

BEST PRACTICES IN TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR INDUCTION PROGRAMS

California County Superintendents Educational Services Association

June 2016



In the following report, CCSESA presents a compilation of the work done by CCSESA and Hanover Research relating to best practices in teacher and administrator induction programs.



California County Superintendents
Educational Services Association

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Executive Summary..... | 3 |
| INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| PRELIMINARY KEY FINDINGS | 3 |
| Section I: Teacher Induction | 4 |
| OVERVIEW | 4 |
| EFFICACY OF TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS..... | 4 |
| PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND SCOPE | 6 |
| MENTORING | 7 |
| COMPARABLE STATES OF INTEREST | 9 |
| Section II: Administrator Induction | 14 |
| OVERVIEW | 14 |
| EFFICACY OF TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS..... | 14 |
| PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND SCOPE | 15 |
| MENTORING | 16 |
| COMPARABLE STATES OF INTEREST | 18 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies indicate that the challenges faced by new teachers and administrators may contribute to the high rates of attrition observed during the first few years of employment.¹ Induction programs – defined as post-hire, in-service training programs completed during the few years of employment – provide additional support and foster skill acquisition among teachers and administrators. However, the nature and scope of teacher and administrator induction programs vary greatly between states and districts. This report discusses findings regarding best practices in teacher and administrator induction and outlines statewide induction standards in 5 states: Ohio, North Carolina, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York. In addition, we highlight common themes in teacher and administrator induction programs identified in our research.

PRELIMINARY KEY FINDINGS

- **Induction programs have a positive impact on retention and student outcomes.** However, not all induction programs are created equal. Programs with more supports and greater mentee/mentor contact are strongly correlated with retention and student outcomes while programs that only provide basic supports have little or no impact on retention and student outcomes.
- **Mentoring plays a key role in effective induction programs for teachers and administrators.**
 - When selecting mentors, important attributes include: character, competence, experience, communication skills, interpersonal skills, and an understanding of the setting and context in which a mentee works.
 - The type and intensity of training and support provided to mentors may impact the efficacy of an induction program. Ongoing support and scheduling adjustments to compensate for the time and effort needed to sustain effective mentorships encourages participation and raises overall program quality.
- **Although induction is correlated with positive outcomes for both teachers and administrators, support for, and participation in, administrator induction programs has lagged behind teacher induction programs.** 27 states require that all new teachers participate in some form of induction or mentorship program. Alternatively, only 16 states require that new administrators receive “some form of professional support” and only 3 of those states require new administrators to participate in a full induction program.

¹ [1] Ingersoll, R. “Beginning Teacher Induction: What the Data Tell Us.” *Kappan Magazine*, 93(8), May 2012.
<http://www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/rmi/PDK-RMI-2012.pdf>

[2] Prothero, A. “For Principals, Continuous Learning Critical to Career Success.” *Education Week*, January 21, 2015.
<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/01/21/for-principals-continuous-learning-critical-to-career.html>

SECTION I: TEACHER INDUCTION

This section analyzes common themes and practices in teacher induction. While the structure and content of teacher induction programs vary across states and districts, this report defines teacher induction as a post-hire, in-service program to socialize beginning teachers into the profession and provide support during the first few years of teaching.

OVERVIEW

Over the past two decades, participation in teacher induction programs has increased substantially—from roughly half of new teachers in the 1990-1991 academic year to more than 90 percent by 2007-2008.² As of 2010-2011, 27 states required that all new teachers participate in some form of induction or mentorship program, 15 states had established formal induction program standards, and 11 states required induction and mentorship for all first- and second-year teachers.³

Since 1998, California law has required teachers to complete a two-year induction program to earn a full teacher license (“Clear Credential”).⁴ California county offices of education, districts, and other entities design and implement induction programs that align with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the California Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs.⁵

EFFICACY OF TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS

In 2011, renowned education researchers Richard M. Ingersoll and Michael Strong published a meta-analysis of 15 empirical studies—conducted over the previous 25 years—examining teacher induction programs.⁶ Ingersoll and Strong found that, despite varying program components and intensity, induction programs have a consistently positive impact in three areas:⁷

- **Teacher retention:** Participation in an induction programs increases the likelihood that a teacher will remain in the field. It also increases the likelihood that the teacher will remain at that particular school.
- **Classroom instructional practices:** Beginning teachers who participate in some form of induction are more effective in various aspects of teaching, including: keeping

² Ingersoll, Op. cit.

³ Goldrick, L. et al. “Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction.” New Teacher Center, February 2012, pp. iv, 7.

<http://newteachercenter.org/sites/default/files/ntc/main/pdfs/brf-ntc-policy-state-teacher%20induction.pdf>

⁴ Koppich, J.E. et al. “California’s Beginning Teachers: A Bumpy Path to a Profession.” SRI International, J. Koppich Associates, and Inverness Research, 2012, p. v. http://edsources.org/wp-content/uploads/sri_bumpy-road.pdf

⁵ “Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Induction.” Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Induction. <http://www.btsa.ca.gov/>

⁶ Ingersoll, R., and M. Strong. “The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research.” University of Pennsylvania, Scholarly Commons, 2011. p. 1.

http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1127&context=gse_pubs

⁷ Text adapted from: Ingersoll, Op. cit., pp. 50-51.

students on task; developing workable lesson plans; using effective student questioning practices; adjusting classroom activities to meet student interests; maintaining a positive classroom atmosphere; and demonstrating successful classroom management.

- **Student achievement:** Students of beginning teachers who participate in some kind of induction generally have higher scores and/or larger gains on academic achievement tests.

Although Ingersoll and Strong found that participation in a teacher induction program was consistently correlated with increased teacher retention and student achievement, their research also revealed that the strength of the correlation was highly dependent on the extent and intensity of the particular induction program. Significant research supports these findings.

With regard to retention rates:

- The number of induction components has a multiplying effect on the rate of teacher retention. Alternatively, teachers with minimal induction supports were nearly as likely to leave the field as teachers who did not participate in induction.⁸
- Having a mentor who works (or worked) at the same school decreases attrition rates for beginning teachers.⁹
- Beginning teachers with a mentor in the same subject area, common planning with teachers in the same subject area, and regularly scheduled collaboration time, are significantly more likely to stay in teaching.¹⁰

With regard to student achievement:

- Students of teachers who are highly engaged in an induction program outscore students of teachers with low levels of engagement in an induction program even after controlling for API.¹¹
- The students of a beginning teacher in a high-intensity induction program are predicted to gain between 6 to 8 points in reading, while the students of a beginning teacher in a low intensity induction program are likely to lose points.¹²
- Teachers who received more hours of mentoring had higher student achievement scores in both math and reading than those who had fewer mentoring hours.¹³

⁸ Ingersoll, R. and T. Smith. "Do Teacher Induction and Mentoring Matter?" University of Pennsylvania, Scholarly Commons, March 2004. http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1134&context=gse_pubs

⁹ Rockoff, J. "Does Mentoring Reduce Turnover and Improve Skills of New Employees? Evidence from Teachers in New York City." National Bureau of Economic Research, March 2008. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w13868.pdf>

¹⁰ Ingersoll, R., and M. Strong. Op cit., p. 35.

¹¹ Thompson, M. et. al. "Relationship of BTSA/CFASST Engagement and Student Achievement." Educational Testing Service, April 2004. <https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-04-32.pdf>

¹² Strong, M. "Effective Teacher Induction and Mentoring." Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 2009.

¹³ Rockoff, J. Op cit. Abstract

- Students of teachers who received 49 hours or more of professional development over a 1 year period gained approximately 21 percentile points more than other students. However, teachers receiving 14 hours or less of professional development saw no statistically significant increase in student test scores.¹⁴

PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND SCOPE

As noted above, the scope and intensity of induction programs vary significantly between districts and states. A comprehensive induction program generally includes all of the following components:

- **Formal or Informal Orientation:** Includes a review of basic school procedures and policies such as how to order supplies, how to organize a classroom, and where to find instructional resources.
- **Mentoring:** Mentors and mentees are required to meet periodically to review progress and discuss challenges. Mentors conduct observations and assessments and provide feedback.
- **Professional Development:** Incorporates the opportunity to engage in ongoing learning through coursework, in-service development, and/or participation in professional learning communities (PLCs).

The National Education Association (NEA) Foundation lists three types of induction models outlined by teacher preparation expert Barry Sweeny. These models vary in their intensity and incorporation of program components:

- **Basic Orientation Model:** Basic orientations introduce teachers to general district procedures, policies, and responsibilities. The program may consist of a series of professional development activities, including the assignment of a mentor. Mentors may give occasional advice but are not actively involved in modeling instructional practice.
- **Instructional Practice Model:** This model links induction with local and state standards for teaching, using skilled mentors to help bridge the gap between theory and practice for new teachers. Induction may last two or more years and offers teachers continued opportunities for in-depth learning.
- **School Transformational Model:** While relatively uncommon, this model weaves attributes of both the orientation and instructional practice models into a system promoting continuous improvement in student learning. It engages new teachers in school reform and connects their professional growth to student learning goals. This model views teachers as a community of learners and enables faculty to work collaboratively in all aspects of their jobs.¹⁵

¹⁴ Yoon, K., et. al. "Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement." National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assessment, U.S. Department of Education, October 2007. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033_sum.pdf

¹⁵ "Using Data to Improve Teacher Induction Programs." NEA Foundation, Summer 2002, p. 2. https://www.neafoundation.org/downloads/NEA-Using_Data_Teacher_Induction.pdf

MENTORING

Mentorship is a key component of effective teacher induction programs. Mentors provide beginning teachers with practical information, guide teachers as they develop instructional skills, and offer feedback and opportunities for reflection. The NEA Foundation suggests that beginning teachers should receive three stages of mentoring, as shown in Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1: Mentoring Stages for Beginning Teachers

| STAGE | FOCUS |
|---------------------|--|
| First Stage | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Practical skills and information:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Where to order supplies○ How to organize a classroom○ Where to find instructional resources○ What kind of assistance the teacher association can provide |
| Second Stage | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The art and science of teaching and on polishing classroom management skills |
| Third Stage | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A deeper understanding of instructional strategies and ongoing professional development that is based on the assessed needs of students |

Source: National Foundation for the Improvement of Education¹⁶

Significant research on teacher induction suggests that the most effective mentoring models are designed to support greater frequency and length of contact between mentor and mentee.¹⁷ In addition, new teachers who meet with their mentors weekly, as opposed to a few times per year, self-report substantially greater improvement in instructional skills (36% improvement versus 88% improvement).¹⁸ Based on this data, induction experts encourage districts to guarantee adequate “protected time” – between 1.25 and 2.5 hours – for observation and discussion between mentors and mentees during each week of the mentorship.¹⁹

In addition, experts urge districts to consider the extent to which participant confidentiality should be protected to ensure an honest dialogue between mentors and new teachers. The NEA Foundation recommends introducing clear confidentiality policies at the beginning of a mentorship.²⁰

SELECTING AND SUPPORTING MENTORS

State policies that establish mentor qualifications generally address experience levels, interpersonal skills, and teaching ability.²¹ In specific terms, the NEA Foundation outlines the “qualities of effective mentors” presented in Figure 1.2.

¹⁶ Adapted from: “Creating a Teacher Mentoring Program.” The National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, (1) 1999. p. 12.

http://www.neafoundation.org/downloads/NEA-Creating_Teacher_Mentoring.pdf

¹⁷ Ingersoll and Strong, Op. cit., p. 17.

¹⁸ “Creating a Teacher Mentoring Program,” Op. cit., p. 4.

¹⁹ Goldrick et al., Op. cit., p. 17.

²⁰ Jones, as cited by: “Creating a Teacher mentoring Program,” Op. cit., p. 6.

²¹ Goldrick et al., Op. cit., p. 10.

Figure 1.2 Characteristics of an Effective Mentor Teacher

| ATTITUDE AND CHARACTER | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Willing to be a role model for other teachers ▪ Exhibits strong commitment to the teaching profession ▪ Believes mentoring improves instructional practice ▪ Willing to advocate on behalf of colleagues ▪ Willing to receive training to improve mentoring skills | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is reflective and able to learn from mistakes ▪ Is eager to share information and ideas with colleagues ▪ Is resilient, flexible, persistent, and open-minded ▪ Exhibits good humor and resourcefulness ▪ Enjoys new challenges and solving problems ▪ Demonstrates a commitment to lifelong learning |
| PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE AND EXPERIENCE | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is regarded by colleagues as an outstanding teacher ▪ Has excellent knowledge of pedagogy and subject matter ▪ Has confidence in his/her own instructional skills ▪ Demonstrates excellent classroom - management skills ▪ Feels comfortable being observed by other teachers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintains a network of professional contacts ▪ Understands the policies and procedures of the school, district, and teacher association ▪ Is a meticulous observer of classroom practice ▪ Collaborates well with other teachers and administrators ▪ Is willing to learn new teaching strategies from protégés |
| COMMUNICATION SKILLS | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is able to articulate effective instructional strategies ▪ Listens attentively ▪ Asks questions that prompt reflection and understanding ▪ Offers critiques in positive and productive ways | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Uses email effectively ▪ Is efficient with the use of time ▪ Conveys enthusiasm and passion for teaching ▪ Is discreet and maintains confidentiality |
| INTERPERSONAL SKILLS | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is able to maintain a trusting professional relationship ▪ Knows how to express care for a protégé's emotional and professional needs ▪ Is attentive to sensitive political issues | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Works well with individuals from different cultures ▪ Is approachable; easily establishes rapport with others ▪ Is patient |

Source: National Foundation for the Improvement of Education²²

Because mentors require superior experience and skill, many districts struggle to employ enough qualified mentors to staff their induction programs.²³ To attract mentors, most districts provide incentives, such as a stipend, a reduced or modified course load, or opportunities to shape the mentorship program. In some states, districts may also offer additional incentives by collaborating with state education agencies to grant mentors credit towards re-licensure or recertification, where applicable.²⁴

²² "Creating a Teacher Mentoring Program," Op. cit., p. 8.

²³ Id., p. 9.

²⁴ "Creating a Teacher Mentoring Program," Op. cit., p. 9.

To foster effective mentorships, induction experts encourage districts to provide mentors with both initial training and ongoing support. Successful mentor programs generally include one or more of the following supports: mentor training programs that last anywhere from one day to a few weeks, linking mentors with higher education faculty, supplying common office space to encourage collaboration among mentors, and protecting mentors from additional administrative duties.²⁵

ACCOUNTABILITY

According to the New Teacher Center, for an induction program to thrive, districts should develop systems that maintain accountability and improve program quality. Specifically, accountability systems help to:

- Assure compliance with state laws, regulations, and policies;
- Lessen the disconnect between policy regulations and implementation practices;
- Focus on program improvement; and
- Assess the effect of induction programs on student achievement and teacher outcomes.²⁶

To promote accountability, most states develop clear mentorship program standards and/or require districts to submit plans that detail accountability processes at each level.²⁷ These induction plans generally require districts to consider: how mentors will be assessed, what evidence will be used to evaluate and document the effectiveness of the program, and how a mentee's progress in the program will be tracked.²⁸

COMPARABLE STATES OF INTEREST

To provide national context, CCSESA examined teacher induction programs in 5 states: Ohio, North Carolina, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York. Although California's unique characteristics make it difficult to draw direct comparisons to other programs, these states were selected because they share the following characteristics with California: high ADA, above average rates of ethnic and racial diversity, state-mandated participation in induction program for beginning teachers, and statutorily established tenure rights. In addition, all 5 states studied are aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, have received national recognition for statewide or district-level induction programs, and rank in the top third of states for education.

²⁵ "Creating a Teacher Mentoring Program," Op. cit., p. 9-11

²⁶ Adapted from: Goldrick, L. et al. "Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction." New Teacher Center, February 2012, p. 11. <http://newteachercenter.org/sites/default/files/ntc/main/pdfs/brf-ntc-policy-state-teacher%20induction.pdf>

²⁷ Goldrick et al., Op. cit., p. 30.

²⁸ National Foundation for the Improvement of Education

Figure 1.3 summarizes the statewide mandates for induction programs. Although each state allows districts to create and implement their own induction plans, the district plan must meet the minimum state requirements as outlined in Figure 1.3. Many districts mandate supplemental program components in addition to the state requirements.

Figure 1.3 Statewide Teacher Induction Requirements

| STATE | PROGRAM LENGTH | PROGRAM COMPONENTS | ASSESSMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS | DETERMINATION OF CERTIFICATION |
|-----------------------|----------------|---|---|--|
| Ohio | 4 years | Mentoring, assessment, counseling, other optional activities | YRs 1 and 2: Mentors complete 1 annual formal observation. YR 3: Mentees take the Resident Educator Summative Assessment (RESA). Formative assessments may NOT be used for formal teacher evaluation or employment decisions and mentors may NOT participate in formal teacher evaluations. | Once a candidate completes the induction program and passes the RESA, the district superintendent or professional development committee chair signs the application and submits it to the Ohio Department of Education. The Department reviews all applications and provides final approval before issuing a credential. |
| North Carolina | 3 years | Formal orientation, mentoring, professional development, assessment | 3 summative assessments per year conducted by a trained teacher. Mentors may participate in formal teacher evaluations if agreed to in the collective bargaining agreement (CBA). | After completion of the program, the program official identified in the district's Beginning Teacher Support Program Plan approves or denies the conversion of the teacher's certificate to a Standard Professional Two credential (i.e. a clear teaching credential). |
| Illinois | 2 years | Mentoring, professional development, assessment | Mentors and mentees must participate in formative assessments and classroom observation for the purpose of improving classroom practices. | |
| New Jersey | 1 year | Professional development, orientation, mentoring | Provisional teachers are evaluated 3 times per year by a trained principal or administrator. Mentors may NOT participate in formal teacher evaluations. | After completion of the program, the school principal submits the final evaluation to NJ Secretary of Education with one of three recommendations: approval, insufficient, or disapproved. If a provisional teacher receives two insufficient rating, he/she is deemed disapproved. |
| New York | 1 year | Mentoring (other program elements are negotiated locally) | Mentors may participate in formal teacher evaluations if agreed to in the CBA. | Upon completion of the program, the district superintendent must submit a verification form to the state attesting that the new teacher has completed the required induction components. |

*Please note: If the space was left blank, it means that information for that category was unavailable.

Figure 1.4 demonstrates how mentors are selected, supported, and assigned. In addition, “Mentor/Mentee Contact” outlines the frequency of interactions between mentors and mentees mandated by state law. Again, many districts require additional mentor/mentee contact in excess of the state requirement.

Figure 1.4 Statewide Teacher Mentor Requirements

| STATE | MENTOR SELECTION CRITERIA | MENTOR TRAINING AND PD | ASSIGNMENT TO MENTEE | MENTOR/ MENTEE CONTACT |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Ohio | Holds a teacher certification and a five-year professional development license; completes the district application process and is selected to serve; successfully completes the mentor training program. | 2-day mentor training program | Matched according to proximity of location to mentee and familiarity with school and district. Ideally 1:1 ratio, but can be greater | There must be “protected time for mentor-mentee” collaboration and observation; no hour requirement specified |
| North Carolina | Demonstrated record of success; other locally determined criteria | Mentor orientation and foundational training program, ongoing participation in PLCs and PD related to “refining mentoring skills” | | Minimum of 4 in-person observations per year; “mentors and mentees must have protected time to participate in mentoring and induction activities” |
| Illinois | Demonstrated effective teaching practice; strong intra and inter-personal skills; demonstrated knowledge of pedagogy and diverse learning needs | Foundational mentor training, ongoing participation in a PLC and regularly scheduled PD related to “deepening mentoring skills,” and completion of periodic self-assessments | Matched according to certifications, experience, current assignments, and proximity of location to mentee. 1:1 ratio required. | YR1: Minimum of 30 hours in-person contact; YR2: Minimum of 20 hours in-person plus 10 hours virtual contact |
| New Jersey | Holds a teacher certification, preferably in the same subject area as the mentee; at least 3 years of teaching experience and has taught full time for 2 of the last 5 years; demonstrated record of success in the classroom; familiar with district norms, resources, and opportunities; completes the mentor training program. | Mentor training program | | Once per week for first 8 weeks for mentees who have not completed a teacher prep program. Once per week for first 4 weeks for mentees who have completed teacher prep program. |
| New York | Holds a valid NY teacher certification (same subject area not required); completes the district selection process. | | Recommended that the ratio not exceed 1:10. | No statewide hour requirement identified |

*Please note: If the space was left blank, it means that information for that category was unavailable.

Figure 1.5 summarizes how districts in each state develop and administer their induction plans and identifies the role that the state plays in program oversight.

Figure 1.5 Teacher Induction Program Administration

| STATE | PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT | ADMINISTRATION | OVERSIGHT |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Ohio | Developed by a district leadership team comprised of teachers, administrators, and stakeholders. Must incorporate the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession and be developed in accordance with the Ohio Resident Educator Program Standards Planning Tool. | The district’s program coordinator must register all induction participants and update completion of program criteria in a state-maintained database. | Program coordinators must conduct an annual self-assessment to ensure that the district’s program is aligned with Resident Educator Program standards. |
| North Carolina | Option 1: Developed by the Department of Public Instruction, the State Board of Education, and the University of North Carolina (UNC). Implemented by the North Carolina New Teacher Support Program located at institutions across the state. (Used in 43 districts) Option 2: Developed and implemented by the district in accordance with the Beginning Teacher Support Program (BTSP) standards; approved by the State Board of Education. (Used in all other districts) | The mentee, mentor, and principal annually update the new teacher’s Professional Development Plan. After three years of induction, the local program coordinator must approve or deny the automatic conversion of a new teacher’s certificate to a fully credentialed certificate. | Programs must submit annual reports to the Department of Public Instruction that demonstrate evidence of mentor success in meeting standards and proficiency on BTSP standards. Every 5 years the Department reviews programs for evidence of proficiency. Programs that do not supply sufficient evidence of proficiency are placed on improvement plans. |
| Illinois | Developed by the district in accordance with the State Board of Education requirements. Must incorporate the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs. | | The State Board of Education and the State Teacher Certification Board are required to contract with a third party to conduct evaluations of all induction programs every 2 years. |
| New Jersey | Traditional route induction programs: Developed by the district’s chief school administrator and approved by the board of education and school improvement panel. Must annually certify to state education agency that the district program meets all requirements. Alternative route induction programs: Operate under a contract with the state educational agency. The content of the program is approved by the state. | District must register provisional teachers with the state. Once the provisional teacher has met state induction requirements, the district submits the teacher’s name to the state agency along with the appropriate documentation and evaluations required for granting a permanent certificate. | |

| STATE | PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT | ADMINISTRATION | OVERSIGHT |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| New York | Developed by the district. The State Department of Education provides 10 recommended program standards. | The district and Board of Cooperative Education Services must maintain records on all provisional teachers and document the teacher's assigned mentor, mentoring activities completed, and number of hours logged. | Programs must develop their own evaluation models based on identified program outcomes. |

*Please note: If the space was left blank, it means that information for that category was unavailable.

SECTION II: ADMINISTRATOR INDUCTION

OVERVIEW

Administrator induction programs are somewhat newer and less well established than teacher induction programs.²⁹ As of 2010-2011, only 16 states required “some form of professional support” for first-time school principals, and only 3 required induction or mentoring for first- and second-year school administrators.³⁰ Nevertheless, recent research highlights the importance of professional development for administrators. In one 2014 report, the School Leaders Network estimates that the cost of developing, hiring, and onboarding a school principal is \$75,000. Thus, investments in principal retention – for example, through induction and ongoing professional development – may improve school performance in a cost-effective manner.³¹

In 2013-2014, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing implemented program standards for administrative services credentialing. Credentialing programs for administrators are divided into several steps, including a “clear credential program” centered on a job-embedded, in-service induction model. This coaching-based program spans two years and is informed by candidate assessment, coach observations, and district focus. Professional development activities such as seminars and courses are required; additionally, participants meet with mentors to reflect on their practices as administrators.³²

DEFINING ADMINISTRATORS

Induction programs may include administrators in many positions – including supervisors, assistant principals, principals, assistant superintendents, and superintendents. However, the literature on administrator induction programs focuses primarily on beginning principals, perhaps because “the principalship is often the entry point from teacher to administrator, unless someone has served in an assistant principal position.”³³ Thus, this section analyzes reports and studies that focus almost exclusively on principal induction.

EFFICACY OF ADMINISTRATOR INDUCTION PROGRAMS

While research on the efficacy of administrator induction is not as prolific as that on teacher induction, some of the most respected names in education research have released reports indicating that completion of an induction program can increase both an administrator’s effectiveness and the likelihood that he or she remains in the field.

²⁹ Hartzler, L. and T. Gavin. “Administrator Induction Programs: Summary of Research and Promising Practices.” The Connecticut Principals’ Center, June 30, 2003. p. 3. http://www.casciac.org/pdfs/admin_induction.pdf

³⁰ Goldrick et al., Op. cit., p. 4.

³¹ “Churn: The High Cost of Principal Turnover.” School Leaders Network, 2014. p. 2. http://connectleadsucceed.org/sites/default/files/principal_turnover_cost.pdf

³² “Administrative Services Credential Program Standards.” Commission on Teacher Credentialing, February 2014. pp. 8, 10. <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/svc-admin-handbook-2014.pdf>

³³ Hartzler and Gavin, Op. cit., p. 30.

Linda Darling-Hammond's comprehensive review of administrator induction studies concluded that administrators who participate in innovative induction programs report significantly higher perceptions of their training and stronger leadership outcomes.³⁴ However, as with teacher induction programs, the correlation between effectiveness and participation in an administrator induction program is highly dependent upon the quality of the program. Darling-Hammond found that administrators who participated in exemplary induction programs that included school visits, peer observations and principal networking were judged to be much more effective than administrators who participated in traditional, less intensive induction programs.³⁵ Another study that surveyed teachers' perceptions of principal's leadership effectiveness found that participation in an induction program with more comprehensive features (such as completion of an internship and pedagogy on instructional strategies) was strongly correlated with principal effectiveness.³⁶

PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND SCOPE

According to the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, in-service administrator induction programs typically belong to one of four program types depending on the entity that administers the program: university-based programs, district programs, third-party programs, and partnership programs.³⁷ The Institute describes partnership programs as "highly contextualized" collaborations – generally between districts and postsecondary institutions – that often occur in areas "where the district and university partners have developed a common vision of education and school leadership and where the principal preparation offered by the university is closely consistent with the instructional initiatives of the district and features internships in the district's schools."³⁸

Studies suggest that the design of administrator induction can differ based on the program's intended purpose (i.e., support versus licensure assessment) and the length and breadth of pre-service administrator training.³⁹ However, successful administrator induction programs tend to share similar features regardless of program type. A 2007 report on exemplary leadership development programs from the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute found that high-quality in-service programs share three main characteristics:⁴⁰

- A learning continuum operating systematically from pre-service preparation through induction and throughout the career, involving mature and retired principals in mentoring others

³⁴ Darling-Hammond, L., et al. "Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs." Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, 2007. p. 17
<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Preparing-School-Leaders.pdf>

³⁵ Id., p. 47.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Darling-Hammond, L. et al. "Developing Successful Principals." Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, 2005. pp. 15. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.123.7780&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

³⁸ Id., p. 19.

³⁹ Hartzler and Gavin, Op. cit., p. 23.

⁴⁰ Taken verbatim from Darling-Hammond, L., et al. "Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs." Op. cit, p. 146.

- Leadership learning grounded in practice, including analyses of classroom practice, supervision, and professional development using on-the-job observations connected to readings and discussions and organized around a model of leadership
- Collegial learning networks, such as principals' networks, study groups, and mentoring or peer coaching, that offer communities of practice and sources of ongoing support for problem solving

Research also highlights the importance of coordinating pre-service programs with in-service models. As Linda Hartzler and Tom Galvin write for the Connecticut Principals' Center, "The more we coordinate the preparation with the current expectations for school leadership, the less the need or concern to 'add' requirements during induction... when administrators are most overwhelmed and in need of support and assistance with daily job expectations."⁴¹

MENTORING

Experts consistently emphasize the value of mentorships in administrator induction programs. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), for example, describes high-quality mentors as "the key" to improving training for aspiring principals in an effective manner.⁴² However, the ability of a mentorship to improve new administrators' skills and capabilities depends on factors such as program length and funding, as well as mentor quality and training. To support an effective program, the Wallace Foundation recommends structured mentorships focused on developing new principals who:⁴³

- Put learning first in their time and attention and know how to rally their entire school communities around that goal;
- See when fundamental change in the status quo is needed in order to make better teaching and learning happen; and
- Have the courage to keep the needs of all children front and center and not shrink from confronting opposition to change when necessary.

SELECTING AND SUPPORTING MENTORS

Careful selection of mentors helps foster the development of substantive relationships with mentees. Experts recommend the selection of instructional leaders who possess a "solid knowledge about current learning theories, curriculum, assessment and school organization," a successful record, and a detailed understanding of the organizational context in which the mentee is operating.⁴⁴ Although experts suggest that the mentor should have some familiarity with the mentee's environment, employment in the same district does not appear

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 64.

⁴² "Good Principals Aren't Born--They're Mentored." Southern Regional Education Board. p. 11.
<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-training/Documents/Good-Principals-Arent-Born-Theyre-Mentored.pdf>

⁴³ Ibid., p. 9.

⁴⁴ Hartzler and Galvin, Op. cit., p. 31.

to be essential.⁴⁵ Philosophical compatibility also may factor into strong mentorships, as mentees may struggle to work with leaders who advocate educational theories and beliefs wildly different from their own.⁴⁶

Logistically, researchers urge the selection of mentors who are capable of committing the time required of a meaningful mentorship. Specifically, the Connecticut Principals' Center observes that, when selecting current principals as mentors, "care must be taken to select only those principals whose schools are sufficiently strong so that the school will not suffer as a result of the time and energy spent by the principal."⁴⁷ Likewise, the NYC Leadership Academy, a privately-funded organization designed to recruit, prepare, and support the city's principals, previously abandoned the use of sitting principals as mentors in the belief that retired leaders could "spend more time and attention on their new principals."⁴⁸

Notably, mentor compensation may affect the quality and quantity of leaders who participate in mentorship programs, leading some researchers to conclude that stipends should be "commensurate with the importance and time requirements of the task."⁴⁹ In Kentucky, for example, Jefferson County Public Schools found that the \$1,400 annual stipend provided to mentors was an insufficient incentive to attract high-quality principals to mentorship roles. In addition to the low stipend, two other factors posed a challenge to mentorship in the district: a requirement that mentors spend at least 50 contact hours with new principals and be consistently available for advice beyond those hours; and a reliance on active principals as mentors.⁵⁰

As with teacher induction, research suggests that the type and intensity of training that administrator mentors receive may impact a mentor's ability to cultivate the specific skillset needed to successfully coach mentees. The Wallace Foundation identifies "weak or non-existent training for mentors" as a key problem underlying contemporary mentorship programs, even in states that mandate mentorships, and advises mentorship programs to provide high-quality training for mentors on a routine basis.⁵¹

⁴⁵ [A] Ibid.

[B] Darling-Hammond, L., et al., "Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs," *Op. cit.*, p. 146.

[C] Dukess, L. "Meeting the Leadership Challenge." *New Visions for Public Schools*, 2001. pp. 1–2.
http://b3cdn.net/nvps/1b09a4b6c9285c247c_bkm6bnkhs.pdf

⁴⁶ Gates, S.M. et al. "Preparing Principals to Raise Student Achievement: Implementation and Effects of the New Leaders Program in Ten Districts." RAND Corporation, 2014. pp. 29–30.
http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR500/RR507/RAND_RR507.pdf

⁴⁷ Hartzler and Gavin, *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁴⁸ "Getting Principal Mentoring Right: Lessons from the Field." The Wallace Foundation, March 2007. p.11.
<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-training/Documents/Getting-Principal-Mentoring-Right.pdf>.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 4.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 15.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 4.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Overall, experts and policy-makers emphasize the importance of external standards in ensuring that mentorships meet established guidelines. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education regulations, for example, require districts to report the number of site-based visits made by mentors and the number of hours mentors spend with mentees.⁵² The Wallace Foundation also recommends explicit accountability measures, stating that all organizations requiring mentorships should gather “meaningful information about its efficacy: especially, how mentoring is or is not contributing to the development of leadership behaviors and dispositions that are needed to change the culture of school towards improved teaching and learning.”⁵³ Surveys and other forms of self-reporting may be insufficient means of gathering comprehensive and/or reliable information on program activities, outcomes, and satisfaction levels. Thus, states and districts may need to conduct more formal evaluations of the extent to which mentees have gained useful skills and habits as a result of the mentorship.⁵⁴

COMPARABLE STATES OF INTEREST

CCSESA examined the statewide requirements for administrator induction programs in 5 comparable states: Ohio, North Carolina, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York. The findings are consistent with the literature review above – most administrator induction programs are newer and less well established than teacher induction programs.⁵⁵

⁵² “Guidelines for Induction and Mentoring Programs.” Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, April 2015. p. 27. <http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/mentor/guidelines.pdf>

⁵³ “Getting Principal Mentoring Right: Lessons from the Field,” Op. cit., p. 4.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 8.

⁵⁵ Hartzler, L. and T. Gavin. “Administrator Induction Programs: Summary of Research and Promising Practices.” The Connecticut Principals’ Center, June 30, 2003. p. 3. http://www.casciac.org/pdfs/admin_induction.pdf

Figure 2.1 demonstrates that statewide administrator induction requirements are much more limited in scope and applicability than teacher induction requirements. Only one state – New Jersey – unconditionally requires candidates to complete an induction program to receive certification.

Figure 2.1 Statewide Administrator Induction Requirements

| STATE | REQUIREMENT | PROGRAM LENGTH | PROGRAM COMPONENTS |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Ohio | Required only for alternative certification pathways. | Principals: 3 years. Superintendents: 4 years. Administrative Specialists: 4 years. | Mentoring and professional development. Depending on the candidate experience and certificate sought, may also include: self-assessments, development of personal plan, college coursework requirements, and completion of a licensure exam. |
| North Carolina | No statewide requirement. | | |
| Illinois | Required contingent to an annual state budget appropriation. | Principal: 1 year. Superintendent: 2 years. | Mentoring |
| New Jersey | Required for all new principals and administrators. | Principal: 2 years. School Administrators: 1-2 years. | Mentoring, professional experiences, training, and instruction. |
| New York | Required, but can opt-out with 2+ years of teaching experience. | School building leaders: 1 year. | Mentoring |

*Please note: If the space was left blank, it means that information for that category was unavailable.

Figure 2.2 summarizes how programs are administered in each state and to what extent oversight and support is provided by a statewide agency or association.

Figure 2.2 Administrator Induction Program Administration

| STATE | MENTOR SELECTION CRITERIA | PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION | OVERSIGHT |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Ohio | Holds a standard principal/superintendent/Administrator license; experience and interpersonal skills | Districts. Some training and support is provided by the state's various principal and superintendent associations. | The Ohio Department of Education is responsible for ensuring the alternative certification requirements are fulfilled. If college coursework is required, the college must guarantee those requirements have been fulfilled. |
| North Carolina | | Districts. The North Carolina Principals and Assistant Principals Association offer professional development modules and support to districts. | |
| Illinois | 3+ years of experience, demonstrated success as an instructional leader, similar grade level or school type as mentee, geographical proximity to mentee, understanding learning needs of new principal/superintendent | | Mentors and mentees must certify that program requirements have been completed. Program providers are required to annually submit the mentees progress to the State Board of Education. |
| New Jersey | Retired or current NJ school leader with 5+ years of experience. Experiences that are similar to mentees including: grade-level or school-type; district/community type; and positions held. | The state contracts with two associations to provide administrator induction: the state association of principals and supervisors and the New Jersey Association of School Administrators. | Mentors act as agents of the Board of Examiners. Mentors conduct evaluations, ensure the mentee has fulfilled all requirements, and submit documentation either recommending or denying certification to the mentee. A mentee who is denied certification by his/her mentor may appeal the decision. |
| New York | | | Completion of the program must be verified by the superintendent of the employing district. |

*Please note: If the space was left blank, it means that information for that category was unavailable.