

Effective Teachers are Made, Not Born
Mandating Induction Programs for New Teachers in Maryland

Maryland Governor's Summer Internship Program, 2008



Renee Brown, Mount St. Mary's University
Maryland State Department of Education

Alexandra Costlow, Towson University
Maryland State Department of Education

Adrienne Hawkins, University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Maryland State Department of Education

Alexander Newman, Towson University
Maryland State Department of Education

Paige Spencer, St. Mary's College
Maryland State Department of Education

Shane Spencer, University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Maryland Department of the Environment

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary..... | 3 |
| Background of the Problem..... | 4 |
| Alternative Policy Options | 5 |
| No Change in Policy..... | 5 |
| Reduction of Class Sizes | 5 |
| Financial Incentives for Teachers..... | 6 |
| Mandated Induction Programs for New Teachers..... | 7 |
| Other State Models | 9 |
| Iowa | 9 |
| New York | 10 |
| Retention Rates..... | 10 |
| Maryland Model for New Teacher Induction Program..... | 11 |
| Definitions | 11 |
| Funding..... | 12 |
| Program Details | 13 |
| Sample Implementation Model | 14 |
| Benefits of Mandated Induction Programs..... | 15 |
| Induction Programs Reduce Attrition and Save Money..... | 15 |
| Induction Programs Improve Students' Education..... | 15 |
| Mentoring is Supported by Maryland Educators and Citizens..... | 16 |
| Conclusion..... | 17 |
| Appendix: Current Law | 18 |
| Works Cited..... | 21 |

Executive Summary

Maryland trains, hires, and places thousands of teachers in Maryland schools, but many leave after only a few years. Baltimore City, with a particularly troublesome teacher attrition problem, loses 60% of its new teachers after less than five years (Maryland Teacher Shortage Task Force Report 4; “Teacher Staffing Report” 39). Teacher attrition is an expensive problem, and is estimated to cost the state approximately \$42 million annually (Maryland Teacher Shortage Task Force Report 4). Due to the diverse needs of each school district, the problem cannot be fixed with one overarching policy; teachers need individual attention. “Effective teachers are made rather than born” (Rosenholtz 380) advises the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz, which is the leader for teacher integration and training.

Teachers need attention and individual support as they face the difficult challenge of converting university learning to classroom application. As such, we recommend a change in Maryland law to help to alleviate this problem. A program of induction should be required by law for all new teachers to become certified, which would feature two years of mentoring.

While a continuation of current policy, smaller class sizes, and financial incentives for teachers have been considered as possible solutions for teacher attrition, each approach is prohibitively expensive, fails to address the root causes of new teachers' dissatisfaction, or both. Induction programs serve to introduce and integrate new teachers into the teaching community where they work, and mentors can help teachers improve their lesson plans and their approaches for dealing with problems in the classroom. Our research has shown that improved teacher retention can more than pay for the cost of mentoring programs and that students will benefit from a more stable teacher workforce.

Background of the Problem

The high turnover rate in Maryland reflects career dissatisfaction among thousands of teachers, and this problem must be combated in order to reduce the \$42 million yearly estimated cost of teacher turnover in the state (Maryland Teacher Shortage Task Force Report 4).

Although Maryland does not have a uniform system for recording reasons for attrition, it is evident that Maryland is constantly replacing teachers (“Maryland Teacher Staffing Report” 38). The state hired 8,046 teachers in the fall of 2004; more than half of them were teachers with no previous teaching experience, and over two thirds of those were recruited from out of state (“Teacher Staffing Report” 20). In the same year, over 5,000 teachers, which constituted 8% of the workforce, left; most were leaving after less than five years of teaching. For example, of the 622 teachers from Baltimore City who departed, 62% were leaving after less than five year’s work; that figure is 51% in Montgomery County. Only Worcester, Kent and Garrett counties manage to keep more than 75% of their teachers beyond the fifth year (“Teacher Staffing Report” 39).

Teachers trained in a university setting may find they are unable to adjust their teaching practices to the real-life workplace, especially to the needs of students in low-performing schools, and they may lack the ability or confidence to develop flexible classroom management and teaching styles (Hanson & Moir 109; Gshwend & Moir 21). A lack of highly-qualified teachers compounds the problem in some jurisdictions. About 86% percent of Montgomery County core classes are taught by highly qualified teachers. In Baltimore City, however, less than half of core classes are taught by a qualified educator. This problem is not isolated; in six counties, less than two thirds of middle school classes are taught by highly-qualified teachers (“Teacher Staffing Report” 82). As the Maryland Teacher Task Force reports, “Because states

across the country share these difficulties, Maryland cannot recruit its way out of the problem” (4).

Alternative Policy Options

No Change in Policy

We assume the yearly cost of implementing no change in policy to be \$42 million, for recruitment and training costs required for replacements (“Maryland Teacher Shortage Task Force Report” 4). High attrition rates exacerbate Maryland’s shortage of teachers, especially of those qualified to teach in fields like math and science. If there is no change in Maryland, teacher attrition’s monetary and educational quality costs will continue- and may grow.

Reduction of Class Sizes

Research has shown that reductions in class size have a positive impact on younger children, especially the disadvantaged (“Benefits of Small Class Size” 1). In addition, more than two-thirds of teachers in high-needs schools consider reducing class size to be a very effective way to improve teacher retention (Rochkind et al. 27). A study in New York associated a class size reduction from 23 to 20 students with a decrease in the likelihood of a teacher leaving a school district by 4.2% (Pas 2). However, a class-size-reduction policy would require an increased recruitment of teachers during a teacher shortage, and increase the total cost for salaries and benefits substantially. A demand for new teachers during a teacher shortage would likely require hiring many less-qualified and less-experienced teachers, groups who are most likely to resign within just a few years (“Benefits of Small Class Size” 1). In order to accommodate additional classes, construction costs for additional classrooms and new buildings would also increase. Although a policy of decreasing class sizes might improve teacher

retention, it would require other expenditures and lacks feasibility considering Maryland's current difficulty in recruiting teachers ("Maryland Teacher Staffing Report" vii).

Financial Incentives for Teachers

Sixty percent of educators surveyed in the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality's 2007 report, "Working Without a Net", believed that upping teacher pay could improve the profession (Rochkind et al. 27). Increasing pay, however, cannot ameliorate the difficulties of teaching. Of those same teachers, few listed teacher pay as a reason for leaving the profession, and "the vast majority [said] they would rather work in a school where 'administrators gave strong backing and support' compared to a school where they could earn more" (Rochkind 27). Math, science, and computer technology teachers, often the teacher that are the most needed in today's schools, are offered salaries in the private-sector that would be difficult for school systems to compete with ("Salary Survey"). According to the Maryland Teacher Task Force, "Teacher salaries have monopolized conversations...very rarely is there any dialogue about working conditions...when teachers feel included, valued, and supported they stay" (Helfman 4). One example of supporting teachers, and hence encouraging them to stay, is providing them with an induction program that has a strong emphasis on mentoring.

Another possible financial incentive, the HOPE Scholarship, which was phased out in 2006, offers a merit-based tax credit of up to \$1,500 per year for two years to college students in exchange for a commitment to teach in Maryland upon graduation ("Hope Scholarship Programs"). Unfortunately, programs such as the HOPE Scholarship, while admirable in encouraging entrance into the field, are ineffective solutions for teacher attrition problems, as they suffer from the same weaknesses as increasing salaries. After the requisite period of time is over for service in Maryland, a teacher may still leave the profession. Financial incentives to

encourage entrance and continuation in the teaching field also fail to hold anyone accountable for supporting teachers and helping them to develop the competencies required to cope with unexpected difficulties in the classroom that contribute to teacher attrition. The HOPE Scholarship may attract teachers to the profession but it does not address attrition, as minimum scholarship requirements allow teachers to migrate after a period of obligatory service.

Mandated Induction Programs for New Teachers

Induction programs that include mentoring have proven to be an effective solution to the problem of teacher retention. New teachers face complex issues in their first years of teaching including learning the curriculum, lesson planning, parent conferencing, mandatory standardized testing, addressing behavioral issues in students, developing grading policies and practices, and much more. Induction programs, which can be defined as “a comprehensive, coherent, and sustained professional development process that is organized by a school district to train, support, and retain new teachers and seamlessly progresses them into a lifelong learning program”, carry the responsibility of supporting new teachers both professionally and socially (“Induction Programs” 41). Induction programs aim to help teachers acclimate to the communities in which they will teach, and they serve to capitalize on the “crucial link between student achievement and the quality of a teacher’s instruction” (Hanson & Moir 109).

Key components of a full induction programs include, “Highly qualified, carefully selected mentors, authentic mentoring processes where teacher routinely reflect on their practices, a standards-based seminar series for new teachers, collaborative inquiry, district/site/professional partnerships, and administrative support” (Gschwend & Moir 21) in addition to an initial orientation for new teachers. Furthermore, quality induction programs help new teachers assimilate into the local community; for example, some districts spend one of their

orientation days providing a tour of the community. Basically, induction programs provide teachers with a variety of professional development (orientation, seminars, etc.) as well as specific, targeted feedback from mentors based on a new teacher's particular classroom practices. The mentoring piece of induction programs can introduce new teachers to models of flexible classroom management and teaching styles; they have also proven to decrease attrition among new teachers.

Baltimore City's Blum mentoring program, begun in 1999 and terminated in 2008, is a testament to the desire for training and support that teachers often have. Teachers made over 3,000 visits in a single school year to a 'mentoring PLACE' for resources and support ("Systemic Teacher Mentoring" 4). Although the Blum mentoring program was one of several independent programs in the city, it was one with particularly impressive results. The program succeeded in lowering the average rate of attrition among first-year teachers from levels as high as 40% in some schools to 20%, below the city-wide average of 25% ("Systemic Teacher Mentoring" 4). Blum mentors were full-time, on-site mentors based at the neediest schools with the highest percentages of new teachers (Anozie). They led training sessions and helped teachers one-on-one while maintaining scrupulous records of their interactions and progress. Blum mentors were particularly useful in acclimating new teachers from all over the world to the realities of urban teaching. Another key factor in their success was the existence of the mentoring coordinator and the mentoring 'PLACE' which fostered communication and resource sharing (Anozie).

Mentors can be particularly useful in helping teachers address in addressing the diversity of student needs. Mentors can work alongside teachers in the classroom in order to provide an example of expected performance and discuss how the new teacher might attain that ideal.

Mentors can also work to improve the new teacher's approach to educating special populations, such as English Language Learners and Special Needs students (Gschwend & Moir 21). Through mentoring strategies that increase the collective efficacy level of a teaching community, teachers become more confident that they can, as a group, effectively organize and execute courses of action that will raise student achievement (Goddard, LoGerfo, & Hoy 404).

Other State Models

Two states that employ induction programs are Iowa and New York. Both states have mandated that new teachers participate in induction programs in order to become certified to teach, and have shown an improvement in teacher retention.

Iowa

During Iowa's 2001 legislative session, the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program was enacted. According to the law, "a beginning teacher mentoring and induction program" was created "to promote excellence in teaching...and promote the personal and professional well-being of classroom teachers." Local education authorities (LEAs) were required to create a beginning mentoring and induction program for new teachers, to be approved by the Iowa Department of Education. Funding for these programs comes from the state legislature. During the past session of the legislature, \$4,650,000 was designated for mentoring and induction based on an allocation of \$1300 per new teacher (Iowa State Legislature). Districts could also rely on area education agencies (AEAs). These mentoring and induction programs have to follow certain guidelines as set out by the legislation, such as mentor training that includes, at a minimum, demonstration of classroom skills and coaching, and district expectations for beginning teacher competence on Iowa teaching standards.

At the end of two years, the mentee is evaluated to assess whether they have successfully

met the requirements of the induction program. If they have met the requirements, they are certified to teach. If not, the teacher may apply for a third year of mentoring, but funding has to come from the local district or the AEA. If at the end of the third year the mentee has not met the requirements of the induction program, they cannot become certified to teach in Iowa.

New York

In February 2004, the State of New York mandated that all new teachers applying for their certification undergo mandatory mentoring for one year. Mentors came from several pools, including retired teachers and current teachers that desire to advance their career without becoming an administrator. Funding for the mentoring program comes from the state legislature; money is appropriated to support the development and implementation of programs by LEAs. These funds are subject to yearly approval by the legislature. The New York State Education Department does not have mandatory guidelines for the creation of mentoring and induction programs, but they do outline suggested items to be included in each program. Once a new teacher is ready to apply for a Professional Certificate, local superintendents are required to show that this teacher has undergone the necessary year of mentoring by submitting a Superintendent Verification of Mentored Experience form to the New York State Education Department.

Retention Rates

The data shows that the mentoring programs are helping to increase teacher retention. Since Iowa mandated mentoring and induction for new teachers, the retention rate has steadily increased. The table below (“Education in Iowa’s Future”) lists the figures:

TABLE 3
Public School District First Year Teacher Retention 2000-01 to 2005-2006*

| Year | Number of First Year Teachers in Base Year | Teachers Returning in 2001-2002 | Teachers Returning in 2002-2003 | Teachers Returning in 2003-2004 | Teachers Returning in 2004-2005 | Teachers Returning in 2005-2006 |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2000-2001 (Base year) | 1810 | 1574 (87.0%) | 1424 (78.7%) | 1339 (74.0%) | 1273 (70.3%) | 1221 (67.5%) |
| 2001-2002** | 1614 | | 1407 (87.2%) | 1285 (79.6%) | 1216 (75.3%) | 1162 (72.0%) |
| 2002-2003*** | 1269 | | | 1131 (89.1%) | 1033 (81.4%) | 975 (76.8%) |
| 2003-2004 | 1432 | | | | 1295 (90.4%) | 1200 (83.8%) |
| 2004-2005 | 1512 | | | | | 1391 (92.0%) |
| 2005-2006 | 1590 | | | | | |

Source: Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) Staff Files.

*Data does not include teachers leaving Iowa to teach in other states.

**Mentoring and induction was first offered in 2001-2002.

***All beginning teachers were supported by mentoring and induction in 2002-2003.

In New York, there has thus far been no formal collection of data on the retention rates of beginning teachers who have gone through mentoring, though the state has noticed a slight increase in retention where data is collected. The lack of data available from the New York State Education Department emphasizes the need for data collection with mandated programs of induction.

Maryland Model for New Teacher Induction Program

Definitions

In creating a Maryland induction system model, several definitions are necessary. An induction program shall be defined as a distinct program designed and operated independently by each Maryland LEA, in which all new teachers in Maryland are properly assimilated and otherwise made confident educating the children of this State; the induction program should include an emphasis on mentoring. A mentor shall be defined according to the guidelines outlined in COMAR and whatever additional definitions are given by each LEA; but generally, a

mentor should formally guide and advise new teachers. For purposes of program funding, the state shall define a new teacher as an educator entering the profession for the first time; however, for purposes of assigning mentors, local districts may decide to further define a new teacher by principles such as being new to the local school system or new to a subject matter.

Funding

We recommend that the Maryland State Legislature pass a law that requires each new teacher to participate in an induction program in order to become certified to teach in Maryland. Because the Local Education Authorities (LEA) in Maryland are so diverse, each LEA would develop its own induction program, to be approved by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). Funding for implementation of these programs would come from the state legislature as well as each LEA; the state legislature would allocate money to MSDE, which would then be allocated to each LEA. The money would be distributed based on giving each LEA \$3,000 per new hire to be used in the induction program. Additional funds for implementation would come from the LEA.

Although Maryland does not currently require districts to administer induction programs, the 2002 Bridge to Excellence Act provides \$5 million in funding. In 2007-2008, about 6,000 new teachers were hired in Maryland. As such, the cost of implementing induction programs statewide would be roughly \$18 million. Districts will then have the opportunity to apply to MSDE for more funding for their induction program, with preference given to need-based requests.

Considering that attrition is currently costing the state \$42 million, there is the potential to save the state several million dollars in cuts to teacher retaining. Also, since our program encourages teacher retention and since experienced teachers are linked to student achievement;

our program will also increase student achievement. While its dollar amount is immeasurable, student achievement is invaluable to Maryland and therefore, in addition to saving the state money on retraining teachers, our program will also assist the state in making gains in student achievement. In addition to requiring mandatory participation in induction programs, the law should also require accurate data collection measures, such as retention rates. This data should come from MSDE; collection would be similar to that of standardized tests, with data coming from each individual school, then each LEA, and finally for the state as a whole. Without this data, the effectiveness of having an induction program cannot be measured.

Program Details

Although teacher induction programs are not currently mandatory, guidelines for mentoring in Maryland already exist, as laid out in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR). Thus, the following is aligned and intended to be an addition to the laws already in place. We recommend that the law contain language that such as:

Each public school district is required to create and maintain its own Teacher Induction program, to be approved by the Maryland State Department of Education. Each district is required to maintain new teacher data including retention rates, entrance surveys, exit surveys, mentor curriculum (such as joint lesson planning, coaching observations, reflection activities) and mentor/teacher feedback. The Maryland State Department of Education will use at minimum the following criteria to evaluate each district's proposed program:

- Criteria/requirements created for hiring mentors
- Training program for mentors
- Mentor distribution (full-time, part-time, etc.)
- Mentor curriculum when training new teachers
- Description of mentor responsibilities
- Targets and learning outcomes
- Methodology for collecting data (retention data, surveys, mentor activity documentation, performance data, etc.), and the means of properly analyzing and publishing the data
- Disbursement of state funds including mentor payment, and Induction program funding

Sample Implementation Model

Although the districts will have latitude in creating their own program, a district's Induction Program may look like the following:

1. County A works with MSDE to create a mentor training facility to equip it with adequate resources so that mentors will be able to instill confidence in new teachers.
2. County A uses 30% of state new teacher funds to pay 10 full-time mentors, 40% to pay for part-time mentors, and 30% to maintain the Induction program's resources.
3. County A applies for more funds, and in conjunction with their own dollars, upgrades their training facilities and funds several more mentors.
4. After approval from MSDE, County A creates a mentor recruiting and selection process, which will be based on a specific set of criteria in addition to the guidelines outlined in COMAR.
5. Panel then trains the first set of mentors (part-time and full-time together) at a central facility in County A equipped with teacher resources. Mentor activities with new teachers might include things such as joint lesson planning, reflection activities, curricula development, and feedback sessions.
6. Mentors are surveyed and collection is maintained.
7. Mentors are then disbursed to schools with priority to percentage of most newly hired teachers.
8. Mentors and teachers create learning-goals together and there are required feedback checkpoints where mentors sit in on teacher classes and evaluate outcomes together.
9. County A requires all mentors to create a teacher report card.
10. County A decides to keep strict separation between feedback and formal evaluation, and thus the mentor will never be allowed to advise a school principal on a new teacher's employment status; this allows for mentees to be completely honest with mentors without the threat of being fired for poor performance.
11. All new teachers will be required to take an entrance and exit survey, and they will be able to apply for second-year mentorship if they feel the need. They will also evaluate their mentors and return it to County A's Induction Center

All of the points on the bulleted list are intended to be a sample, which can be used as a tool by the districts. However, they will be free to create the system that best suits their needs, as the best induction systems are created organically by the individual school system. MSDE will have the role of overseeing the induction programs that each LEA creates, evaluating their criteria for selection, and allocating funds accordingly. MSDE will not have the role of evaluating, training, or hiring actual mentors.

Benefits of Mandated Induction Programs

Induction Programs Reduce Attrition and Save Money

Implementing an induction program requires paying additional employees (the mentors) and paying for costs associated with setting up and operating the program. Induction programs elsewhere have been financially rewarding. For example, assuming the cost of replacing a teacher is 50% of a new teacher's salary, California saved over \$800 per teacher annually through mentoring, yielding \$3,763 in savings per teacher after five years (Villar & Strong 48). Mentoring programs in Georgia and Ohio witnessed dramatic decreases in attrition, with 100% of teachers with challenging urban assignments in Savannah, GA, remaining for the four studied years ("Creating a Teacher Mentoring Program"). Conservative estimates of losses associated with teacher attrition indicate that a mentor's salary is paid for when a mentor manages to retain four teachers who would have otherwise left ("System Teacher Mentoring" 5).

Induction Programs Improve Students' Education

Studies of "teacher effects" demonstrate a strong relationship between teaching and student achievement gains and show that teaching skills increase over time (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer 8). Mentoring may help develop this improvement more rapidly than experience alone and help to boost achievement; in the January 1999 Teacher Quality study, the National Center for Education Statistics reported that 7 in 10 teachers who received mentoring at least once a week believed that their instructional skills had improved significantly as a result ("Creating a Teacher Mentoring Program"). Villar and Strong reported that students of new teachers who experienced a strong, mentoring-based induction "achieve in patterns that mirror the achievement rates of students assigned to more experienced mid-career teachers" (31).

Moreover, reducing teacher attrition ensures a more stable faculty at a given school over time, encouraging sustained commitment to school improvement (Ganser).

Mentoring is Supported by Maryland Educators and Citizens

The Maryland Teacher Shortage Task Force's 2008 report, submitted by the Maryland State Teacher's Association, provides a multi-faceted set of options for dealing with the teacher shortage. One of their most substantial findings was the need for teacher mentoring in response to Maryland's high teacher attrition rates. The Task Force's report is unequivocal. MSDE and institutions of higher education "should create guidelines for an induction program for teachers," as well as administrators, "that includes highly qualified, trained mentors" (13). Mentoring should be a requirement for the first two years of teaching and for the first three years in schools in any phase of school improvement (13). In their brief of recommendations, the Task Force stresses, "if there is a program that will slow down attrition and attract teachers to the profession, we believe that strong mentoring programs will be high on the list" (Helfman 6).

Conclusion

There is no substitute for a skilled and knowledgeable veteran teacher who will guide a new teacher, and thus mentor teachers should be carefully selected based on their outstanding instructional practice, repertoire with peers and administrators, respect for varying opinions, and excellent interpersonal skills (Hanson & Moir 453).

In order to create a successful induction program, new teacher programs must “recognize the period of induction (two to three years) as an important and essential phase of teacher learning” (Hanson & Moir 453). New teachers should not be rushed into classrooms alone, without any support from their communities of practice. Also, induction programs need full-time administrators who have the necessary resources and time to dedicate to the new teachers. Mentors who are a part of the community of practice are more aware of the needs of the learning community as a whole and the best ways in which the new teachers can serve their students.

By enabling new teachers to become adept, confident classroom leaders, the student learning experience is enriched and declared paramount. Although unquantifiable, student learning and developmental outcomes are maximized, and the value of the program is expressed in student competence and achievement.

Appendix: Current Law

In 2002, the Maryland state legislature passed the Bridge to Excellence Act, which revamped the entirety of state funding for Maryland public schools and thus affected all programs in Maryland public schools. All programs using state funds, including teacher mentoring programs, were consolidated under this act. Prior to the enactment of Bridge to Excellence, there was money line itemed for mentoring programs, but now the money is included as part of the general funds for districts, which they use at their own discretion.

Nonetheless, although Bridge to Excellence eliminated the line item that allocated money to teacher mentoring programs, the act still tries to promote mentoring programs in the districts. In section 5-206a, the Bridge to Excellence Act states, “It is the intent of this section to provide competitive grants to encourage county boards to expand and develop mentoring programs.” While the legislature offers \$5 million to districts as an incentive to create or increase teacher mentoring programs through the Bridge to Excellence Act, the districts are not required to have a teacher mentoring program. As a result, there is a great variety in the existence and degree of teacher mentoring throughout the 24 school districts in Maryland.

The Bridge to Excellence Act does require the state superintendent to give preferences to certain districts when he or she is determining how to allocate the \$5 million funding for teacher mentoring programs. In section 5-206c, the Bridge to Excellence Act dictates that “The State Superintendent shall give priority to plans targeting funds to schools in which 40% of the students receive free or reduced lunches... 50% or more of the teachers have 5 years of less of teaching experience or student achievement of on local, State and national assessments are at below a satisfactory level.” In short, the state superintendent administering funds is required to

give preference to districts which are socio-economically disadvantaged, suffer from low student achievement or where over half the teachers in the district are new to the profession. In doing so, the Bridge to Excellence Act tries to focus the funds for teacher mentoring programs to the districts that need it the most.

While the Bridge to Excellence Act is the legislation that created funding for teacher mentoring in Maryland, the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) provides the specific guidelines for teacher mentoring programs and requirements for mentors. Section 13A.07.01.03 of Maryland's Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) explains the qualifications for mentors, which include holding "an advanced professional certificate," demonstrating "a knowledge base of/training in adult learning theory and peer coaching techniques" and possessing "a positive reference from a current or recent building principal or supervisor." If a district should choose to develop a teacher mentoring program, COMAR dictates that mentors must be a respected member of the teaching community and possess the knowledge as well as the skills to advise a beginning teacher. In addition, section 13A.07.01.05 of COMAR restricts mentors to 15 mentees and also bars a mentor from performing "school-level administrative duties" or participating in "the formal evaluation of a mentee." This section of COMAR ensures that the mentor keeps his or her focus and priority on the mentee rather than the school administration.

Lastly, section 13A.07.01.04 of COMAR addresses the requirement for mentoring programs, if a district should choose to have one. COMAR dictates that mentors receive initial training on the "essential characteristics on mentoring adults and the duties and responsibilities of a mentor." Mentoring programs also require "ongoing feedback" and "regular meetings" between the mentor and the mentee as well as "models of effective classroom practice" and "identification and coordination of appropriate resources." Essentially, COMAR provides

districts with flexible guidelines to govern their mentoring programs. This framework allows districts to decide their own specific procedure, but ensures that state funding for mentoring programs is used properly and appropriately. COMAR ensures that mentors are adequately trained and regularly advising mentees on resources and effective instruction.

The Bridge to Excellence Act and relevant sections in COMAR serve as the only mandates governing teacher mentoring in Maryland public schools. While there are regulations and guidelines if a district should choose to have a mentoring program, it is not required by the state. Current law only “encourages” districts to develop a mentoring program.

Works Cited

Anozie, Lynda, Coordinator of the BCPSS Blum Mentoring Program. Personal interview. June 2008.

Anozie, Lynda. "Systemic Teacher Mentoring (Blum)." Baltimore. 2007.

Barnes, Gary, Edward Crowe and Benjamin Schaefer. "The Cost of Teacher Turnover in Five School Districts: A Pilot Study." National Commission on Teacher and America's Future, 2007. Accessed July 7, 2008 from <http://www.nctaf.org/resources/demonstration_projects/turnover/documents/CTFullReportfinal.pdf>.

"Benefits of Small Class Size." American Federation of Teachers. Issue Brief, November 2003. Accessed July 7 from <<http://www.aft.org/topics/classsize/downloads/ClassSizeBrief.pdf>>.

Bowman, C T. "Teacher/Principal Quality Team." 2008. Baltimore City Public School System. Accessed 22 June 2008 from <http://www.baltimorecityschools.org/Staff/Professional_Development.asp>.

St. Mary's College of Maryland "Costs and Aid." 2008.. Accessed July 7 2008 from <<http://admissions.smcm.edu/pages/costs.htm>>.

"Creating a Teacher Mentoring Program". National Foundation for the Improvement of Teaching. 1999. Accessed July 7 2008 from <<http://www.nfie.org/publications/mentoring.htm>>.

DeRose, Barbara. Personal Interview. 24 June 2008.

Ganser, Tom. "Building the Capacity of School Districts to Design, Implement, and Evaluate Effective New Teacher Mentor Programs: Action Points for Colleges and Universities." Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning 10.1 (2002): 47-55.

Goddard, R.D., LoGerfo, L., & How, W.K. "High School Accountability: The Role of Perceived Collective Efficacy". Educational Policy 18.3 (2004): 403-425.

Gschwend, Laura & Moir, Ellen. "Growing Together." National Staff Development

- Council 28.4 (2007): 20-24.
- Hanson, Susan & Moir, Ellen. "Beyond Mentoring: Influencing the Professional Practice and Careers of Experience Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 89.6 (2008): 453-458.
- Helfman, David E. "Maryland Teacher Shortage Task Force Recommendations".
Maryland State Teachers Association. 2008. 1-7.
- Iowa State Legislature. "Student Achievement And Teacher Quality Program."
Accessed 21 June 2008 from
<<http://nxtsearch.legis.state.ia.us/NXT/gateway.dll/IAC?f=templates&fn=default.htm>>.
- Iowa State Legislature. HF 2679. Accessed 28 July 2008 from
<<http://coolice.legis.state.ia.us/CoolICE/default.asp?Category=billinfo&Service=Billbook&frame=1&GA=82&hbill=HF2679>>.
- Iowa Legislative Services Agency. "Education is Iowa's Future: Annual Update on Measures of Success, Key Strategic Plan Initiatives, and State Board Priorities."
2007. <<http://www.legis.state.ia.us/lsadocs/IssReview/2008/IRSLS003.PDF>>.
- Maryland State Teachers Association. 2008. 1-7. Accessed 21 June 2008 from
<<http://www.marylandpublicschools.org>>.
- Maryland Higher Education Agency. "Hope Scholarship Credit." Publication 970 (2006),
Tax Benefits for Education. Accessed 10 July 2008 from
<<http://debtfree.elearners.com>>.
- Maryland State Department of Education. "The Fact Book 2006-2007: a Statistical Handbook". Accessed 21 June 2008 from
<<http://www.marylandpublicschools.org>>.
- Maryland Teacher Shortage Task Force Report. 2008. 1-19. Accessed 25 June 2008 from
<<http://www.marylandpublicschools.org>>.
- Maryland State Department of Education. "Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2006-2008". 38-92. Accessed 22 June 2008 from
<<http://marylandpublicschools.org>>.
- Maryland Higher Education Commission. "Hope Scholarship Programs." Student

- Financial Assistance. 2008. 10 July 2008.
<http://www.mhec.state.md.us/FinancialAid/ProgramDescriptions/prog_hope.asp>.
- Maryland Higher Education Commission – Office of Student Financial Assistance. Hope Scholarship Program: Maryland Teacher Scholarship Conditions of Award Renewal Academic Year 2007-2008. Annapolis: Maryland Higher Education Commission, 2007.
- McConney, Andrew, Robert Ayers, Joe B. Hansen, and Laurel Cuthbertson. "Quest for Quality: Recruitment, Retention, Professional Development, and Performance Evaluation of Teachers and Principals in Baltimore City's Public Schools." Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk 8 (2003): 87-116.
- New York State Education Department. "NYS Mentor Teacher Internship Program." <<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/resteachers/mentoring.htm>>.
- Pas, Emily. "The Effect of Class Size Reduction on Teacher Attrition and Recruitment: Evidence from Class Size Reduction Policies in New York State." Essays on Teacher Labor Markets and Educational Disparities. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Economics, Syracuse University. June 2007.
- Preston, Mary B. Personal interview. June 2008.
- Rochkind, Johnathan, Amber Ott, John Immerwahr, John Doble, and Jean Johnson. "Working Without a Net: How New Teachers From Three Prominent Alternate Route Programs Describe Their First Year on the Job. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality". 2007. Accessed 23 June 2008 from <<http://hub.mspnet.org/index.cfm/15795>>.
- Rosenholtz, S.J. Effective Schools: Interpreting the evidence. American Journal of Education, 93.3 (1985): 352-388.
- "Salary Schedule." Teacher Benefits. Baltimore City Public School System. Accessed July 5 2008 from <http://www.baltimorecityschools.org/Careers/Benefits/Salary_Schedule.asp>.
- "Salary Survey Report for Degree: Mathematics." PayScale. 3 July 2008. Accessed July 9 2008 from <<http://www.payscale.com/research/US/Degree=Mathematics/Salary>>.

"State Financial Aid Programs." Maryland Higher Education Commission. Accessed July 7 2008 from <<http://www.mhec.state.md.us/FinancialAid/descriptions.asp>>.

Villar, Anthony and Michael Strong. "Is Mentoring Worth the Money? A Benefit-Cost Analysis and Five-year Rate of Return of a Comprehensive Mentoring Program for Beginning Teachers." Educational Research Service: Journal of Research and Information. 25.3 (Summer 2007). Accessed July 7, 2008 from <http://homepage.mac.com/dbyrum/TIRHandbook/TIRInterestingInfo/Is_Mentoring_worth_the_Money.pdf>.

Wong, Harry K. "Induction Programs That keep New Teachers Teaching and Improving." NASSP Bulletin. 88.638 (March 2004).