not know.

Discussions between provisional teachers and their assigned mentors were most likely to focus on the specific needs of students, curriculum selection, and classroom management. They were least likely to discuss contractual obligations, the role of the school principal, and career decisions. The topics most likely discussed between the assigned mentors and provisional teachers were also those topics with which provisional teachers perceived that they had received a higher quality of help. In other words, there is a positive relationship between discussions and perceived help that suggests issues of proximity, time, and access between the assigned mentor and provisional teacher are critical.

When describing the quality of help they received from their mentor, classroom management, new ideas and methods, and general school operations were mentioned most often as either "good" or "very good." The quality of help from the assigned mentor

most often characterized as either "poor" or "very poor" centered on contractual obligations, career decision making, and curriculum selection.

How do provisional teachers assess the effectiveness of their formal mentoring relationships? "Effectiveness" was narrowed to the perceptions of the provisional teachers relative to the quality of help and support received from their assigned mentor as well as the relationship between positive mentoring relationships and the likelihood of remaining in the public schools as a teacher.

Of the provisional teachers reporting that they had an assigned mentor, 105 (76%) state that "overall, my assigned mentoring relationship is" good (26%) or very good (50%). More than half of these teachers, 71 of the 138 with assigned mentors (51.5%), also report that their assigned mentor provided the most valuable help in "learning to become a teacher." An "informal mentor" was the most helpful for 49 of the provisional teachers (35.6%) and someone "other" than a teaching mentor was the most helpful for 18 (12.9%) of the provisional teachers with assigned mentors.

There is a significant positive correlation, at the .05 level, between the support received from a mentor and the likelihood that the provisional teacher will stay in teaching (see Table 1.2)

When a comparison is made between the support from the mentor and the likelihood that the provisional teacher will "stay in the district" or "stay at this school," similar patterns emerge. Fifty-six percent of the provisional teachers who report "very good" support from their assigned mentor, state that they are "very likely" to stay in the district with 47% reporting that they are "very likely" to stay in their current school. When the mentor support is seen as "very poor," 49% state that they are "very unlikely" or

Table 1.2

Support Received from Mentor

		The support I have received from my assigned mentor has been . . .	How likely are you to stay in teaching?
The support I have received from my assigned mentor has been . . .	Pearson Correlation	1	.177*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.041
	N	137	134
How likely are you to to stay in teaching?	Pearson Correlation	.177*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041	.
	N	134	134

*.Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

"unlikely" to stay in the district with 33% reporting that they are "very unlikely" or "unlikely" to stay in their current school.

Are there informal mentoring relationships between the provisional teacher and other "unassigned" mentors that are perceived by the provisional teacher as helping guide their teaching career and classroom practice? There are 145 (71.4%) of the 203 provisional teachers returning surveys that report that they have an "informal" (unassigned) mentor. Of these, 94 (46.3%) provisional teachers also have an assigned (formal) mentor. This leaves 51 (25.1%) of the provisional teachers that report that they have an informal mentor that they have "chosen to interact with as a consulting educator," without being assigned a specific mentor. Eleven (5.4%) of the provisional teachers report having neither an assigned nor an informal mentor.

When asked who "has generally provided the most valuable help to you in learning to become a teacher," 194 provisional teachers answered as follows: 90 (46%) report that their informal mentor has provided the most valuable help; 75 (39%) claim that their assigned mentor has been the most helpful; and, 29 (15%) state that someone "other" than an informal or formal mentor has been the most helpful in learning to become a teacher (i.e., friend, spouse, family member, etc.).

Informal mentoring relationships had the same general characteristics as assigned mentoring relationships relative to the expressed needs of the provisional teacher in finding help and support in becoming a successful teacher and the likelihood of staying in teaching.

How do formal mentoring relationships differ by level (elementary K-6 and secondary 7-12 schools)? Elementary provisional teachers were more likely to be

assigned a mentor teacher. There were 302 (59.9% of the 504 total provisional teachers in the school district) elementary and 202 (40.1%) secondary provisional teachers in the school district. Of the 138 provisional teachers responding that they had been assigned a mentor, 97 (70.3%) were elementary teachers and 41 (29.7%) were secondary school teachers.

Of those provisional teachers with assigned mentors, there were no significant differences reported between elementary and secondary teachers' perceptions of the "quality of help" they received from their assigned mentor on the 15 specific topics identified in the survey. Quality of help was rated from very good (=5) to very poor (=1) on a 5-point scale. The provisional teachers also responded to these same 15 items by indicating the degree to which they had "discussed" these topics with their assigned mentor. There were significant differences between elementary and secondary provisional teachers in the degree to which they had discussed two of these subjects with their assigned mentor (see Tables 1.3 and 1.4). Elementary teachers were more likely to discuss *curriculum selection* and *new ideas and methods* with their assigned mentor than their secondary counterparts.

How do formal mentoring relationships differ by number of provisional teaching years (first, second, and third)? From the 138 provisional teachers responding that they had been assigned a mentor, 72 (52.2%) were first-year provisional teachers, 38 (27.5%) were second-year provisional teachers, and 19 (13.8%) were third-year provisional teachers (9 provisional teachers, 6.5%, failed to identify themself as first-, second-, or third-year). First-year provisional teachers were clearly the most likely (52.2% of the 138) to be assigned a mentor even in comparison to the proportion of first-year

Table 1.3

Discussion of Subjects With Mentor

	Teaching Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Discussed Curriculum Selection	Elementary	97	3.1031	1.26231	.12817
	Secondary	41	2.6341	1.24008	.19367
Discussed New Ideas and Methods	Elementary	97	3.1649	1.22202	.12408
	Secondary	41	2.5366	1.12021	.17495

Table 1.4

Discussion of Subjects With Mentor
t-Test for Equality of Means

		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Discussed Curriculum Selection	Equal variances assumed	2.005	136	.047	.4689
	Equal variances not assumed	2.019	76.589	.047	.4689
Discussed New Ideas and Methods	Equal variances assumed	2.828	136	.005	.6284
	Equal variances not assumed	2.930	81.743	.004	.6284

provisional teachers in the total district. There were 181 (35.9% of the 504 total provisional teachers in the school district) first-year provisional teachers in the district.

There were 60 provisional first-, second-, and third-year teachers reporting that they did not have an assigned mentor. Of this group, 13 (21.7%) were first-year, 24 (40.0%) were second-year, and 23 (38.3%) were third-year provisional teachers.

First-year provisional teachers were far more likely to be observed by their mentor than second- and third-year teachers. There were 10 (13%) first-year teachers who report that their mentoring relationship includes having the mentor observe their teaching either "often" (7; 9%) or "very often" (3; 4%). This is in contrast to 2 (4%) second-year teachers and 0 (0%) third-year teachers reporting such levels of observation.

When comparing the "quality of help received" from the assigned mentor by provisional year (first-, second-, or third-year), there are a few differences in those areas that received either a "good" or "very good" quality of help rating. Table 1.5 illustrates the top areas of perceived quality of help by provisional year (with 1 being ranked first):

Which elements, qualities, and characteristics of formal mentoring relationships can be used to differentiate between effective and ineffective mentoring relationships? When asked, "In your opinion, what characteristics should the 'ideal' mentoring relationship have," comments from provisional teachers (italicized) can be grouped in four general categories: communication, character, expertise, and availability.

Communication is described as open, confidential, supportive, reflective, and purposeful. Direct comments include: *open communication, genuine empathy; open, able to ask any questions, give ideas; ability to communicate freely, certain level of comfort with each other so that sharing of ideas and problems is possible; open communication,*

Table 1.5

Top Areas of Perceived Quality of Help by Provisional Year

Topic	Ranking by Provisional Year . . . 1st Yr	2nd Yr	3rd Yr
general school operations and procedures	1	1	1
classroom management	2	3	3
new ideas and methods	3	-	2
curriculum selection	4	4	-
specific needs of students	5	-	5
professional developement	-	2	-
general district operations and procedures	-	-	4
communication with parents	-	5	-

feeling of friendship, confidentiality; friendly, open, and interactive with ongoing exchange of knowledge and strengths; open, able to discuss without fear of insult; great listener, approachable; open, honest, willing to help; open, honest, informative, take serious; gives constructive feedback; they should be very nonjudgmental, positive, approachable; and, able to listen and not get frustrated with many questions (complete list of comments found in Appendix E).

Character is portrayed as caring, supportive, honest, friendly, and professional. Examples of these comments include: *you should be able to feel at ease, not intimidated; trustworthy, good listener, positive; kindness, caring, concern, helpful attitude, patience; accepting, understanding, helpful; nonjudgmental, co-worker, friend; knowledgeable, outgoing, easy to get along with; professional, friendly, easy to talk with; consistency, caring, helpfulness, informative, value each other, respect; and, friendly, reciprocal, supportive* (complete list of comments found in Appendix E).

Expertise is used to group comments concerning teaching skills, content and process knowledge, experience, and confidence. Provisional teachers descriptions include: *willing to help anytime, willing to give teaching ideas; someone who can help you with whatever–discipline, ideas, etc.; I wish I had someone to sit down and do planning with; the mentor should know certain information and share it with the one being mentored; be willing to share the specifics of what to do, how time is used, and lesson plans or materials; knowledge of my grade/program; and, someone who will let me know what I'm doing well, build me up a little, someone who I can go to if I have questions* (complete list of comments found in Appendix E).

Availability focuses on those comments concerning the willingness to help, being

accessible, being involved/concerned, and being available when needed. Comments that characterize this grouping include: *same time obligations; available to help give suggestions when needed; be more accessible, more involved, willing to make daily or at least weekly contact; someone who is available to discuss all the issues in this survey and someone who would approach me to see how things are going; be available for consulting and helpful tips, provide ideas and planning time; take time to listen and observe; weekly discussion of concerns, informal and formal observations, grouped teaching experiences where provisional can watch mentor teach; proximity in the building; and, time to help (paid by district time to help), someone who is there, someone who initiates sharing ideas and resources.*

The perceived and desired effective mentoring relationships clearly include trusted interactions about the working environment, accessibility for open communication, and a willingness to model and provide feedback.

Auxiliary Research Question

How do principals perceive their role of assigning mentors, their assessment of the quality of the assigned mentors, their assessment of the provisional teachers working in their school, and their characterization of the provisional teacher evaluation process? In the role of assigning mentors, principals were asked to determine "the order of importance" when assigning a mentor to a provisional teacher (ordered from "most important" to next most important to next . . .). Responses are reported in Table 1.6 for all principals first and then differences between elementary and secondary principals are noted.

Table 1.6

Order of Importance for All Principal

Order of Importance for All Principals	Elementary	Secondary
1. who is the best teacher	1	1
2. who has the most similar assignment	2	2
3. who is willing	3	4
4. who has the most knowledge about the school	4	3
5. who is available.	5	5

Assessment of the quality of the assigned mentors. Of the 79 principals responding to the question of, "what degree of formal training do most mentors receive before being assigned to a provisional teacher," 20 (25%) report no formal training, 48 (61%) state 1-5 hours of training, 10 (13%) answered that 5-10 hours of training occurred, and 1 (1%) reported more than 10 hours of training. Elementary principals report that 41% of the mentors they assign are "master teachers" with 55% being "above average" and 3% "average" ability teachers. Secondary principals claim that 48% of their mentor teachers are "master teachers" and 52% are "above average" educators.

Assessment of the provisional teachers working in their school. Principals were asked to consider all of the provisional teachers currently at their school and to determine how many they would place in each of the following categories: exemplary (143 or 24.8%), above average (221 or 38.4%), average (170 or 29.5%), below average (29 or 5%), or, nonrenewal in process (13 or 2.3%). The principals were asked to report the total number of first-, second-, and third-year teachers at their school. They reported 607 total teachers which is 103 more than the total provisional teachers in the regular K-12 classrooms of the district. This difference may be accounted for if the principals included special education teachers and teachers returning to teaching that are sometimes called "provisional" even though they are not in their first 3 years of teaching.

Characterization of the provisional teacher evaluation process. This district currently requires two direct observations of all provisional teachers, with a one-page descriptive form to be filed with the human resource office after each observation. There is space on the form for evaluator comments and to either recommend continued employment or not. The majority of principals (58%) believe that the provisional teacher

evaluation process is "adequate," with 35% stating that it is "less than adequate," 3% reporting that the process is "inadequate," and 3% believing the process to be "thorough."

Discussion

Major Findings

At best, only a slight majority of the provisional teachers who participated in this study are working in compliance with Utah law (i.e., are receiving mentoring at any level). This disturbing finding is reached by documenting the lack of assigned mentors in the first place, compounded by assigning mentors without substantially the same duties, and then realizing that even when assigned most mentors meet ten or fewer times during the school year with their protégé. With the legal requirements to assign mentor teachers to provisional teachers and the clear consensus from the literature that assigning mentors has a positive impact on teacher retention, the lack of a clear and consistent practice of assigning mentors is placing the district in jeopardy of state sanctions, and provisional teachers in circumstances far less than ideal for success.

If mentors were systematically assigned to provisional teachers and if mentoring were to be used as any part of a reform strategy for better teaching, more attention needs to be paid to identifying "master" teachers to become mentors, training for the identified mentors, and establishing time for the provisional teachers and their mentors to actually engage in conversations, demonstrations, and formative evaluation processes. With 25% of the currently assigned mentors having received no formal training to be mentors and the majority (61%) receiving 5 hours or fewer of training, there is no evidence to suggest that mentoring is meeting its primary state-mandated objective of informing the

beginning teacher about the teaching profession.

The primary unanswered questions from the literature were, whether mentors should assist or assess provisional teachers, should be chosen or assigned to provisional teachers, and what should they be trained to do and expected to do with provisional teachers. From the data collected in this study, it is clear that provisional teachers want help from an experienced colleague who is a good listener, gives feedback, is supportive, caring, honest, and professional, has strong teaching skills, is willing to help, is accessible, available, and approachable, and is knowledgeable about their teaching assignment. Provisional teachers want immediate and accessible help with formative evaluation of their work. Provisional teachers want a competent mentor whether they are assigned or chosen. District efforts to try and improve induction practices and to offer support for improved mentoring could not be detected from the data.

If induction programs are potentially the single most cost-effective strategy for improving teaching, there is a noticeable absence of such a systematic expectation related to mentoring as a part of any formal induction processes. Assigning a mentor is the only required piece of any statewide induction, as outlined in evaluation statues, that is expected in this particular school district.

If there is to be any improvement in recruiting and retaining provisional teachers through the assignment of mentors, practice will need to change dramatically. New teachers are looking for systematic help and support in meeting the expectations of teaching. From the data collected in this school district, significant numbers of provisional teachers are truly left to either sink or swim.

Surprises

While the lack of systematically assigning, training, and tracking mentoring relationships was somewhat expected, the almost universal lack of communication between mentors and provisional teachers was not anticipated. For the average provisional teacher to have less than one contact per month throughout the school year speaks for itself.

The failure to observe provisional teachers in their classrooms was much worse than anticipated. Most of the provisional teachers were trained within the state of Utah. All of the Utah institutions of higher education authorized to recommend individuals for teaching licenses, claim to support and encourage collegial observation and interaction, yet none of them seem to be engaged in any efforts to improve or expand their responsibilities in the induction process beyond qualifying the student to receive their license to teach through the Utah State Office of Education. For most beginning teachers, the student teaching or internship program they were trained in, was the last time anyone, other than the principal, observed their practice in the classroom.

A lower than expected rate of return for provisional teacher surveys was contrasted with a higher than expected rate of return for principal surveys. Although provisional teachers are not looking for anything else to do the last few weeks of the school year, the invitation to participate in this study was described as an opportunity to "help the district to better understand and meet the needs of provisional teachers." After the analysis of the data collected in this study, it seems that a low rate of return may suggest that provisional teachers are overwhelmed and may not know where to turn for help and support. The high rate of return for principal surveys and the reporting by

principals that they had assigned mentors, even though almost half of the provisional teachers seem to be unaware of such, seems to support the premise that assigning mentors is viewed more as a compliance report than an opportunity to better prepare and support new teachers.

The review of the research literature also provided a surprise of sorts. With all the attention given to mentoring as a useful and cost-effective tool to help beginning teachers, the simple counting of the itemized benefits of mentoring clearly favors the mentor rather than the protégé. Many of the newer studies of mentoring relationships speak clearly of the renewing of veteran teachers as they mentor others. This is most often described in tandem with efforts to observe, discuss, and improve overall classroom practices. The mentors are also more likely to improve their own practice as they are expected to assist and guide another teacher. There is also an argument that can be made from related studies that formal (assigned) mentoring relationships may not result in substantive mentoring.

Findings Supported or Contrary to the Literature

With the lack of systematic processes to establish mentoring relationships, the lack of support for mentoring relationships, and the lack of training for mentors to be more effective in mentoring relationships, many of the benefits attributed to mentoring could not be validated in this study. The need to find and retain teachers is a priority for this district, but has not reached the crisis proportions identified in many larger urban areas of the United States. This study documents the earlier findings that positive mentoring relationships can help with teacher retention at all levels; school, district, and

profession. The literature suggests that mentors are important for organizations as well as for individuals. This study concludes that provisional teachers would like to have mentors readily available to help, support, and guide their practice. The literature identifies advantages to both assigning and selecting mentors without a clear consensus as to which is the best practice. This study clearly identifies a problem when mentors are supposed to be assigned and the assignment is not clearly articulated, supported, nor evaluated. Training mentors, relative to their role, is strongly supported in the literature. This study provides evidence that the lack of training for mentors is expected and accepted by all parties (principals, mentor teachers, and provisional teachers). This suggests that the needs for professional development are either different or perceived as unavailable.

Recommendations

Recognizing that the current law and practice are not providing for systematic and meaningful mentoring relationships for many, if not most provisional teachers, and that mandates without resources are rarely able to meet expectations, the following recommendations are organized by changes that could be accomplished by legislation, policy, practice, and/or resources.

Legislation

The current law is not being fully complied with and will not likely be fully implemented until resources are shifted or provided to change practice. Changes to the law can be made to either align with practice by removing the requirement to assign a mentor or influence practice by focusing on more meaningful expectations of mentoring

that could include the mentor's (or appropriate career educator) participation in the evaluation of the provisional teacher.

With the different purposes and procedures for formative and summative teacher evaluation, it is time for mentors to be fully engaged in the formative evaluation processes for all provisional teachers. The required assignment of a mentor with "substantially the same duties" and the exclusion of the mentor in the evaluation process, seems to limit the potential for modeling effective teaching behaviors and providing for the ongoing formative evaluation of the provisional teacher. The educator evaluation section of the Utah code was to improve and enhance the public schools by providing systematic, fair, and competent evaluation of public educators as well as remediation for those who are inadequate. The law needs to be changed to encourage teachers to fully engage in the formative evaluation process and to better train principals to work with teachers to develop meaningful summative evaluation processes. Currently, the law tries to direct specific activities and responsibilities without the necessary understanding of the differences between formative and summative evaluation. Specifically, provisional teachers need to be observed by and receive feedback from a competent and effective career educator in addition to the principal.

If there is not enough capacity in the school or district for such a teacher to also serve as a mentor, at least the required evaluations of the provisional teacher can be structured to include such an interaction. Unfunded mandates, with narrow language and responsibilities, reduce the efforts necessary for thoughtful evaluation and improvement rather than encourage it. A recently passed bill (Fifth Substitute Senate Bill 154, 2003), now signed into law, could further damage the problems associated with narrow measures

and broad implications of evaluation by using published student test scores for parents to actively choose the district, school, and teacher "they wish to involve in the educational process for their children."

Policy

If mentoring is to be used as any part of a long-range reform strategy for better teaching, more attention needs to be paid to identifying effective teachers to become mentors. If appropriate mentors are identified, trained, and provided with sufficient time and resources, they may be able to actually engage in conversations, demonstrations, and formative evaluation processes with provisional teachers. With the understanding that the most successful mentoring relationships are those with perceived mutual benefits for both the mentor and the provisional teacher, perhaps provisional teachers can be allowed (and expected) to "choose" their mentor from a list of willing and capable "master" teachers. Ultimately, it appears that all teachers emulate at least some image of who they want to become as a teacher. If there are images/role models that can help bring about better instructional practices in public school classrooms, it seems sensible to at least identify those teachers who exemplify good practice and try to help foster mentoring relationships between them and those teachers that could learn from them.

Practice

Principals will find that a few well spent and focused hours preparing mentor teachers to be thoughtful observers, formative evaluators, and caring role models, will pay huge dividends for provisional teachers, the mentors themselves, and especially the students they are trying to teach and help learn. Often, the perceived overwhelming

nature of the day-to-day events in a school can take away the energy and motivation to look beyond one's perceived set of urgent issues to attend to. More thoughtful and productive practice will always require the practitioners to see beyond the current crisis to construct relationships that provide the desired outcomes.

If unfunded mandates, like assigning mentor teachers to provisional teachers, are to be generally ignored, careful attention needs to be paid to the consequences of those actions and inactions. In the case of assisting provisional teachers to become successful career teachers, there is a systematic lack of attention, resources, and priorities that could otherwise positively impact the young people that depend on the public schools to find, train, and retain good teachers.

For mentors (preferably chosen) to be able to help with formative evaluation and model effective techniques and strategies, they will need ongoing and thoughtfully constructed professional development as well as structured time and resources to perform a positive mentoring role.

Teacher preparation programs, school induction processes, and ongoing professional development priorities ought to be coordinated, and ought to be thoughtfully and collaboratively designed and implemented by universities and school districts with a singleness of purpose. Perhaps in such an arrangement, teacher preparation, induction, and professional development might include more formal connections between the teachers who train new teachers and those teachers who are identified as mentors for provisional teachers. With connections being made in preservice settings that continue through the provisional teaching years, the possibility increases that more constructive and meaningful mentoring relationships might be established. These connections can

also be used to develop appropriate career-long professional development that revitalizes and refocuses the career teacher while also developing the next generation of career teachers.

Resources

Although all of the above recommendations require at least some level of shift in the prioritization of resources, the following comments are a reflection on the need for policy makers and practitioners to engage in the practice of aligning resources to meet strategic objectives that can improve our public schools.

For schools and school districts that articulate goals and objectives without aligning the resources to accomplish such, the problems associated with unfunded mandates are exasperated even further. The board of education, for the school district participating in this study, has identified five primary long-range objectives, of which to "improve educator quality and effectiveness" is one. Two indicators of success in meeting this objective include "continuous monitoring of educator performance" and "increased support for new teachers." For this objective to be realized, district leaders will need to quickly and thoughtfully address and change the current practices within the district.

Resources currently identified for curriculum specialists, general professional development, and recruiting new teachers, may be able to be pooled and redistributed to have a more powerful long-term impact on the quality of teachers in the schools by more systematically supporting and mentoring teachers for their first three to five years of teaching. The basic functions of mentoring, career development, professional development, and psychosocial development, are at least delayed, if not compromised,

from the lack of creating and supporting meaningful mentoring relationships.

Implications for Future Research

When Utah lawmakers enacted the educator evaluation requirements into law (1988), they clearly outlined the need to provide beginning teachers with a mentor that could assist them in becoming a successful career educator. In 2000, the provisional teaching time period was extended from 2 to 3 years. This extension was to help school personnel to be sure that they had selected the best teachers to move towards career status before tenure was offered. As one of many unfunded mandates, this expectation has not been systematically adopted into practice to support 2 provisional years let alone 3. Most principals seem to believe that they have fulfilled their obligation of assigning a mentor as long as there are teacher names in two columns (column one: provisional teacher names, column two: assigned mentor names) of an unmonitored form from the district personnel office. The unspoken norm seems to be a perpetuation of expecting new teachers to figure out how to be teachers on their own.

The Utah code states that principals "shall" assign a mentor that will help the new teacher become effective and competent. Perhaps the principals believe that since they had to learn to become a teacher and then a principal on their own, provisional teachers should be able to do the same. Perhaps the principals are overwhelmed with the day-to-day challenges of their work and are unable to dedicate the time necessary to provide training for mentors and to facilitate productive meetings between provisional teachers and their mentors. Perhaps in a few schools (K-6, Title I, elementary schools), where the number of provisional teachers equals or exceeds the number of career teachers, any

effort to try and comply may seem pointless.

The need to study principal decision making and practice relative to recruiting, hiring, training, evaluating, and retaining teachers seems to be necessary since there is such a large disconnect between law, research, and expectation versus practice (at least from the perceptions of provisional teachers). Provisional teachers are looking for guidance and support that can be structured at the school level to positively impact classroom practice, job satisfaction, and teacher retention rates.

Mentors should be studied to identify more clearly the dynamics of current mentoring relationships as well as to build a foundation for appropriate mentor training, support, and resource allocation. It is not known if mentors are unavailable and/or inaccessible because they choose to be, have not been clearly assigned, or are unable to provide the necessary support for provisional teachers.

Laws, rules, and policies relative to teacher selection, evaluation, and retention should be studied, reviewed, and modified to be consistent with practices that can bring about the desired improvements for teachers and students in the public schools. While the current educator evaluation laws do not necessarily inhibit good practice, they do not support it either. Appropriate distinctions between formative and summative evaluation processes can provide an opportunity to improve practice with more collegial participation.

APPENDIX A

LITERATURE REVIEW

This brief literature review is focused primarily on the research related to mentoring, teacher induction, and teacher mentoring. With the U.S. Department of Education estimating that over two million teachers will be hired in the next decade, finding, training, and retaining good teachers will be a priority for all public schools across the nation. In the year 2000, the average age of public school teachers was 43 (Cutlip & Shockley, 2000). Teacher induction programs that include teacher mentoring, have been able to document a positive influence on retention rates and teacher preparation and skills. Well-prepared teachers serve the interests of all segments of our society. Providing a mentor for beginning teachers is a requirement of Utah law.

Mentoring

The first "Mentor" was a trusted friend of Odysseus who educated, watched over, and cared for Odysseus's son Telemachus. This 20-year relationship between Mentor and Telemachus is described in Homer's epic story *The Odyssey.* So influential was this character that we continue to use the term "mentor" to define our trusted counselors, guides, coaches, or role models for which we give credit to influencing, perhaps even directing, our lives. Few people will ever have life-long mentors that approach the level of interaction characterized in the Mentor-Telemachus relationship. Most of us will be influenced and socialized by many different people that we presume to have more experience and thus the ability to help us learn from that experience.

The selection of a doctoral committee to read and approve a research proposal as well as to guide the subsequent research and to affirm the accomplishment of meeting a

"doctoral" standard is evidence of the desire to find mentors to share the insights necessary to move beyond one's own experience. Phillips-Jones (1982) distinguishes between two types of mentors, primary and secondary. In-depth mentoring across a broad content would be characterized as a primary mentor relationship, while secondary mentors provide a more narrow scope of influence. A doctoral committee "chair" becomes a primary mentor in the dissertation process. The committee members are secondary mentors in the dissertation process, even though they may be primary mentors in other contexts.

The Utah code requires the assignment of a mentor with substantially the same duties as the provisional teacher they are assigned to (UCA 53A-10). This would suggest that these assigned mentors are only secondary mentors in relationship to the provisional teacher's overall professional life, yet they are viewed as primary mentors in the language of Utah law and in the practice expected in the public schools.

Mentors can play many different roles as they "guide" their charge. The descriptive term *protégé,* comes from the French term *protegere,* meaning one who is protected or trained or whose career is furthered by a person of experience, prominence, or influence. These mentor-protégé relationships can be described in many different ways. Odell (1990) used the work of others to differentiate between the different roles that mentors play: the trusted guide (Homer); the teacher (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978); the sponsor (Schein, 1978); the challenger (Daloz, 1983); and, the confidant (Gehrke & Kay, 1984).

In 1981, Bova and Phillips identified 10 characteristics inherent in any mentor-

protégé relationship:

1. mentor-protégé relationships grow out of voluntary interaction;
2. mentor-protégé relationships have a life cycle (introduction; mutual trust-building; teaching of risk-taking, communication, and professional skills; transfer of professional standards; and dissolution);
3. people become mentors to pass down information to the next generation;
4. mentors encourage protégés in setting and attaining short and long-term goals;
5. mentors guide technically and professionally (mentors teach protégés skills necessary to survive daily experiences and promote career-scope professional development);
6. mentors protect protégés from major mistakes by limiting their exposure to responsibility;
7. mentors provide opportunities for protégés to observe and participate in their work;
8. mentors are role models;
9. mentors sponsor protégés organizationally and professionally; and,
10. mentor-protégé relationships end, amiably or bitterly.

If these characteristics are "inherent" in mentor-protégé relationships, then attention to the process of selecting and assigning mentors is critical for the positive modeling necessary to develop good teaching skills and to retain good teachers. Efforts to formalize and "assign" mentors can help or hurt this induction process. All beginning teachers are likely to have or find a mentor. The majority of those who enter the teaching

profession report that a good teacher influenced them enough to pursue teaching as their own career (Cutlip & Shockley, 2000). Using a mentoring program to comply with state-mandated and/or district required activities can load the relationship to a point that the benefits of mentoring become compromised. The mentor is most often seen as a guide to the profession, not a stand-in for administration (Driscoll et al., 1985).

With various mentor-protégé relationships comes the question of whether or not these relationships are good or bad. The answer can be either, depending on the motivation and circumstances of the relationship. Muse, Wasden, and Thomas (1988) found that mentors may have personal agendas to follow that could be working against the best interests of others. If the mentor is more focused on prestige or status than helping and guiding, the protégé will not likely benefit from the relationship in positive ways. Mentoring relationships can be based on control and protection (Daresh & Playko, 1993). The mentor can limit the protégé's growth and development by distorting and/or controlling information and experiences. Mentoring may limit experience and understanding if the mentor is so entrenched in a particular style or approach as to ignore or avoid opportunities to help the protégé make their own decisions and/or solve their own problems. The perception of the mentor as either expert or incompetent can lead to the generalization that all mentors have either no real answers or all right answers. Understanding that all mentors have strengths and weaknesses is important for the protégé. Mentoring can create an unhealthy dependency on the mentor. The protégé must be able to make reasonable decisions and take reasonable actions without the constant approval of the mentor. Mentoring can eliminate other perspectives. Hart

(1993) argued that veteran mentors can limit innovation and virtually guarantee the reproduction of existing roles rather than supporting new roles.

If there were not benefits from mentoring relationships, they would not be so important to us. Mentors are reinforced in their behavior as they are asked to help guide their protégé. Mentors feel important and needed by both the protégé and the organization they belong to (company. institution, group, etc.). Mentors become more enthused about their work as they pass along important information to the protégé (Intrator, 2002). Mentors gain new insights as questions are asked by the protégé and/or observations are made relative to the protégé's experiences. Mentors benefit from the long-lasting relationships, and often friendships, formed with the protégé. Being a mentor leads to the desire to continue being a mentor (Crow & Matthews, 1998) and thus the continuation of the benefits listed above.

Protégés are reinforced as they gain greater insight into their own beliefs and priorities. Protégés learn the expectations of the organization in a relatively protected way as they work with and through their mentor. Protégés are filled with observations, insights, suggestions, and warnings from their mentor. In addition to these three somewhat universal benefits for the protégé, Crow and Matthews (1998) found that beginning school administrators also benefitted by their exposure to new ideas and creativity, their visibility with key personnel, their protection from damaging situations, their opportunities for challenging and risk-taking activities, their increased confidence and competence, and finally their improved reflection of their own practice.

In addition to the limitations and benefits of mentoring, there are functions of mentoring. Kram (1985) found two functions of mentoring in the corporate world; the career function and the psychosocial function. The career function focused on learning the expectations of the workplace along with the career opportunities. These functions relate directly to aid in career advancement. The psychosocial function describes the development of the individual in their social environment. These functions affect the role identity or the individual on a very personal level.

Crow and Matthews (1998) made a third distinction of the functions of mentoring. Where Kram (1985) included both career and professional issues of mentoring within the career function, Crow and Matthews distinguished between career development and professional development. This distinction is important in the study of school leadership because of the ever-changing nature of school leadership and the different career functions in schools as compared to other professions. These three functions of mentoring are: 1. *career development function*–focused on career satisfaction, career awareness, and career advancement; 2. *professional development function*–focused on the development of knowledge, skills, behaviors, and values; and, 3. *psychosocial development function*–which involves personal and emotional well-being, as well as role expectation, clarification, and conflict.

There are 15 topics that can be pulled from the literature on mentoring that cut across the functions of mentoring and provide a basis for inquiry relative to the qualities of mentoring relationships. These 15 topics described in the context of a classroom teacher include:

1. developing classroom management skills;
2. understanding and meeting specific student needs;
3. selecting curriculum and other instructional materials;
4. learning new methods and finding new ideas and strategies for instructional practice;
5. assessing the various levels of student learning;
6. developing effective instructional skills;
7. learning to avoid mistakes;
8. understanding the role differences between teachers and principals;
9. learning the necessary school level operations and procedures;
10. learning the necessary district/system level operations and procedures;
11. understanding contractual obligations;
12. making good career decisions;
13. participating in meaningful professional development;
14. learning to network with other teachers; and,
15. learning how to communicate effectively with parents.

The mentoring literature supports the practice of using mentors to assist beginning teachers with both the acquisition of necessary skills and the socialization into the teaching profession. The most powerful mentoring relationships seem to come from a mutual need and/or desire between the mentor and the protégé. For better or worse, mentors clearly influence and socialize their protégés

Teacher Induction

The induction of beginning teachers implies a planned and organized orientation procedure that typically lasts for 3 to 5 years. The intent of all induction programs is to help transform the new teacher into a competent career educator. Thoughtful and well-organized induction programs are the exception rather than the rule. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2003) documented that informal or haphazard induction experiences have been associated with higher levels of attrition as well as lower levels of teacher effectiveness. Teaching may be the only profession where beginners are expected, on their first day at work, to do the same jobe and to perform at the same level as the experienced teacher. First-year teachers are frequently left to "sink or swim" in their position with little support from colleagues and few opportunities for professional development (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996). There is generally no monitored progression from observing to student teaching to practice.

The benefits of good induction programs include both reduced attrition rates among new teachers and improved teaching capabilities (Weiss & Weiss, 1999). The percentage of new teachers who participate in formal induction programs is slowly growing from 59% in 1994 to 65% in 1998 (NCTAF, 2003). The value of mentoring is statistically borne out by research demonstrating that teachers without induction support leave the profession at a rate almost 70% higher than those who received it (U.S. Department of Education, 2000). The real teacher shortage problem may actually be a teacher retention problem. Teachers tend to leave because of inadequate preservice preparation, difficult workplace conditions without support and guidance, and poor

salaries and benefits (Bolich, 2001).

Schlechty (1985) notes that signs of effective induction programs can be observed in the faculty by looking at the support of school norms and the general conformity of teacher performance to those norms. He created a framework to evaluate induction programs by looking at four characteristics of the influence of other professions on teaching and four characteristics that apply directly to the needs of beginning teachers. This framework is intended to apply to vastly differing induction programs relative to both content and delivery structure. The four characteristics from other professions include: 1. The program explains to the inductees that the process of their selection is based on special requirements and that induction training is crucial to their future success; 2. The induction process is divided into progressive stages of achievement; 3. The program cultivates mutual support within the peer groups; and, 4. The training is oriented toward long-term career goals.

The needs of beginning teachers are met with the remaining four characteristics: 5. Administratively-set expectations and norms of teacher conduct are clearly articulated and disseminated; 6. Teachers must assimilate a professional vocabulary; 7. New teachers receive supervision, coaching, demonstration, and assessment; and, 8. The responsibility for supervision should be distributed throughout the faculty in a tightly organized, consistent, and continuous program.

The general content of an induction program can come from multiple sources. The priority lists are often generated by surveys of senior teachers and administrators experienced in observing and/or dealing with the shortcomings of first-year teachers.

With wide variance in degree, all programs contain elements of faculty and facility introduction, classroom management, student discipline, professional conduct, school and school district expectations, and professional obligations. Some programs instruct and assess the beginning teacher while others merely emphasize assistance for the beginning teacher. New teachers need exposure to a variety of teaching techniques as well as evaluation processes. Serious problems arise when evaluation is mistaken for assessment and induction programs are used as wash-out programs. New hirees in any field are hired with the expectation that they will "survive" the induction process and start on their way to full-term careers.

In 1996, NASSP summarized the research on formal induction programs and activities to generate a list of what induction efforts should be provided for beginning teachers:

- ease the transition from student to teacher (Fox & Singletary, 1986);
- develop networks of teachers to help beginning teachers combat the most persistent problems that new teachers face (Klug & Salzman, 1991);
- provide opportunities for new teachers to talk about their issues both formally and informally without fear of retribution (Rosenholtz, 1989);
- establish built-in supports such as monthly meetings to address topical issues;
- provide opportunities for seasoned teachers to mentor beginning teachers (Gehrke, 1991);

- increase supervisory efforts—beginning teachers need reassurance, friendly faces, and opportunities to talk and make sense of their experiences (Rosenholtz, 1989); and,
- involve beginning teachers in coaching, moderating a club, or attending social events to feel connected to their community (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1996).

Since the mid 1980s, induction programs have increasingly used mentors to provide assistance to new teachers. These veteran educators help beginners learn the philosophy, cultural values, and established sets of behaviors expected by the schools where they are employed (Little, 1990). Some new teachers receive regular coaching and opportunities for collaboration, but others may see their mentor only on rare occasion. In the California New Teacher Project, the intensity of the support and instruction did differ across projects and had an impact on new teachers' perceptions of teaching and their performance in the classroom (Gold, 1996). The frequency and the quality of the support offered to beginning teachers are both important. Most programs do not provide training for mentors specifically, nor for the support teams established within the induction program (Weiss & Weiss, 1999). North Carolina is the only state that requires mentor teachers to hold a mentor license (Andrews & Andrews, 1998).

The "teacher induction" literature also supports the assignment of mentors to assist beginning teachers. A systematic and well-planned induction process is essential for beginning teachers to maximize their chances of being successful in the classroom and for improving the chances that they will stay in the teaching profession. Effective mentoring is a cornerstone of effective induction programs.

Teacher Mentoring

Although it is difficult to always agree on who the best teachers are, it is easy to observe that all parents and students want to have the teachers that they perceive to be the best. The National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching (NPEAT, 2002), funded primarily by the United States Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement, has sought to place the improvement of teaching as the center of its efforts to improve schools. The NPEAT Policy Board (recently incorporated into the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future [NCTAF]) has representation from thirty national organizations and has articulated its goal as working to ensure that America will provide all students with access to competent, caring, qualified teachers in schools organized for success (NCTAF, 2003). As work continues to establish a set of strategies that hold promise for continuously improving the quality of teaching, NCTAF has provided principles and guidelines for the design of improved policy and practice.

For teacher preparation, NCTAF has outlined six dimensions of quality teacher preparation that include extensive clinical practice to develop effective teaching skills and entry level teaching support through residencies and mentored induction (p. 74). Improving the induction of new teachers into the profession can be seen as the single most cost-effective strategy for improving teaching. Further, providing the best initial preparation programs and recruiting the best teachers will likely be wasted unless schools are structured to provide ongoing professional development and appropriate teacher evaluation.

The most common characteristics of mentoring that are provided as a part of a new teacher induction program are helping the beginner learn the philosophy, cultural values, and established sets of behaviors expected by the schools where they are employed (Little, 1990; Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., 1999). Some teachers receive regular coaching and opportunities for collaboration, while others see their mentors sporadically. Successful mentor programs are dependent on the quality of training afforded the mentors (Feiman-Nemser, 1996; Ganser, 1996b; Ganser & Koskela, 1997). Research indicates that beginning teachers who are mentored are more effective teachers in their early years, since they learn from guided practice rather than depending on trial-and-error alone.

In an ERIC Digest titled "Teacher Mentoring: A Critical Review", Sharon Feiman-Nemser (1996) reviewed the issues, promises, and limitations of mentoring programs. She notes that the enthusiasm for mentoring has not been matched by clarity about the purposes of mentoring. Mentoring has the potential to go beyond helping beginning teachers survive their first year of teaching. Mentoring can function as a strategy for school reform if it is linked to a vision of good teaching, an understanding of how beginning teachers learn to become successful career teachers, and is supported by practice and expectations that favor collaboration, communication, and inquiry.

Fairbanks, Freedman, and Kahn (2000) explored the characteristics of successful mentoring by reviewing data collected from teachers and mentors who met in monthly workshops to reflect on their mentoring relationships. They reviewed journals, conducted interviews, video taped conferences, and examined artifacts from professional

development workshops that had been attended. They found three categories to help describe the successful characteristics: 1. Helping teachers survive their beginning teaching experiences and define their teaching lives; 2. Establishing relationships based on dialogue and reflection; and, 3. building proffessional relationships.

There is a general recognition that mentors have a positive impact on teacher retention, but there is no generalized understanding of what mentors should do, what they actually do, and what beginning teachers learn as a result of being mentored. Mentors have been found to promote conventional norms and practices, thus limiting reform (Feiman-Nemser, Parker, & Zeicher, 1993). Few mentor teachers practice the kind of conceptually oriented, learner-centered teaching advocated by reformers (Cohen, McLaughlin, & Talbert, 1993). Mentor teachers have little experience with the core activities of mentoring; observing and discussing teaching with colleagues. If we want mentors to help novices learn the ways of thinking and acting associated with new kinds of teaching, then we have to place them with mentors who are already reformers in their schools and classrooms (Cochran-Smith, 1991), or develop collaborative contexts where mentors and provisional teachers can explore and practice new approaches together.

More recent studies suggest that formal mentoring can be better described as mentor-apprentice collaboration (Dever, Johnson, & Hobbs, 2000) that focuses on mentoring strategies to share concerns and joys, build a sense of team, and establish trust, dialogue, and affirmation. Another refinement suggests that educative mentoring vision (Feiman-Nemser, 2001) can be developed by experienced mentors who create specific principles and strategies that shape mentoring practice and the efforts required to sustain

it. There is also evidence that informal or secondary mentoring can enhance the formal processes of mentoring and induction (Tillman, 2000).

As might be expected, the differences in mentoring relationships and expectations can create very different outcomes for the beginning teacher. If policy and practice related to mentoring is to be improved, there needs to be more direct studies of mentoring and its affects on teaching as well as teacher retention. Mentoring relationships are bound to be unpredictable. Yet the conditions and expectations for the provisional teacher require some systematic approach to induction into the profession of teaching.

There are three major issues in the mentoring literature that receive comment and debate but have yet to emerge with any clear consensus. First is the role of the mentor with regards to assistance versus assessment. Second is whether mentors should be chosen or assigned. The third issue is one of time; time to learn to be a mentor and time to thoughtfully mentor the new teacher. The Utah Code clearly addresses the first two and suggests that providing time (and pay) may be appropriate for districts to consider if "additional time is required" (UCA-53A-10-111).

Common sense and conventional wisdom has led many states, including Utah, to conclude that mentors should assist and not assess the provisional teacher. This belief is centered around the assumption that the new teacher is more likely to share problems and ask for help if the mentor does not evaluate them. The more dynamic and collaborative approaches to professional development require the evaluation process to include those most closely linked to daily practice, peers. While excluding the mentor from the formal evaluation process may seem necessary, it also removes the person who may have the

best assessment of the needs of the beginning teacher from helping define the process to meet those needs. Trenta, Newman, Newman, Salzman, Lenigan, and Newman (2002) found that there was a high degree of comfort in having the same consulting teacher serve in both mentor and evaluator roles. This unique 3-year mixed methods program approach was endorsed by the teachers union, school district administrators, and entry-year teachers.

Since mentoring relationships are unpredictable, does it matter if mentors are chosen or assigned? In Utah, the mentors are to be assigned by the principal or immediate supervisor, based on the criteria of finding someone "who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional educator and has at least three years of educational experience" (UCA-53A-10-108). There will likely be a difference between the "assigned" mentor relationships and the "adopted" mentor relationships developed throughout ones' career. Tauer (1995) argues that it may be more useful to focus on establishing optimal conditions for developing positive mentoring relationships rather than trying to make optimal assignments of mentors to novices. This suggests that attention needs to be paid to who are the good models/mentors and what conditions can help these relationships to be productive and effective.

Providing time to learn to be a mentor and to mentor seems like a simple and reasonable consideration. Across the country, mentoring programs use retired teachers, release teachers from some or all of their regular duties, or just expect the mentor to combine this responsibility with full-time teaching. Training ranges from none to formal courses that may include clinical supervision, research on effective teaching, beginning

teacher concerns, and theories of adult learning. Those programs that provide training, normally conduct such prior to assigning the mentor to a novice. A better practice might include opportunities to discuss questions and problems that arise in the course of their work with provisional teachers (NCTAF, 2003).

Effective mentoring processes are built on a foundation of mutual trust with the primary objective of assistance. For trust to be built and good assessment to take place, the mentor must be viewed by the provisional teacher as competent and worthy of emulation. The assignment of mentors with substantially the same duties as their protégé, while trying to judiciously consider common professional interests, expressed educational philosophies, and compatible personalities, seems like an impossible task.

As an interactive system, mentoring is seen as benefitting the mentor, the protégé, and the school system (Krupp, 1984). The mentors benefit from the questions of the beginning teachers that cause the mentors to reexamine their own classroom practices and the effects of accepted instructional strategies on the teaching/learning process. Provisional teachers are quickly assimilated into the school environment and begin to establish their own professional competence while recognizing that teaching can be a continually developing, lifelong career. The school district benefits when there is a positive mentoring relationship as the teacher attrition rate has been shown to decline (Driscoll et al., 1985). There is also evidence that if close supervision is a characteristic of this relationship, discouragement can be decreased and instructional problems can be corrected.

The teacher mentoring literature supports further investigation of the issues laid

out in this clinical research study. The qualities of formal and informal mentoring relationships, the differences in mentoring by level (elementary, junior high, or high school) and by number of provisional teaching years (first, second, or third), the principals' mentor assignment practices, quality of assigned mentors, assessment of provisional teachers abilities, and the perceived effectiveness of provisional teacher evaluations are all in need of thoughtful analysis.

APPENDIX B

UTAH CODE 53A-10

Educator Evaluation

53A-10-101 Legislative Findings

(1) The Legislature recognizes that the quality of public education can be improved and enhanced by providing for systematic, fair, and competent evaluation of public educators and remediation of those whose performance is inadequate.

(2) In accordance with Subsections 53A-1a-104(7) and 53A-6-102(2)(a) and (b), the desired purposes of evaluation are to allow the educator and the school district to promote the professional growth of the teacher, to identify and encourage teaching strategies which contribute to student progress, to identify teachers according to their abilities, and to improve the education system.

53A-10-102 Definitions

As used in this chapter:

(1) "Career educator" means a certified employee entitled to rely upon continued employment under the policies of a local school board.

(2) "Educator" means any individual, except the superintendent, employed by a school district who is required to hold a professional certificate issued by the State Board of Education. Educator does not include individuals who work less than three hours per day or who are hired for less than half of a school year.

(3) "Probationary educator" means any educator employed by a school district who, under local school board policy, has been advised by the district that his performance is inadequate.

(4) "Provisional educator" means any educator employed by a school district who has not achieved status as a career educator within the school district.

53A-10-103 Establishment of Educator Evaluation Program -- Joint Committee

(1) Each local school board shall develop an evaluation program in consultation with its educators through appointment of a joint committee.

(2) The joint committee shall be comprised of an equal number of classroom teachers, parents, and administrators appointed by the board.

(3) A board may appoint members of the joint committee from a list of nominees:

(a) voted on by classroom teachers in a nomination election;

(b) voted on by the administrators in a nomination election; and

(c) of parents submitted by school community councils within the district.

(4) The evaluation program developed by the joint committee must comply with the requirements of Section 53A-10-106.

53A-10-104 Frequency of Evaluations

A local school board shall provide for the evaluation of its provisional and probationary educators at least twice each school year.

53A-10-105 Evaluation Orientation

(1) The principal of each school shall orient all educators assigned to the school concerning the school board's educator evaluation program, including the purpose of the evaluations and the method used to evaluate.

(2) Evaluations may not occur prior to the orientation by the principal.

53A-10-106 Components of Educator Evaluation Program

-- Evaluator -- Notice -- Criteria -- Response

Any educator evaluation program adopted by a local school board in consultation with a committee shall provide the following:

(1) unless otherwise provided in the adopted program, the principal, the principal's designee, or the educator's immediate supervisor shall perform the educator evaluation;

(2) personal notice to the educator of the evaluation process at least 15 days prior to the first evaluation and receipt of a copy of the evaluation instrument, if an instrument is to be used;

(3) a reasonable number of observation periods for any evaluation to insure adequate opportunity for evaluation;

(4) the use of several types of evaluation and evidence, such as self-evaluation, student evaluation, peer evaluation, or systematic observations;

(5) that the educator may make a written response to all or any part of the evaluation and that the response will be attached to the evaluation;

(6) a reliable and valid evaluation consistent with generally accepted professional standards for personnel evaluation systems; and

(7) within 15 days after the completed evaluation process the evaluation in writing shall be discussed with the educator. Following any revisions made after the discussion, a copy of the evaluation shall be filed in the educator's personnel file together with any related reports or documents. A copy of the evaluation and attachments shall be given to the educator.

53A-10-107 Deficiencies -- Remediation

(1) An educator whose performance is inadequate or in need of improvement shall be provided with a written document clearly identifying deficiencies, the available

resources for improvement, and a recommended course of action that will improve the educator's performance.

(2) The district shall provide the educator with reasonable assistance to improve performance.

(3) An educator is responsible for improving performance by using the resources identified by the school district and demonstrating acceptable levels of improvement in the designated areas of deficiencies.

53A-10-108 Mentor for Provisional Educator

(1) In accordance with Subsections 53A-1a-104(7) and 53A-6-102(2)(a) and (b), the principal or immediate supervisor of a provisional educator shall assign a mentor to the provisional educator.

(2) Where possible, the mentor shall be a career educator who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional educator and has at least three years of educational experience.

(3) The mentor shall assist the provisional educator to become effective and competent in the teaching profession and school system, but may not serve as an evaluator of the provisional educator.

53A-10-109 Final Evaluation

(1) At least 60 days prior to the end of the contract school year, the principal, immediate supervisor, or appointed evaluator of an educator whose performance has been determined to be inadequate or in need of improvement, shall complete all written evaluations and recommendations regarding the educator evaluated during the contract school year.

(2) The final evaluation shall contain only data previously considered and discussed with the individual educator as required in Section 53A-10-106.

(3) Nothing in this section prevents a school district from performing supplementary evaluation for good cause after the issuance of the final evaluation.

53A-10-110 Review of Evaluation -- Time Limit on Request

(1) An educator who is not satisfied with an evaluation has 30 days after receiving the written evaluation to request a review of the evaluation.

(2) If a review is requested, the district superintendent or the superintendent's designee shall appoint a person, not an employee of the district, who has expertise in teacher or personnel evaluation to review and make recommendations to the superintendent regarding the teacher's evaluation.

(3) Nothing in this section prevents the teacher and district superintendent or the

superintendent's designee from agreeing to another method of review.

53A-10-111 Additional Compensation for Services

The district may compensate a person employed as a mentor under Section 53A-10-108 or participant in the evaluation for those services, in addition to the person's regular salary, if additional time is required in the evaluation process.

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTERS, SURVEYS, AND CODES

May 23, 2002

Dear Provisional Teacher,

I am conducting a doctoral study in Granite School District to collect data that will help the district to better understand and meet the needs of provisional teachers. Specifically, the attached survey asks questions about your mentoring relationships and your experiences as a provisional teacher. Survey data is being collected from all of the first, second, and third year provisional teachers in the regular K-12 programs within the district.

Please take a few minutes to complete this survey and return it in the provided envelop at your earliest convenience. I know that this is a very busy time of the school year and that this is a difficult year for all of us in public education. With your help and input, I hope we can collect data that will provide the insights necessary to influence policy and practice with regards to supporting and retaining provisional teachers.

All responses will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time and help with this clinical research study.

Sincerely,

McKell Withers, Doctoral Candidate
University of Utah

Provisional Teacher Survey
Mentoring Relationships and Induction Experiences

1. Were you **"assigned"** a mentor by your principal this current school year? ❑ yes ❑ no

   • How long has this mentor been assigned to you? from_____ to _____

2. Does your assigned mentor have substantially the same teaching assignment as you do? ❑ yes ❑ no

3. Approximately how many times have you met with your assigned mentor this school year?
_____

4. Do you have an **"informal"** mentor (someone ***you have chosen*** to interact with as a consulting educator)?

   ❑ no ❑ yes; If yes, what teaching assignments does he/she have?
_____

5. In rank order (1 to 3), who most frequently initiates contact? ___you; ___assigned mentor; ___informal mentor

6. When you have a question about teaching or when you are troubled about some aspect of your work, to what degree do you use each of the following for help or support (5 = very often; 4 = often; 3 = occasionally; 2 = rarely; 1 = never)?

   ⑤④③②① assigned mentor

   ⑤④③②① informal mentor

   ⑤④③②① other (_____) please specify

   • Which of these, has generally provided the most valuable help to you in learning to become a teacher (check one)? ❑ assigned mentor ❑ informal mentor ❑ other

7. Please indicate the degree to which you have discussed the following with your **"assigned"** mentor
(5 = very often; 4 = often; 3 = occasionally; 2 = rarely; 1 = never):

   ⑤④③②① classroom management
   ⑤④③②① specific student needs
   ⑤④③②① curriculum selection
   ⑤④③②① new ideas and methods
   ⑤④③②① assessment of learning
   ⑤④③②① effective instruction
   ⑤④③②① general school operation and procedures
   ⑤④③②① general district operation and procedures
   ⑤④③②① contractual obligations
   ⑤④③②① career decisions
   ⑤④③②① professional development
   ⑤④③②① networking with other faculty

⑤④③②① avoiding mistakes

⑤④③②① the role of the school principal

⑤④③②① how to communicate with parents

⑤④③②① other

_____
please specify

8. How would you characterize the mentoring relationship you have with your assigned mentor?_____

_____

9. In your opinion, what characteristics should the "ideal" mentoring relationship have?_____

_____

10. Using the following scale, how often has your assigned mentoring relationship included any of the following
(5 = very often; 4 = often; 3 = occasionally; 2 = rarely; 1 = never):

⑤④③②① observing your teaching

⑤④③②① demonstrating a teaching method

⑤④③②① taking you to a conference/ workshop

⑤④③②① providing feedback about your teaching

⑤④③②① introducing you to other teachers to network with

⑤④③②① inviting you to a (non-work related) social event

11. Use the following scale to describe your perceptions and/or experiences relative to your assigned mentoring relationship (5 = very good; 4 = good; 3 = average; 2 = poor; 1 = very poor):

Overall, my assigned mentoring relationship is .....

⑤
④
③
②
①

The support I have received from my assigned mentor has been .....

⑤
④
③
②
①

The availability of my assigned mentor has been . . . . . .

⑤
④
③
②
①

My experience as a teacher thus far has been . . . . . .

⑤
④
③
②
①

12. Using the following scale, please rate the quality of help you have received from your assigned mentor with the following (5 = very good; 4 = good; 3 = average; 2 = poor; 1 = very poor):

⑤④③②① classroom management
⑤④③②① meeting specific student needs
⑤④③②① making curriculum selections
⑤④③②① using new ideas and methods
⑤④③②① assessing student learning
⑤④③②① providing effective instruction
⑤④③②① avoiding mistakes
⑤④③②① working with the principal
⑤④③②① understanding general school operation and procedures
⑤④③②① understanding general district operation and procedures
⑤④③②① understanding contractual obligations
⑤④③②① making career decisions
⑤④③②① participating in professional development activities
⑤④③②① networking with other faculty
⑤④③②① communicating with parents
⑤④③②① other

_____
please specify

13. How many times was your job performance formally evaluated this year (number of formal evaluations)? _____

14. Did your assigned mentor participate in any formal evaluation of your performance? ❑yes ❑no ❑don't know

15. What rating best represents how *your principal* has evaluated your job performance this year?

❑exemplary ❑above average ❑average ❑below average ❑non-renewal in process

16. What rating best represents how *you* would evaluate your own job performance this year?

❑exemplary ❑above average ❑average ❑below average ❑non-renewal in process

17. Using the following scale, how likely are you to . . . (5 = very likely; 4 = likely; 3 = undecided; 2 = unlikely; 1 = very unlikely)?

⑤④③②① stay in the teaching profession
⑤④③②① stay in this school district
⑤④③②① stay at this school
⑤④③②① recommend becoming a teacher to others

The following information is very important to the analysis of this data and will be held in the strictest confidence until destroyed.

Teaching assignment (grade/subject):_____

Degree(s) held:_____Major:_____minor:_____

License/endorsements:_____

Is teaching your first "career" position? ❑Yes ❑No, my first career position was_____

Ethnic/racial background:_____

Your gender (male/female):_____

Date first started teaching:_____

Provisional Teacher Survey Codes

Mentoring Relationships and Induction Experiences

Sur# = number assigned to a returned survey (ET=elementary teacher; JT=junior high teacher; HT=high school teacher)

TL = Teacher Level (1=Elementary; 2=Junior High; 3=High School)

1 = Were you **"assigned"** a mentor by your principal this current school year? (1=yes; 2=no)

1A = How long has this mentor been assigned to you? (N=total number of months)

2 = Does your assigned mentor have substantially the same teaching assignment as you do? (1=yes; 2=no)

3 = Approximately how many times have you met with your assigned mentor this school year? (N=number)

4 = Do you have an **"informal"** mentor? (1=yes; 2=no)

4A = If yes, what teaching assignments does he/she have? (1=same; 2=team/dept; 3=district; 4=other)

5Y = In rank order (1-3), who most frequently initiates contact? (Answer you=1, 2, or 3)

5AM = In rank order (1-3), who most frequently initiates contact? (Answer assigned mentor=1, 2, or 3)

5IM = In rank order (1-3), who most frequently initiates contact? (Answer informal mentor=1, 2, or 3)

6AM = When you have a question about teaching or when you are troubled about some aspect of your work, to what degree do you use each of the following for help or support (5 = very often; 4 = often; 3 = occasionally; 2 = rarely; 1 = never)? (Answer assigned mentor=5, 4, 3, 2, or 1)

6IM = When you have a question about teaching or when you are troubled about some aspect of your work, to what degree do you use each of the following for help or support (5 = very often; 4 = often; 3 = occasionally; 2 = rarely; 1 = never)? (Answer informal mentor=5, 4, 3, 2, or 1)

6OT = When you have a question about teaching or when you are troubled about some aspect of your work, to what degree do you use each of the following for help or support (5 = very often; 4 = often; 3 = occasionally; 2 = rarely; 1 = never)? (Answer other=5, 4, 3, 2, or 1)

6M = Which of these, has generally provided the most valuable help to you in learning to

become a teacher? (Answer assigned mentor=1; informal mentor=2; other=3)

All 7's = Please indicate the degree to which you have discussed the following with your **"assigned"** mentor (5 = very often; 4 = often; 3 = occasionally; 2 = rarely; 1 = never):

7CM=classroom management
7SS=specific student needs
7CS=curriculum selection
7NI=new ideas and methods
7AO=assessment of learning
7EI=effective instruction
7AM=avoiding mistakes
7RS=the role of the school principal
7GS=general school operation and procedures
7GD=general district operation and procedures
7CO=contractual obligations
7CD=career decisions
7PD=professional development
7NW=networking with other faculty
7HC=how to communicate with parents
7OT=other

8 = How would you characterize the mentoring relationship you have with your assigned mentor? (positive answer=1; negative answer=2; no comment=3) Note: comments listed in appendix

9 = In your opinion, what characteristics should the "ideal" mentoring relationship have? All comments listed in appendix

All 10 = Using the following scale, how often has your assigned mentoring relationship included any of the following (5 = very often; 4 = often; 3 = occasionally; 2 = rarely; 1 = never):

10YT=observing your teaching
10DT=demonstrating a teaching method
10TY=taking you to a conference/workshop
10PF=providing feedback about your teaching
10IY=introducing you to other teachers to network
10SE=inviting you to a social event

All 11 = Use the following scale to describe your perceptions and/or experiences relative to your assigned mentoring relationship (5 = very good; 4 = good; 3 = average; 2 = poor; 1 = very poor):

11MR=Overall, my assigned mentoring relationship is
11SA=The support I have received from my assigned mentor has been
11AA=The availability of my assigned mentor has been
11ET=My experience as a teacher thus far has been

All 12 = Using the following scale, please rate the quality of help you have received from your assigned mentor with the following (5 = very good; 4 = good; 3 = average; 2 = poor; 1 = very poor):

12CM=classroom management
12GS=general school operation and procedures

12SS=specific student needs
12CS=curriculum selection
12NI=new ideas and methods
12AO=assessment of learning
12EI=effective instruction
12AM=avoiding mistakes
12RS=the role of the school principal
12GD=general district operation and procedures
12CO=contractual obligations
12CD=career decisions
12PD=professional development
12NW=networking with other faculty
12HC=how to communicate with parents
12OT=other

13 = How many times was your job performance formally evaluated this year (number of formal evaluations)? (N=number of times reported)

14 = Did your assigned mentor participate in any formal evaluation of your performance? (1=yes; 2=no; 3=don't know)

15 = What rating best represents how *your principal* has evaluated your job performance this year? (1=exemplary; 2=above average; 3=average; 4=below average; 5=non-renewal in process)

16 = What rating best represents how *you* would evaluate your own job performance this year? (1=exemplary; 2=above average; 3=average; 4=below average; 5=non-renewal in process)

All 17 = Using the following scale, how likely are you to . . . . .(5 = very likely; 4 = likely; 3 = undecided; 2 = unlikely; 1 = very unlikely)?

17ST=stay in the teaching profession
17SA=stay at this school
17SS=stay in this school district
17RT=recommend becoming a teacher to others

18 = Teaching assignment (grade/subject): (1=K-3; 2=4-6; 3=english/history; 4=math/science; 5=art/music; 6=other)

19 = Degree(s) held: (1=BS; 2=BA/BFA; 3=MS; 4=MA; 5=PHD/EDD; 6=alternative/other)

19A = Major: (1=early childhood; 2=elementary education; 3=english/history; 4=math/science; 5=art/music; 6=other)

19B = minor: (1=early childhood; 2=elementary education; 3=english/history; 4=math/science; 5=art/music; 6=other)

20 = License/endorsements: (0=no response; 1=response)

21 = Is teaching your first "career" position? (1=Yes; 2=No)

21FC = . . . my first career position was (1=business; 2=professional position; 3=military)

22 = Ethnic/racial background: (1=white/caucasion; 2=hispanic; 3=asian/pacific island; 4=black; 5=native american; 6=other)

23 = Your gender (male/female): (1=male; 2=female)

24 = Date first started teaching: (N=month/year)
'01 = 1 (First Year)
'00 = 2 (Second Year)
'99 = 3 (Third Year)
'98> = 4 (Other)

May 23, 2002

Dear Principal,

I am conducting a doctoral study in Granite School District to collect data that will help the district to better understand and meet the needs of provisional teachers. Specifically, the attached survey asks questions about the provisional teachers and assigned mentors at your school. Please take a few minutes to complete this survey and return it in the provided envelop at your earliest convenience. I know that this is a very busy time of the school year and that this is a difficult year for all of us in public education. With your help and input, I hope we can collect data that will provide the insights necessary to influence policy and practice with regards to supporting and retaining good teachers.

All responses will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time and help with this clinical research study. Survey data is also being collected from all of the first, second, and third year provisional teachers in the regular K-12 programs within the district.

Sincerely,

McKell Withers, Doctoral Candidate
University of Utah

Principal Survey

Assigning Mentors to Provisional Teachers

1. How many provisional teachers currently work at your school? _____

- Of this total, how many are? ____first year; ____second year; ____third year

2. In order of importance, which of the following do you consider when you assign a mentor to a provisional teacher (1 = most important, 2 = next most important, . . .):

___who is willing
___who is available
___who is the best teacher
___who has the most similar assignment
___who has the most knowledge about the school
___other
_____
please specify

3. To what degree should mentors help you evaluate provisional teachers (check one)?

❑ highly involved ❑ equally involved ❑ minimally involved ❑ not involved

4. What degree of formal training do most mentors receive before being assigned to a provisional teacher (check one)?

❑ more than 10 hours ❑ 5 to 10 hours ❑ 1 to 5 hours ❑ no formal training

5. Considering all of the mentor teachers you have assigned, are they most likely to be a (check one) . . .

❑ master teacher ❑ above average teacher ❑ average teacher ❑ below average teacher

6. Considering all of the provisional teachers currently at your school, how many would you place in each of the following categories (total number should match total on question # 1)?

___exemplary; ___above average; ___average; ___below average; ___non-renewal in process

7. How would you characterize the provisional teacher evaluation process (check one)?

❑ thorough ❑ adequate ❑ less than adequate ❑ inadequate

8. How many total years have you been a principal in this school? _____ in this district?_____

Thank you for your time and help.

Principal Survey Codes

Assigning Mentors to Provisional Teachers

Sur# = number assigned to a returned survey (EP=elementary principal; JP=junior high principal; HP=high school principal)

PL = Principal Level (1=Elementary; 2=Junior High; 3=High School)

1 = How many provisional teachers currently work at your school? (N=total number of teachers)

1A = Of this total, how many are? (N=first year)

1B = Of this total, how many are? (N=second year)

1C = Of this total, how many are? (N=third year)

All 2 = In order of importance, which of the following do you consider when you assign a mentor to a provisional teacher (1 = most important, 2 = next most important, . . .):

2A= # for "who is willing"

2B= # for "who is available"

2C= # for "who is the best teacher

2D= # for "who has the most similar assignment"

2E= # for "who has the most knowledge about the school"

2F= # for "other"

3 = To what degree should mentors help you evaluate provisional teachers (check one)? (1=highly involved; 2=equally involved; 3=minimally involved; 4=not involved)

4 = What degree of formal training do most mentors receive before being assigned to a provisional teacher (check one)? (1=more than 10 hours; 2=5-10 hours; 3=1-5 hours; 4=no formal training)

5 = Considering all of the mentor teachers you have assigned, are they most likely to be a (check one) . . . (1=master teacher; 2=above average teacher; 3=average teacher; 4=below average teacher)

All 6 Considering all of the provisional teachers currently at your school, how many would you place in each of the following categories (total number should match total on question # 1)?

6A= # for "exemplary"

6D= # for "below average"

6B= # for "above average"
6C= # for "average"
6E= # for "non-renewal in process"

7 = How would you characterize the provisional teacher evaluation process (check one)? (1=thorough; 2=adequate; 3=less than adequate; 4=inadequate)

8A = How many total years have you been a principal in this school? (N=total years at school)

8B = How many total years have you been a principal in this district? (N=total years in district)

APPENDIX D

DATA TABLES C1 THROUGH C46

Table D.1

Discussed Classroom Management

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	12	8.7	8.7	8.7
	Rarely	39	28.3	28.3	37.0
	Occasionally	38	27.5	27.5	64.5
	Often	30	21.7	21.7	86.2
	Very Often	19	13.8	13.8	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.2

Discussed Specific Student Needs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	19	13.8	13.8	13.8
	Rarely	27	19.6	19.6	33.3
	Occasionally	40	29.0	29.0	62.3
	Often	33	23.9	23.9	86.2
	Very Often	19	13.8	13.8	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.3

Discussed Curriculum Selection

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	23	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Rarely	27	19.6	19.6	36.2
	Occasionally	37	26.8	26.8	63.0
	Often	34	24.6	24.6	87.7
	Very Often	17	12.3	12.3	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.4

Discussed New Ideas and Methods

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	20	14.5	14.5	14.5
	Rarely	27	19.6	19.6	34.1
	Occasionally	44	31.9	31.9	65.9
	Often	30	21.7	21.7	87.7
	Very Often	17	12.3	12.3	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.5

Discussed Assessment of Learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	29	21.0	21.0	21.0
	Rarely	37	26.8	26.8	47.8
	Occasionally	43	31.2	31.2	79.0
	Often	20	14.5	14.5	93.5
	Very Often	9	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.6

Discussed Effective Instruction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	26	18.8	18.8	18.8
	Rarely	36	26.1	26.1	44.9
	Occasionally	40	29.0	29.0	73.9
	Often	25	18.1	18.1	92.0
	Very Often	11	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.7

Discussed Avoiding Mistakes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	30	21.7	21.9	21.9
	Rarely	39	28.3	28.5	50.4
	Occasionally	39	28.3	28.5	78.8
	Often	18	13.0	13.1	92.0
	Very Often	11	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	137	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.7		

Table D.8

Discussed the Role of the School Principal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	48	34.8	34.8	34.8
	Rarely	43	31.2	31.2	65.9
	Occasionally	29	21.0	21.0	87.0
	Often	10	7.2	7.2	94.2
	Very Often	8	5.8	5.8	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.9

Discussed General School Operation and Procedures

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	16	11.6	11.6	11.6
	Rarely	31	22.5	22.5	34.1
	Occasionally	46	33.3	33.3	67.4
	Often	29	21.0	21.0	88.4
	Very Often	16	11.6	11.6	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.10

Discussed General District Operation and Procedures

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	38	27.5	27.5	27.5
	Rarely	41	29.7	29.7	57.2
	Occasionally	33	23.9	23.9	81.2
	Often	20	14.5	14.5	95.7
	Very Often	6	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.11

Discussed Contractual Obligations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	47	34.1	34.1	34.1
	Rarely	47	34.1	34.1	68.1
	Occasionally	34	24.6	24.6	92.8
	Often	8	5.8	5.8	98.6
	Very Often	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.12

Discussed Career Decisions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	49	35.5	35.8	35.8
	Rarely	40	29.0	29.2	65.0
	Occasionally	28	20.3	20.4	85.4
	Often	13	9.4	9.5	94.9
	Very Often	6	4.3	4.4	99.3
	Total	1	.7	.7	100.0
		137	99.3	100.0	
		1	.7		
		138	100.0		

Table D.13

Discussed Professional Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	26	18.8	18.8	18.8
	Rarely	40	29.0	29.0	47.8
	Occasionally	45	32.6	32.6	80.4
	Often	20	14.5	14.5	94.9
	Very Often	7	5.1	5.1	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.14

Discussed Networking With Other Faculty

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	33	23.9	23.9	23.9
	Rarely	40	29.0	29.0	52.9
	Occasionally	42	30.4	30.4	83.3
	Often	16	11.6	11.6	94.9
	Very Often	7	5.1	5.1	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.15

Discussed How to Communicate With Parents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	31	22.5	22.5	22.5
	Rarely	30	21.7	21.7	44.2
	Occasionally	44	31.9	31.9	76.1
	Often	21	15.2	15.2	91.3
	Very Often	12	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table D.16

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Classroom Management

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	11	8.0	8.3	8.3
	Rarely	17	12.3	12.8	21.1
	Occasionally	40	29.0	30.1	51.1
	Often	38	27.5	28.6	79.7
	Very Often	27	19.6	20.3	100.0
	Total	133	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.6		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.17

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Specific Student Needs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	14	10.1	10.4	10.4
	Rarely	22	15.9	16.3	26.7
	Occasionally	4	29.0	29.6	56.3
	Often	43	31.2	31.9	88.1
	Very Often	16	11.6	11.9	100.0
	Total	135	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	2.2		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.18

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Curriculum Selection

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	16	11.6	12.1	12.1
	Rarely	19	13.8	14.4	26.5
	Occasionally	37	26.8	28.0	54.5
	Often	31	22.5	23.5	78.0
	Very Often	29	21.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	132	95.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.3		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.19

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With New Ideas and Methods

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	15	10.9	11.5	11.5
	Rarely	16	11.6	12.2	23.7
	Occasionally	36	26.1	27.5	51.1
	Often	36	26.1	27.5	78.6
	Very Often	28	20.3	21.4	100.0
	Total	131	94.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.1		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.20

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Assessment of Learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	21	15.2	15.7	15.7
	Rarely	21	15.2	15.7	31.3
	Occasionally	39	28.3	29.1	60.4
	Often	26	26.1	26.9	87.3
	Very Often	17	12.3	12.7	100.0
	Total	134	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.9		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.21

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Effective Instruction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	16	11.6	11.9	11.9
	Rarely	18	13.0	13.4	25.4
	Occasionally	49	35.5	36.6	61.9
	Often	33	23.9	24.6	86.6
	Very Often	18	13.0	13.4	100.0
	Total	134	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	4	2.9		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.22

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor
With Avoiding Mistakes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	23	16.7	17.3	17.3
	Rarely	19	13.8	14.3	31.6
	Occasionally	43	31.2	32.3	63.9
	Often	30	21.7	22.6	86.5
	Very Often	18	13.0	13.5	100.0
	Total	133	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.6		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.23

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With
Understanding the Role of the School

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	23	16.7	17.4	17.4
	Rarely	21	15.2	15.9	33.3
	Occasionally	38	27.5	28.8	62.1
	Often	29	21.0	22.0	84.1
	Very Often	21	15.2	15.9	100.0
	Total	132	95.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.3		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.24

The Quality of Help From assigned Mentor
With General School Operation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	17	12.3	12.8	12.8
	Rarely	17	12.3	12.8	25.6
	Occasionally	33	23.9	24.8	50.4
	Often	39	28.3	29.3	79.7
	Very Often	27	19.6	20.3	100.0
	Total	133	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.6		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.25

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor
With General District Operation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	20	14.5	15.5	15.5
	Rarely	23	16.7	17.8	33.3
	Occasionally	40	29.0	31.0	64.3
	Often	28	20.3	21.7	86.0
	Very Often	18	13.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	129	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	6.5		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.26

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor
With Contractual Obligations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	24	17.4	18.8	18.8
	Rarely	23	16.7	18.0	36.7
	Occasionally	39	28.3	30.5	67.2
	Often	27	19.6	21.1	88.3
	Very Often	15	10.9	11.7	100.0
	Total	128	92.8	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.2		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.27

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor
With Career Decisions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	27	19.6	21.1	21.1
	Rarely	20	14.5	15.6	36.7
	Occasionally	39	28.3	30.5	67.2
	Often	27	19.6	21.1	88.3
	Very Often	15	10.9	11.7	100.0
	Total	128	92.8	100.0	
Missing	System	10	7.2		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.28

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor
With Professional Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	17	12.3	13.0	13.0
	Rarely	21	15.2	16.0	29.0
	Occasionally	37	26.8	28.2	57.3
	Often	28	20.3	21.4	78.6
	Very Often	28	20.3	21.4	100.0
	Total	131	94.9	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.1		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.29

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With
Networking With Other Faculty

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	20	14.5	15.4	15.4
	Rarely	15	10.9	11.5	26.9
	Occasionally	43	31.2	33.1	60.0
	Often	31	22.5	23.8	83.8
	Very Often	21	15.2	16.2	100.0
	Total	130	94.2	100.0	
Missing	System	8	5.8		
Total		138	100.10		

Table D.30

The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With
Learning How to Communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	22	15.9	17.1	17.1
	Rarely	16	11.6	12.4	29.5
	Occasionally	38	27.5	29.5	58.9
	Often	29	21.0	22.5	81.4
	Very Often	24	17.4	18.6	100.0
	Total	129	93.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	6.5		
Total		138	100.0		

Table D.31

Discussed Specific Student Needs

		Discussed Specific Student Needs	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Specific Student Needs
Discussed Specific Student Needs	Pearson Correlation	1	**.642
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	135
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Specific Student Needs	Pearson Correlation	**.642	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	135	135

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.32

Discussed Curriculum Selection

		Discussed Curriculum Selection	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Curriculum Selection
Discussed Curriculum Selection	Pearson Correlation	1	**.771
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	132
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Curriculum Selection	Pearson Correlation	**.771	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	132	132

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.33

Discussed New Ideas and Methods

		Discussed New Ideas and Methods	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With New Ideas and Methods
Discussed New Ideas and Methods	Pearson Correlation	1	**.719
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	131
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With New Ideas and Methods	Pearson Correlation	**.719	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	131	131

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.34

Discussed Assessment of Learning

		Discussed Assessment of Learning	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Assessment of Learning
Discussed Assessment of Learning	Pearson Correlation	1	**.653
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	134
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Assessment of Learning	Pearson Correlation	**.653	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	134	134

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.35

Discussed Effective Instruction

		Discussed Effective Instruction	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Effective Instruction
Discussed Effective Instruction	Pearson Correlation	1	**.627
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	134
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Effective Instruction	Pearson Correlation	**.627	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	134	134

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.36

Discussed Avoiding Mistakes

		Discussed Avoiding Mistakes	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Avoiding Mistakes
Discussed Avoiding Mistakes	Pearson Correlation	1	**.588
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	137	132
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Avoiding Mistakes	Pearson Correlation	**.588	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	132	133

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.37

Discussed the Role of the School Principal

		Discussed the Role of the School Principal	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Understanding the Role of the School Principal
Discussed the Role of the School Principal	Pearson Correlation	1	**.434
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	132
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Understanding the Role of the School Principal	Pearson Correlation	**.434	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	132	132

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.38

Discussed General School Operation and Procedures

		Discussed General School Operation and Procedures	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With General School Operation and Procedures
Discussed General School Operation and Procedures	Pearson Correlation	1	**.573
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	133
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With General School Operation and Procedures	Pearson Correlation	**.573	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	133	133

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.39

Discussed General District Operation and Procedures

		Discussed General District Operation and Procedures	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With General District Operation and Procedures
Discussed General District Operation and Procedures	Pearson Correlation	1	**.624
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	129
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With General District Operation and Procedures	Pearson Correlation	**.624	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	129	129

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.40

Discussed Contractual Obligations

		Discussed Contractual Obligations	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Contractual Obligations
Discussed Contractual Obligations	Pearson Correlation	1	**.582
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	128
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Contractual Obligations	Pearson Correlation	**.582	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	128	128

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.41

Discussed Career Decisions

		Discussed Career Decisions	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Career Decisions
Discussed Career Decisions	Pearson Correlation	1	**.441
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	137	127
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Career Decisions	Pearson Correlation	**.441	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	127	128

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.42

Discussed Professional Development

		Discussed General School Operation and Procedures	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With General School Operation and Procedures
Discussed General School Operation and Procedures	Pearson Correlation	1	**.573
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	133
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With General School Operation and Procedures	Pearson Correlation	**.573	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	133	133

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.43

Discussed Networking With Other Faculty

		Discussed Networking With Other Faculty	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Networking With Other Faculty
Discussed Networking With Other Faculty	Pearson Correlation	1	**.691
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	130
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Networking With Other Faculty	Pearson Correlation	**.691	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	130	130

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.44

Discussed How to Communicate With Parents

		Discussed How to Communicate with Parents	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With How to Communicate With Parents
Discussed How to Communicate With Parents	Pearson Correlation	1	**.655
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	138	129
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With How to Communicate With Parents	Pearson Correlation	**.655	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	129	129

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.45

Discussed Other Issues

		Discussed Other Issues	The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Other Issues
Discussed Other Issues	Pearson Correlation	1	**.928
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.003
	N	15	7
The Quality of Help From Assigned Mentor With Other Issues	Pearson Correlation	**.928	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.
	N	7	21

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table D.46

The Support I Have Received From My Assigned Mentor Has Been . . .

		The Support I Have Received From My Assigned Mentor Has Been . . .	How Likely Are You to Stay in This School District	How Likely Are You to Stay at This School
The Support I Have Received From My Assigned Mentor Has Been . . .	Pearson Correlation	1	**.237	*.189
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.006	.030
	N	137	134	133
How Likely Are You to Stay in This School District	Pearson Correlation	**.237	1	**.692
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.	.000
	N	134	134	133
How Likely Are You to Stay at This school	Pearson Correlation	*.189	**.692	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.000	.
	N	133	133	133

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

APPENDIX E

PROVISIONAL TEACHER COMMENTS

List #1 – Positive Comments on Question #8

Very good relationship, it is a very cooperative relationship with much sharing of ideas

Insightful

Friendly and supportive

Great. She is very helpful

Excellent—we have built an exceptionally strong relationship

Great!

My mentor and I are great friends

Great, open relationship that I feel I can contact her anytime

Equals—friendship

At the beginning of school she introduced me to herself and asked me to feel free to ask her any questions

Great!

Distant, but she is always willing to help

Great

We have a comfortable friendly working relationship

She's very thorough and professional. She always makes time for my questions. She's never too busy for me

Good. She helped map out the year, brought me materials and shared materials and ideas. I wished for time to observe her in the classroom.

Good

Very good

We share the same students so we discuss them and I ask questions about school procedures—we share with each other

I feel very confident in my mentor. We have a positive, comfortable working relationship

and friendship.

She is great. I can ask her anything!! We enjoy each other's company.

I feel that she has been very valuable to me as a co-worker. She is always there to help.

She was always very kind if I asked her a question. She shared curriculum ideas with me as well.

We've become very good friends and excellent team members

I was not assigned a mentor. But my relationship with my informal mentor is wonderful. She is a true teacher, a great leader and full of great advice.

Very warm and willing to help

I greatly admire my mentor as a friend and teacher, however she told me she felt guilty for not really mentoring me. I feel she had other family issues to deal with that were obviously more important.

Our relationship is great! She gives advice and coaches me.

Very good—I respect and admire her

Constructive and balanced

Good—open and realistic to school needs

Good and beneficial

Friendly, but she's too busy! She mentors 3 of us!

Very good

We have a good working relationship, but I feel we help each other equally.

Good—shares lots of information

Very close friends because of mentoring relationship. She is available to me whenever I need her.

I ask questions as needed

She's very nice and occasionally leaves things in my box

Good, friendly

Good

Very helpful

Excellent

Open and Friendly

My informal mentors have been great, we share ideas equally

I feel totally comfortable going to him for help in anything, knowing that he will always make time for me.

I had one my first year. If one was assigned I was not told which was my mentor. I hae gotten along well with whoever I ask for help.

We have a very professional, open relationship

Great. It has been very, very helpful to me.

Not sure who my mentors are. I work with a great support staff and can ask any one of the 4 other teachers about anything. This year has run extremely smooth and without difficulty.

She is a good friend, but rarely do I feel like I turn to her for help.

My informal mentor and I have a 'give & take' relationship. We both learn from each other. She has been wonderful.

I think we help each other out with "mentoring."

It has been great! When no one else cared (even principal) my first year, she was what pulled me through.

We get along great!

Very good.

I don't really have an "assigned" mentor. I'm a 3rd year teacher. But I do go to someone on my grade level for questions and she's been very helpful.

Very good.

I am the second grade chairman over my mentor so she usually asks me questions.

I wasn't assigned a mentor. I learned a lot from the teacher I student taught with and I was assigned to the same school for my first 2 years of teaching so I used her when I had time.

We meet for lunch weekly. Excellent!

Excellent, very good teacher—no ideas how to mentor.

We have a great relationship and she does give me advice and support me, but it would be better if she was officially designated as my mentor.

Great—she has been very helpful.

We work well together, he is very helpful in all respects.

Good communication, sharing of ideas.

She is there when I need her.

Colleague

We are great friends.

Very positive and supportive. She challenges me to try new things.

Good, but I talk to everyone on my team equally—including my "assigned mentor."

Excellent!

We are friends; we're casual which is nice.

I look up to her.

Very good.

Very good—I love her—she is very professional.

Very open, great, fun, helpful.

As I got to know her better and began to understand the dynamics and difficulties of teaching a self-contained classroom better—to know "what to ask"—she was/is great! Just also very busy which made it difficult to meet.

It's been very wonderful to work with my supervisor who has been a mentor to me this year even though she was not assigned to me by the principal.

Very good.

Very good and positive.

Since this is my third year, I hae not felt as much need for a mentor as my first year.

It is awesome! She's been very helpful, kind and supportive!

Great—I initiate more—she comes to me with questions more than I go to her.

Very open and trusting.

Excellent—she is very knowledgeable and willing to help.

Very open—I can go to her for anything.

Excellent

No assigned mentor—informal mentors have become good friends and I am very willing to go to them with questions or concerns and they are always happy to help.

We are good friends and we help each other.

Very good

We get along great and she is always willing to help.

She is a griend—she values my opinions and asks me for help and adice at times.

We are friends. I am able to take criticism.

Better this year than last. She is more helpful this year.

Understanding, helpful, supportive.

She ahs been a good friend and resource for curriculum needs.

Good

Supportive, but not overbearing.

Very comfortable, approachable.

We have a good working relationship.

Last year she observed and gave feedback and was very involved in my classroom. This year, I just go to her when I need help or have a question.

I initiate most of the interaction. She occasionally informs of procedure before a major event.

Available as necessary.

Very helpful

Good

Open, friendly, constructive

Fairly open communication

If I need help, I ask her

A wonderful relationship, open and comfortable

Amazing. My mentor knows me well. We have a wonderful relationship. She would have done anything for me if I would not have been able to do it on my own.

Very friendly, helpful and informative—I can go to her for anything.

We get along well—I just don't go to her for advice.

Relaxed and casual. He never pressured me, only gave me options.

My mentor is a great support and friend.

Very good

Anytime I need help they are there with patience and good adice.

Very helpful—always there for my needs and concerns.

Casual, comfortable, helpful.

Good

Pretty informal, good friends, trustworthy, she is a good person.

Very effective

Very good—open to questions, great rapport with me.

Good friendship and support.

Friendly, professional colleague, supportive, unintimidating, helpful.

I think it has been wonderful—she has helped me quite a bit.

This is my second year and officially she is no longer my mentor, however we consult with each other often.

We are very good friends, but she works very hard and does not have much time.

I respect her and her ideas as she does me and my ideas.

Wonderful. He listens very well and has been a great support to me this year.

A true mentor and a friend.

My mentor was perfect in every way. She trusted my abilities as a professional, but she was quick to answer questions or provide support.

I feel like I can talk to her if/when a need arises.

Casual and comfortable—I am a third-year provisional teacher who is quite independent.

She is extremely understanding, loving, and we share similar philosophies about life and teaching.

If I have a question I usually ask her.

We have a very good relationship, he just doesn't teach in my field.

List #2—Negative Comments on Question #8

I wish I had one. I was hired to teach outside my certification in the middle of the school year.

Not there

We have different outlooks. I used my informal more because we connected better. My assigned mentor was difficult to get along with.

Not really helpful.

A little rough—different grade, different side of school still friends.

I love her, but she is too busy and has no time.

Non-existent

Friendly, but not very compatible.

She was rude, cruel and extremely competitive.

Non-existent

Congenial, but not extremely helpful. She rarely, if ever, shares lesson plans.

We don't see each other often.

Not as effective as I would prefer.

Not very positive. Very different teaching ideas and styles.

Limited—She is part-time and I'm full-time. Not enough time to communicate.

Nil

I don't have much contact with her.

I have no relationship with him.

Non-existent. I had a mentor my first year. She didn't like my teaching style and refused to do it again.

Non-existent

Non-existent

Non-existent

I never talk to her. Although she is a great teacher, I have felt very isolated.

Great at first, but fizzled out.

If I needed or wanted help and/or advice, I had to always go to her.

She doesn't like me.

We really never meet. Get more help from other counselors.

List #3—All Comments on Question #9

Available to help give suggestions when needed

Friendly, open, and interactive with ongoing exchange of knowledge and strengths

A mentor should be teaching in the same area, be supportive and should initiate the mentoring relationship

Open communication, genuine empathy

Supportive, answer all "stupid" questions

Kind, helpful, knowledgeable of policies, "school rules", etc.

Open, able to ask any questions - give ideas

One in whom you feel comfortable and can communicate easily

Give and take on both ends. Both teachers can/should benefit

You should be able to feel at ease, not intimidated

Good rapport, similar grade or experience in grade

Willing to help anytime, willing to give teaching ideas, compassionate

Honesty, respect both ways

Grade level, experienced teacher on grade level, flexible, approachable

Inquiring about needs, questions I may have, meeting on a regular basis for short periods of time

Close to room, close to grade level, much experience

Ability to communicate freely, certain level of comfort w/each other so that sharing of ideas and problems is possible.

Trustworthy, good listener, positive

Patience, knowledge and experience

Same time obligations/good friendship

Comfortable, friendly working relationship

Trust and partnership. A mentor should be ready at all times to mentor and help.

Open communication, feeling of friendship, confidentiality

Someone who can help you with whatever–discipline, ideas, etc.
Understanding, good teacher, insightful, friend, trusting

Open, able to discuss without fear of insult

A comfortable relationship-someone who is knowledgeable, willing to help and easy to talk to.

Open, honest, willing to help.

Cooperative, constructive, flexible, helpful, positive

Be more accessible-more involved-willing to make daily or at least weekly contact

It should be professional with the mentor helping to focus on essentials

Approachable, capable, positive attitude, friendly, motivated

Accepting, understanding, helpful, good listener

Someone who is available to discuss all the issues in #7 and someone who would approach me to see how things are going!

Teacher on same grade level

I wish I had someone to sit down and do planning with. I have never met with a grade level team to do this. I have had two very difficult first years–teaching 3 grade levels and share contracting.

Be helpful, give advice and suggestions for improvement, great listener

Good example, approachable, positive, kind, effective teacher

Socially compatible and grade level equivalent

Helpful, patient and caring

Open - friendly

Open communication with a mentor who is experienced

Kindness, caring, concern, helpful attitude, patience

Willing to share strategies and teaching ideas

The mentor should know certain information and share it with the one being mentored.

Initiate contact, willing to share ideas.

Friends able to bounce ideas off each other, get needed information or just share experiences

Meet regularly, plan curriculum

Be available for consulting and helpful tips - provide ideas and planning time
Friendly, business

Good communications and suggestions for improvement

Same grade

Friendly, willing to listen, doesn't think they are perfect, outgoing, talkative

Open, honest, informative - take serious

I think you especially need someone your first couple of years to help you get started on teaching

Knowledge, outgoing, easy to get along with

They can give information when needed to me and vice versa

Listening skills, new ideas, understanding

Someone who has an open door for help.

Mutual respect

Available for help, but not forced to do it their way.

I think it is a waste of money – if I need help, I go ask for it from whoever seems to be best/most knowledgeable (no one person really helps) I think a mentor is good for first year teachers, but otherwise is a waste.

Even the most experienced teacher can learn from others. They key is to be a teacher and a student yourself. You both must be willing to give and take at the right time.

Always able to ask questions

The relationship should be open, mentor should be ready to "show us the ropes"

Be willing to share the specifics of what to do, how time is used, and lesson plans or materials

Comfortable relationship, openness, willingness to share, same grade level

Non-judgmental, co-worker, friend

Available when needed, willing and happy to help, experience

Friendly, knowledgeable, non-judgmental, patient, available

Curriculum support, a shoulder to cry on, support on how school runs

Helpful, encouraging, supportive

Willing to listen, provide suggestions, give feedback, be available to talk to, someone I can talk to
Rooms that are close together so interaction is easy

Ideally, new teachers should have a mentor in the first place and the teaching styles/management styles need to match

Knowledge of my grade/program

Someone who will let me know what I'm doing well, build me up a little. Someone who I can go to if I have questions

Kind, not afraid to teacher the "new teacher"

In my case, simply more time.

Be open, honest and available.

Open communication

Work well together and be helpful in all respects

Good communication, sharing of ideas

A mentor who offers suggestions and helps whenever needed, open door policy

One who consistently checks on needs

Strong friendship, openness on both sides, help is available, but not pushed

They need to be willing to nurture and support new teachers and be willing to learn from them

Trust, support, encouragement, openness and true concern

Be able to talk about everything relating to school issues

Strong teaching skills, patience, willingness to help

Open communication at all times. No one should feel intimidated

Involved, hands on

Take time to listen and observe; also give constructive feedback

Professional, friendly, easy to talk with

Open, be able to ask without being afraid to ask

Very open, great, fun, helpful

They should be very non-judgmental, positive, approachable, I think the "mentor" should "initiate" the contact and approach the new teacher more in the first few months!!

The mentor should be well-trained in current teaching practices.

Approachable, they initiate contact and are very easy to talk with.

Supportive in whatever the provisional teacher is trying to accomplish. Not trying to make the new teacher just like the mentor.

Willing to help, good communicator, willing to ask what they can do for you

Able to listen and not get frustrated with many questions

Helpful, kind, supportive, contacts you (without you contacting first), shares, respectful, trustworthy

Trust, non-judgmental, eager to help out, not too overbearing, confidential, good listener and friend

Honesty

Open, knowledgeable, willing to share, honest, helpful, desire to see success

I would appreciate times to observe my mentor and have her observe my teaching.

Open, willing to teach

Similar goals or teaching styles/ideas, open to questions and willing to give their time to help

Weekly discussion of concerns, informal and formal observations, grouped teaching experiences where provisional can watch mentor teach

Listening skills-brainstorm options-deal with solution-follow through-regroup-encourage-try diverse methods-stick diligent as supporter

Mentors should be able to give instruction and support without changing the new teachers teaching style

Frequent meetings to discuss problems

Consistency, caring, helpfulness, informative, value each other, respect

It should have input from both sides, a willingness to work together and a mentor who shares ideas and curriculum.

Someone who listens to questions and isn't overbearing in answering them

Support, mutual understanding, demonstrations

Approachable, same assignment as you - grade level, sense of humor

What I have. All teachers are friends

Willing to reach out because new teachers aren't sure what questions to ask

The mentor mentors without being asked to-genuine daily concern

Time to sit down and talk about problems and challenges; comfortable relationship

Patient, outgoing, knowledgeable

Lots of ideas and support

Mentors need to be in the same field

Someone who is in the same subject area (or similar area) and has the same schedule

Caring, available, informative, great relationship with students

Patience, understanding and have fun

They should have the exact same teaching assignments and be close in classroom location

Regular checks with me

Same subject taught – willing to listen and give advice

At least talk to the person they mentor

Someone with enough experience to help with all of the above

An equal and open relationship with more mentoring observations of classroom instruction

Constant collaboration, mutual respect, similar schedules and prep periods

Good listener, positive helps

Trust for each other, positive, open to ideas and change

Teacher is interested in helping the students as well as the new teacher. A listener and someone with real strategies to help

Trust

Someone who comes and checks on you. How was your day?

Ability to talk about anything, non-judgmental

Proximity in the building, comparable teaching assignment, someone who'll slow down and talk!

Open communication, trust and confidence, frequent times set aside for discussion

Be there <u>if</u> you need help

Positive, helpful, non-threatening relationship

Just like mine is

Openness, experience, positive outlook

Make sure teaching subjects/material is clear, discuss school affiliated measures

Support, friendship, constructive criticism

Relaxed and casual. No pressure, just options

Trust, communication, knowledgeable, similar teaching load

Time to help (paid by district time to help) Someone who is there - supportive - a friend. Someone who initiates sharing ideas and resources

Consistency, relation to the department mentor is in

Someone close in age and they should have a similar teaching philosophy

Open - mentor needs to be patient and very supportive yet honest

Trust in the other person's ability and knowledge - support without negative criticism

Openness, understanding, open communication lines

Not pushy with ideas, be there for support and when needed

Open communication, knowledgeable, availability, understanding, compassion, compatibility

Casual (not formal meetings), suggestions (not lay-down-the-law), friendly, supportive

I liked it casual because I didn't feel pressure to do extra work, etc. I would have liked a bit more curriculum help though.

One who had taught in the school for a number of years and is regarded as an excellent teacher

She is caring, thorough, has a good understanding of how things work, inside information

They should be encouraging - if you've gotten this far you probably know what you're doing

Knowledgeable of current policies and procedures, a wide range of strategies and ideas

Good friend, supportive with teaching and discipline ideas

Helpful, unintimidating, willingness to share, expertise

Open communication and meeting once a month just to check on you

Someone in the same department
Good, open friendship with honest communication

Patience, lets teacher come to them, not checking all the time

Respect and open minded

Patient, a good listener, kind and understanding

Relationship should consist of ability to ask questions without hesitation and a willingness to help without criticism

Support one another and communicate on all fronts

The mentor should set high expectations, but allow the new teacher to grow in the position; being supportive and patient is essential

Be able to discuss feelings, ideas whenever necessary

Friendly, reciprocal, supportive

Trust, support, confidentiality

I think teachers should have school time to work together to give/get help. Teachers would share similar philosophies and classes

Regular/once a month/trust/coaching relationship/feedback

Same classes and an open mind

The teachers should teach a similar discipline and a consultation period. Past experience in area you are teaching

REFERENCES

Abell, S. K. (1995, March). Somebody to count on: Mentor/intern relationships in a beginning teacher internship program. Teaching and Teacher Education, 11(2), 173-88.

Allen, R. M., & Casbergue, R. M. (2000). Impact of teachers' recall on their effectiveness in mentoring novice teachers: The unexpected prowess of the transitional stage in the continuum from novice to expert. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Andrews, T. E., & Andrews, L. (Eds.). (1998). The NASDTEC manual 1998-1999: Manual on the preparation and certification of educational personnel. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt

Ballantyne, R. (1995, November). Mentoring beginning teachers: A qualitative analysis of process and outcomes. Educational Review, 47(3), 297-307.

Bolich, A. M. (2001). Reduce your losses: Help new teachers become veteran teachers. ERIC # ED460121. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Bova, B. M., & Philips, R. E. (1981). The mentor relationship. A study of mentors and proteges in business and academia. ED 208 233. Washington, DC.

Boyer, K. L. W. (1999). A qualitative analysis of the impact of mentorships on new special educators' decisions to remain in the field of special education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

Brennan, S., Thames, W., & Roberts, R. (1999, May). Mentoring with a mission. Educational Leadership, 56(8), 49-52.

Brock, B. L. (1999). The principals' role in mentor programs. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 12(4), 18-21.

Bullough, R. V., Jr. (1989). First-year teacher: A case study. New York: Teachers College Press.

California State Department of Education. (1983). California mentor teacher program: Program advisory. ED 241 473. Washington, DC.

Clement, M. C. (1995, September-October). If you really want to help the new teacher next door. Clearing House, 69(1), 40-41.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. Harvard Educational Review, 61(3), 279-310.

Cross, R. (1995, March). The role of the mentor in utilizing the support system for the newly qualified teacher. School Organization, 15(1), 35-42.

Crow, G. M., & Matthews, L. J. (1998). Finding one's way: How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Cutlip, G. W., & Shockley, R. J. (2000). Careers in teaching. New York: The Rosen Publishing Group, Inc.

Daloz, L. A. (1983). Mentors: Teachers who make a difference. Change, 5(6), 24-27.

Danielson, C. (1999). Mentoring beginning teachers: The case for mentoring. Teaching and Change, 6(3), 251-57.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1993). Leaders helping leaders: A practical guide to administrative mentoring. New York: Scholastic.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching. New York: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sclan, E. M. (1996). Who teaches and why: Dilemmas of building a profession for twenty-first century schools. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education, 2nd ed. (pp.67-101). New York: Macmillan.

Dever, M. T., Johnson, F. F., & Hobbs, D. E. (2000). A qualitative analysis of an intensive mentor-apprentice collaboration: MAC. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 33(4), 241-56.

Dickson, S. (2000). Supporting new teachers: Report on the great beginnings program. 2002 Magna Awards Report, 13.

Diehl, C. L., Harris, J., Barrios, D., O'Connor, H., & Fong, J. (2000). Teachers training teachers: Four perspectives on an innovative mentoring program for intern science teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Driscoll, A. (1985, October). Designing a mentor system for beginning teachers. Journal of Staff Development, 6, 2.

Eisenman, G., & Thornton, H. (1999, April). Telementoring: Helping new teachers through the first year. T.H.E. Journal, 26(9), 79-82.

Evenson, J. S. (1982). Workplace mentoring. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. ED 246 182. Washington, DC.

Fairbanks, C. M., Freedman, D., & Kahn, C. (2000, March-April). The role of effective mentors in learning to teach. Journal of Teacher Education, 51(2), 102-112.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. B. (1993). Mentoring in context: A comparison or two: U.S. programs for beginning teachers. International Journal of Educational Research, 19(8), 699-718.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001, January-February). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. Journal of Teacher Education, 52(1), 17-30.

Franek, M. (1995, February). The rookie year: First-year advice from a second-year teacher (new teachers). English Journal, 84(2), 120-121.

Ganser, T. (1995, December). What are the concerns and questions of mentors of beginning teachers? NASSP Bulletin, 79(575), 83-91.

Ganser, T. (1996a). What do mentors say about mentoring? Journal of Staff Development, 17(3), 36-39.

Ganser, T. (1996b). Preparing mentors of beginning teachers: An overview for staff developers. Journal of Staff Development, 17(4), 8-11.

Ganser, T. (1998, Winter). Metaphors for mentoring. Educational Forum, 62(2), p. 113-119.

Ganser, T. (1999, October). Under their wing: Promises and pitfalls of mentoring. High School Magazine, 7(2), 8-13.

Ganser, T., & Koskela, R. (1997, October). A comparison of six Wisconsin mentoring programs for beginning teachers. NASSP Bulletin, 81(591), 71-80.

Gehrke, N. J., & Kay, R. S. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers through mentor-protege relationships. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 21-24.

Giebelhaus, C. (1999). Leading the way. State initiatives and mentoring. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 12(4), 10-13.

Giebelhaus, C., & Bendixon-Noe, M. (1997). Mentoring: Help or hindrance? Research alive. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 10(4), 20-23.

Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning teacher support. Attrition, mentoring, and induction. In C. B. Courtney (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 548-594). Washington, DC: American Research Association.

Grant, G., & Murray, C. E. (1999). Teaching in America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gratch, A. (1998, May-June). Beginning teacher and mentor relationships. Journal of Teacher Education, 49(3), 220-27.

Grosso de Leon, A. (2001). Higher education's challenge: New teacher education models for a new century. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Harris, S. (1995, September). A mentoring program for new teachers: Ensuring success. NASSP Bulletin, 79(572), 98-103.

Hart, A. W. (1993). Principal succession: Establishing leadership in schools. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (1998). Guide to the national partnership for excellence and accountability in teaching (NPEAT). ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education

Hayes, I. (Ed). (1998). Great beginnings: Reflections and advice for new English language arts teachers and the people who mentor them. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hersh, S. (1996). Mentoring entry year teachers: A model for rural communities. Rural Educator, 17(2), 31-36.

Hope, W. C. (1999, September-October). Principals' Orientation and Induction Activities as Factors in Teacher Retention. Clearing House, 73(1), 54-56.

Huang, S. L., & Waxman, H. C. (1995). Beginning and mentor teachers' perceptions of their urban school-level work environment. ERS Spectrum, 13(1), 11-17.

Intrator, S. M. (2002) Stories of the courage to teach. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Janas, M. (1996). Mentoring the mentor: A challenge for staff development. Journal of Staff Development, 17(4), 2-5.

Joerger, R. M. (1997, January-February). Theme: Mentoring beginning teachers. Agricultural Education Magazine, 69(4), 4-19, 22-23.

Jones, L., Reid, D., & Bevins, S. (1997, October). Teachers' perceptions of mentoring in a collaborative model of initial teacher training. Journal of Education for Teaching, 23(3), 253-261.

Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Kyle, D. W., Moore, G. H., & Sanders, J. L. (1999). The role of the mentor teacher: Insights, challenges, and implications. Peabody Journal of Education, 74(3&4), 109-122.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Ballantine.

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. In C. B. Courtney (Ed.), Review of research in education, Vol. 16 (pp. 297-351). Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Love, F. E., Rowland, S. T. (1999). The ABCs of mentoring beginning teachers. Dimensions of Early Childhood, 27(4), 8-10.

Mauer, E., & Zimmerman, E. (2000). Mentoring new teachers. Principal, 79(3), 26-28.

Muse, I. D., Wasden, F. D., & Thomas, G. J. (1988). The mentor principal: Handbook. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.

NASSP. (1996, June). Induction: Combined district and schoolwide efforts provide the keys for success for beginning teachers. Practitioner, 22(5) 1-4.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). What matters most: Teaching for America's future. New York: Author, Teachers College Columbia University.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). No dream denied: A pledge to America's children. Washington, DC: James B. Hunt Jr., Chairman and Thomas G. Carroll, Executive Director; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Odell, S. J. (1990). Support of new teachers. In T. M. Bey & C. T. Holmes (Eds.), Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers (pp. 3-23). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Perez, K. (1997). An analysis of practices used to support new teachers. Teacher Education Quarterly, 24(2), 41-52.

Peterson, B. E., & Williams, S. R. (1998, November). Mentoring beginning teachers. Mathematics Teacher, 91(8), 730-34.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). Mentors and protégés. New York: Arbor House.

Reid, D., & Jones, L. (1997, July). Partnership in teacher training: Mentors' constructs of their role. Educational Studies, 23(2), 263-276.

Salzman, J. A. (1999). With a little help from my friends: A course designed for mentoring induction-year teachers. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 12(4), 27-31.

Schein, E. H. (1978). Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schlechty, P. (1985, January-February). A framework for evaluating introduction into teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 37-41.

Smithey, M. W., & Evertson, C. M. (1995, January). Tracking the mentoring process: A multimethod approach. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9(1), 33-53..

Tauer, S. M. (1996). The mentor-protege relationship and its effects on the experienced Teacher. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Tillman, B. A. (2000, February-March). Quiet leadership: Informal mentoring of beginning teachers. Momentum, 31(1), 24-26.

Trenta, L., Newman, I., Newman, C., Salzman, J., Lenigan, D., & Newman, D. (2002). Evaluation of a teacher mentoring program using a mixed methods approach. ERIC# ED463295. Paper prepared for the Annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Sarasota, FL.

Weasmer, J., & Woods, A. M. (2000, January-February). Preventing baptism by fire: Fostering growth in new teachers. Clearing House, 73(3), 171-73.

Weaver, D., & Stanulis, R. N. (1996). Teacher as mentor, teacher as learner: Mentoring a first-year teacher in middle school language arts. Washington, DC: Instructional Resource No. 32.

Weiss, E. Mary., & Weiss, S. G. (1999). Beginning teacher induction. ERIC Digest. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, AACTE.

Wilson, B., & Ireton, E. (1996). Improving mentor teacher effectiveness. Rural Educator, 17(2), 28-30.

Wollman-Bonilla, J. E. (1997). Mentoring as a two-way street. Journal of Staff Development, 18(3), 50-52.