



Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
April 26, 2017 Meeting
Committee #5- Mentoring

Committee Members Present: Deborah Poese, MADTEC; Justin McConnaughey, MAESP; Sarah Mallory, UMS; Stacy Williams, MICUA; Laura Liccione, MSDE

Guests: Liam Goldrick, New Teacher Center

Committee Members Absent: Jasmine Stewart, MSEA; Diane Workman, PSSAM.

MSDE Staff: Jessica Bancroft, Dara Shaw

Approval of Minutes: Sarah Mallory motioned for approval. Stacy Williams seconded.

All in favor. None opposed

Discussion:

Ms. Liccione asked the group to review the recommendation that have been made thus far and distributed the minutes from the last two meetings to provide background for anyone who is not familiar with the four recommendations drafted by the committee.

Ms. Poese asked for a rewording of recommendation two to read instead, establish partnerships between Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) and Local Agencies of Education (LEA) to develop induction programs with innovative evidence based strategies.

Ms. Mallory noted the research does support the recommendations made. There are more opinion pieces than studies. Ingersoll and Strong are two of the researchers who a considerable amount of the work. The study provided is from 2011. There were 17 different studies done and Ms. Mallory provided the critical review. Each study had its own issues. Ms. Mallory is able to provide the research referenced to provide support for the recommendations.

Ms. Williams asked if this research was in isolation of teacher preparation. How well prepared were you when you came in, and then how much induction did you need? Ms. Mallory talked about the concept of the research around this as causal and regression.

Mr. Goldrick provided more information on how the research is done. The challenge as an organization is that you are trying to find impacts on students but you have

tertiary touch. You work with mentors who are working with teachers who are working with students. It is complicated to show how a change in instructional practices impacts student learning over three years. The study did not address why did this happen.

Overall there are complicated issues with the studies.

Ms. Mallory tied studies to what we are talking about. Referencing the research information she provided, page 206 offered information that showed the retention. The second one was over three years instead of two years. This links to the beginning statement. Mr. Goldricks reminded the committee that generally the work has a positive impact on students with some emerging evidence it impacts student learning so there needs to be additional research.

Ms. Liccione asked Ms. Spross how to best site the research for each of the four recommendations. Ms. Spross reminded the group we are working on the fact we import 61% of teachers. There is a low retention rate over three year time period. There is turnover in critical shortage area. The committee should use research to support the recommendations. State the issue, the recommendation, and then show the research that supports it.

Ms. Poese noted the work needs to be done with induction committee.

Mr. Goldrick noted in the first recommendation the contact time with the mentor teacher is important but it is not quantifiable. Ms. Liccione pointed out throughout the state this varies.

Ms. Mallory noted there needs to be differentiated support between counties. Ms. Williams asked if there is any way to know what each LEA is doing.

Need to follow up on what each LEA is doing.

Mr. Goldrick noted research says a one year course does not show that it does anything. Maryland is an exception with COMAR saying three years. In Maryland who are the teachers who are not getting the full support they should be getting?

Mr. Goldrick indicated he could speak to recommendation 1, a little to 4 and some to **(hand out provided- Cecilia has it)**. Summary to six questions.

1. Does this work matter at all? Yes, see research provided- Ingersoll/Strong
2. Rate of return on retention. Research is all over the place. Turn over can be effected by the economy and will it change?
3. Discussion of grant funded study. **(see handout, page 2)**

4. Time spent on behalf of what new teachers need. Some research on release time. If you are asking a full time classroom teacher to mentor on the side they will not be able to do as good a job. They need release as mentors.

Minnesota and Colorado reports on the New Teacher Center website.

Recommendation #4 – Smith and Ingersoll page 207- #4

Ms. Mallory. There is not research that address or supports some of the recommendations. This does not mean the recommendations are not important.

Ms. Shaw joined the conversation. First question, who are the mentor teachers? The group responded with different examples of how different LEAs chose mentors differently. Ms. Shaw noted retired teachers are some of the best mentors. There are multiple factors that show this. Mr. Goldrick asked if retired teachers mean they have more time to spend. However, one drawback is generational issues that materialize. Dara asked what question we are trying to solve. Why are we changing what is currently happening? Ms. Mallory noted we need a set of standards to select the correct mentors.

Ms. Poese said the group agreed that COMAR standards are working, if everyone is holding to those regulations.

Ms. Shaw noted what matters is who is the mentor, and how do they connect with the mentee? It is not just about the number of minutes. Can you write the recommendations then pilot them and study them?

Mr. McCannaughey asked what is the purpose? Is this about retention or advancement? How do we make teachers better teachers?

Suggestion- Look into the Tell Data and can we find disaggregated information by system. Ms. Shaw has some ideas.

Mr. McCannaughey asked about exit interviews.

Ms. Williams asked if there any research that we have that would change our recommendations.

Ms. Poese pointed out there is research for number 1, 3 and 4. This brings us back to number 2 that does not have the research. There needs to be research about LEA funding. Mr. McCannaughey noted this is an issue in Frederick county.

There could be a continued conversation of what is the structure of the growth of strong mentors. This comes back to the career lattice.

Mr. Goldrick noted there is a need to employ full or part time mentors. Use examples in Maryland or other states for other systems to replicate.

Recommendation language? Leadership pathway in mentoring.

Combined Summary of 2/21/2017 and 4/26/2017:

- **Recommendation #1 revised to: *Provide appropriate time for mentors to support non-tenured teachers based upon individual teacher needs.***

An excellent summary of the research on teacher induction is provided by Richard Ingersoll and Michael Strong's in their [2011 academic journal article](#). In addition, past analyses by New Teacher Center for the states of [Colorado](#) and [Minnesota](#) also distilled the research to demonstrate benefit afforded from specific aspects of induction and mentoring. [The NCTAF Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator](#) can be used to estimate a financial price tag of teacher turnover and estimate potential savings.

Possibly include something from the Senate Bill regarding the Pilot Program:

UNDER THE PILOT PROGRAM, EACH PARTICIPATING FIRST YEAR TEACHER SHALL BE AFFORDED AT LEAST 20% MORE TIME THAN TEACHERS WHO ARE NOT FIRST YEAR TEACHERS DURING THE ACADEMIC WEEK TO BE SPENT ON MENTORING, PEER OBSERVATION, ASSISTANCE WITH PLANNING, OR OTHER PREPARATION ACTIVITIES.

Research suggests that regular interactions between a beginning teacher and his or her mentor are required to generate positive benefits on instructional improvement and teacher retention. It is difficult to quantify an exact amount of time, but research is somewhat instructive. First, research has shown that full-time mentors may be more effective than mentors who engage in this work alongside a partial or full classroom-teaching load. Second, the breadth of research suggests that weekly mentor-mentee 3 interactions of between 60-180 minutes may be most beneficial. But, of course, what occurs during these time periods (observing teaching, instructional feedback, lesson planning, etc.) may be even more important than the time spent itself.

- **Recommendation #2 revised to: *Establish IHE's and LEA partnerships to develop and implement mentorship training programs which embed innovative evidence-based strategies as part of a comprehensive induction program.***
- **Recommendation #3 revised to: *Develop online resource repository of resources to strengthen mentor best practices.***

Resources may include:

- videos
- mentor and mentee tools
- webinars

- protocols
- self-reflection guides/surveys
- training modules

It is possible these are similar recommendation to the work done in Committee #3

- **Recommendation #4: *Match mentees with mentors who have similar experiences serving specific student populations, such as student with disabilities, EL, and socio-economic background.***

It is important to note that all induction programs are not created equal, and may range from informal buddy systems to comprehensive programs focused of transforming the instructional practices of beginning educators. The same is true of the design and implementation of state policies. While Maryland has a strong induction mandate and set of program requirements in place (as summarized here by New Teacher Center), the 2015 TELL Maryland Survey found that a quarter of new teachers reported not being formally assigned a mentor. Further, nearly one third said they never engaged in lesson planning with their mentor and 35% said they never analyzed student work during mentoring time.