

February 1995

Educational policy analysis archives

Arizona State University

University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/usf_EPAA

Recommended Citation

Arizona State University and University of South Florida, "Educational policy analysis archives" (1995).
Education Policy Analysis Archives (EPAA). 281.
https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/usf_EPAA/281

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Faculty Collections at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Policy Analysis Archives (EPAA) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Education Policy Analysis Archives

Volume 3 Number 3

February 15, 1995

ISSN 1068-2341

A peer-reviewed scholarly electronic journal.

Editor: Gene V Glass, Glass@ASU.EDU. College of Education,
Arizona State University, Tempe AZ 85287-2411

Copyright 1995, the EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS
ARCHIVES. Permission is hereby granted to copy any article
provided that EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS ARCHIVES is
credited and copies are not sold.

Beginning Teachers Programs: Analysis of State Actions During the Reform Era

Carol B. Furtwengler
Wichita State University

cfurtwen@wsuhub.uc.twsu.edu

Abstract: This article reports the findings from the conduct of a 50- state survey to determine the status of state requirements and state components of beginning teacher programs instituted from 1983 to 1992. The article discusses the implementation of beginning teacher programs during the 1980s reform movement and describes the methodology used for the study. An analysis of seven state policy issues derived from an interpretation of the information about beginning teacher programs is provided, and four major themes identified in beginning teacher programs are presented. Appendices include detailed state-by-state information about beginning teacher programs and an annotated reference list of state materials and publications related to these programs.

One facet of the 1980s reform era was the infusion of beginning teacher programs developed by local school districts, colleges of education, and state agencies (Ashburn, 1987; Association of Teacher Educators, 1989; Huling-Austin, 1989; Theis-Sprinthal, 1986). Beginning teacher programs were designed to have mentor teachers assist and support novice teachers in their professional development (Bowers & Eberhart, 1988; Gehrke & Kay, 1984; Henry, 1989; Littleton, Tally-Foos, & Wolaver, 1992). Key goals of these programs were to retain new teachers in the profession and help those teachers advance through Berliner's (1986) identified stages of competent, proficient, or expert. Beginning teacher programs took on various ownerships at the local and state level (school districts, regional service centers, state departments of education, institutions of higher education), but the major policy initiative for their emergence occurred at the state level.

Early state efforts for personnel reform began with pay-for- performance systems and career ladder programs intended to improve and reward teacher personnel. It became apparent

during the reform movement, however, that beginning teacher programs were needed to develop and retain "master teachers." By the late 1980s, the second wave of reform (Hawley, 1988) had shifted the focus from accountability for experienced teachers to the provision of support and professional growth for beginning teachers. The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (Mastain, 1991) collected information on support systems for beginning teachers in 1984. At that time, eight states reported the operation of such programs. By 1991, 31 states reported that they had launched beginning teacher programs. The Center for Policy Research in Education (1989) reported that the impetus for new educational policies and programs during the reform movement came from state leadership rather than local or national government. This Rstate houseS leadership prompted the enactment of legislation and regulations for state-level beginning teacher programs.

This article results from a study that examined state-level actions for beginning teacher programs during the 1980s. It answers the question of whether "top down" state policy actions created the infusion of beginning teacher programs at the local school level and whether these programs were sustained throughout the reform period. The article presents an analysis of state actions for beginning teacher programs from 1983 to 1992 that describes the involvement of states in these programs and discusses how this involvement compares to other state policy initiatives related to school personnel. The analysis identified other key issues of state-level beginning teacher programs: the involvement of higher education personnel; the unsolved dilemma of formative vs. summative evaluation; the collaborative, non- legislative approach of states in the Northeast; the elimination of model programs during the latter part of the reform period; and the uncertainty of state resources to support mandated beginning teacher programs.

A thematic analysis of major components of beginning teacher programs identifies that: (a) support for the beginning teacher was provided by mentors and support teams, (b) training programs for staff development were a necessary component of beginning teacher programs, and (c) beginning teacher programs served two purposes: formative and summative evaluation. Appendixes contain detailed information obtained from the 50 state agencies about beginning teacher programs and will be referenced where relevant to the text.

Methodology

Information obtained through interviews with state agency personnel and reviews of state documents provided the base material for a state-by-state summary and analysis of beginning teacher programs. The data collection consisted of a series of predetermined steps. Each Chief State School Officer (CSSO) received a letter explaining the research project. Follow-up telephone calls were made to each CSSO to obtain names of appropriate staff members for telephone interviews. A structured interview protocol was developed and pilot tested with personnel in two state agencies. Structured telephone interviews were conducted with the designated state agency personnel, and documents were requested that pertained to the state's beginning teacher program. Information from the structured interviews and document review was entered by state into a data base. The data base information was compared and verified with survey results reported by Mastain (1991) and the Southern Regional Education Board (1991; 1992; 1993). The information for each state was analyzed and comparisons among states were made to draw conclusions about state-level actions for beginning teacher programs.

State Policy Issues: Beginning Teacher Programs

The analysis of data pertaining to state statutes, regulations, and programs for beginning teachers revealed intense state activity in this area during the educational reform movement. Several states instituted such programs at the beginning of the reform movement, but the

widespread creation of programs occurred during the second wave of reform, or the late 1980s. Detailed information about each state's program is found in Appendices A and B. Discussion in this section focuses on distinct policy issues derived from an analysis of beginning teacher programs.

Thirty-Four States Enacted Policy Initiatives for Beginning Teacher Programs

Prior to 1984, only eight states had initiated policy for beginning teacher programs. Information obtained from the states indicated that 26 other states initiated such programs during the years 1984 through 1992. Eighteen of the 34 states mandated statewide programs (Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia). Tennessee, however, did not receive funding to implement its program; Georgia, South Dakota, and Virginia implemented and later rescinded their statewide mandated programs.

Sixteen states that did not mandate statewide programs either implemented pilot programs or provided competitive grant money to local school districts for beginning teacher programs (Alabama, California, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin). Kansas, Missouri, and Wisconsin discontinued fiscal support for their pilot programs. Meanwhile, Virginia and Georgia replaced their rescinded statewide programs with competitive grant money for local pilot programs.

The general success of state-level policy for beginning teacher programs is interesting when compared to other state policy actions regarding school personnel that failed during the reform movement. For example, some key issues such as the testing of inservice teachers and performance pay programs (career ladders) became highly contested issues. Six states enacted performance pay programs and then revoked them prior to implementation. Another 14 states enacted, implemented, and later discontinued performance pay programs. Only nine state programs for performance pay remained in operation in 1992 and, of these nine, only five were viable programs (Furtwengler, 1994).

Beginning teacher programs and testing of beginning teachers, however, proved to be successful policy initiatives. Data from this study revealed that only five beginning teacher programs were rescinded and not replaced, while beginning teacher programs became successful policy in 29 states. New state policy for testing of beginning teachers--either prior to their entry into teacher training programs or for initial certification--also was a successful initiative. Eissenberg and Rudner (1988) reported that 10 states tested teacher candidates prior to 1980 and the number increased to 46 states by 1988.

The success or failure of policy initiatives can often be traced to contextual variables in each state. States involved in this study whose beginning teacher initiative failed reported causes related to state politics and lack of state appropriations. The National Education Association (NEA) strongly opposed the testing of inservice teachers and performance pay programs, but the NEA did not oppose beginning teacher programs. Another variable to consider in the success or failure of policy initiatives related to school personnel is the opposition or support of national teachers unions. What part, if any, did national influences such as teachers unions play in the success or failure of state policy initiatives?

Involvement of Higher Education Faculty

Seven states reported that state departments of education and local school districts involved higher education personnel in their beginning teacher programs (Alabama, Kentucky,

Idaho, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas). In Kentucky, teacher educators serve on a three-person team and are responsible for observing the beginning teacher three times and attending four team meetings. The department of education contracts with the universities to pay partial reimbursement of travel expenses and staff time. In New Jersey, a college faculty member serves as part of a four-member Professional Support Team Advisory Committee. The faculty member is responsible for visiting the provisional teacher, giving assistance in making connections between theory and practice, and providing inservice education. The state provides monies for personnel assigned to the support teams.

State programs that result in higher education's involvement in beginning teacher programs foster collaboration to improve the performance of beginning teachers and the institutions that prepare them. By working with beginning teachers, teacher education faculty assist the novices and identify areas where preservice training programs can be modified or strengthened. These collaborative policy initiatives address the improvement of both the preservice and inservice teaching.

Formative vs. Summative Purposes for Evaluation

All state-level beginning teacher programs reported a formative evaluation component to assist the novice with becoming a better teacher. Six states specified that their beginning teacher program was used only for formative purposes, not for summative evaluation (Alabama, California, Idaho, Ohio, Oregon, and Texas). Conversely, 13 states reported in 1992 that they required summative evaluations of beginning teachers and used the evaluation results for continuing employment and certification (Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and West Virginia). Three other states--Louisiana, Massachusetts, and New York--reported future plans summative certification programs for beginning teacher .

The issue of formative vs. summative evaluation has not been resolved in the evaluation of experienced personnel, and it appears to be a continuing quandary for beginning teacher programs. The intent of beginning teacher programs--to assist younger persons entering the profession--is entangled with the accountability issue of competent performance. The dilemma of providing support for a beginning teacher and/or judging the teacher's performance in a "high stakes" arena appears in state-level programs. Many states combined the formative and summative purposes for participants in beginning teacher programs, but removed the mentor from the role of a summative evaluator. Only a few states assigned the mentor a summative role in determining the future employment and/or certification of beginning teachers. What, then, is the purpose of beginning teacher programs--to improve performance and provide professional growth opportunities- -or to determine certification and continuing employment? A major question for policy makers is whether beginning teacher programs can serve two masters.

Even more interesting is the involvement of local school districts in teacher certification. In more than one-fourth of the states, certification decisions concerning beginning teachers are delegated to or shared with local school districts. This decentralization represents a major policy shift in traditional state responsibility for the certification of school personnel and moves important decision-making to the local authority.

Collaboration in the Northeastern States

In most areas of the country, individual states developed their own beginning teacher programs and did not work in concert with other states. An exception to this generalization is a consortium of Northeastern States that worked jointly with the Northeastern Regional Laboratory to develop a training program for mentor teachers. Northeastern states, with the exception of

Connecticut, were not highly involved in legislation that required the evaluation of school personnel (Furtwengler, 1993). The Northeast's consortium efforts suggest that the state's role is to provide technical assistance for local beginning teacher programs rather than to enact legislation that mandates and requires compliance monitoring of these programs. This approach is in sharp contrast to the 18 states that did mandate programs and reflects the Northeast's preference for less state involvement in legislation for local school districts concerning educational personnel.

Elimination of Model Programs

Two states--Georgia and Virginia--implemented extensive beginning teacher programs that included state-developed summative evaluation systems. Considerable research, development, funding, and training undertaken by these states produced nationally visible programs. Implementation of both of these programs was halted because of limited fiscal resources and political pressures from newly elected state leaders. New state political leaders did not support programs originated by previous administrations. In addition, Kansas, South Dakota, and Wisconsin did not receive funding after the conduct of pilot programs. A major policy issue is how to develop and sustain programs in times of tight fiscal resources and turbulent political turnover.

State Funding for Beginning Teacher Programs: A Move Toward Unfunded Requirements?

State funding of beginning teacher programs revealed an interesting dichotomy. Funding increased in some states (California, Minnesota, New York); more often, however, funding continued to be problematic in other states. Proposed programs in several states, some of which were pilot-tested, did not receive funding for statewide implementation (Alabama, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, North Dakota, Tennessee, Texas). Five states severely reduced or eliminated their program appropriations (Connecticut, \$8 million to \$3 million; Washington, \$3.7 million to \$2.3 million; Georgia and Virginia terminated their programs).

The states' funding of public education--and especially innovative for its improvement--is an unresolved policy issue that is reflected in the implementation of beginning teacher programs. Over two-thirds of the states enacted policies for beginning teacher programs and exerted energy and resources to create and introduce these programs (see Appendix C). Funds for these state initiatives, however, were not always appropriated or were rescinded during fiscal shortfalls. This lack of funding--or discontinuance of program funding--created a climate of fiscal uncertainty at the local school level. With state funding not forthcoming, local school districts either absorbed the fiscal cost of program continuation or eliminated a program whose development and implementation required considerable local investment.

Moreover, this problem in state-local financial policy could be worsened with the current political climate favoring state responsibility for major educational programs. If the federal government sends block grant or unallocated funds to states, will states continue to enact policy, implement programs, and then, in times of fiscal shortfalls, withdraw financial support? Unfunded state-mandated programs that require local school system compliance can lead to severe fiscal problems at the local level.

Duration of Beginning Teacher Programs and Teacher Certification

The length of time for a beginning teacher program varied among the states. The majority

of states reported one-year programs. Programs that included certification decisions were usually two-year programs or required an optional second year of participation (Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Maine, North Carolina, Oklahoma, West Virginia). New Mexico was the only state that reported a three-year program. Beginning teacher programs that are used for "high stakes" evaluation such as continuing state certification required at least two years of participation, while programs that are used for formative evaluation (growth and improvement) required one year of participation.

The change from certifying teachers upon graduation from college to waiting to grant certification until they complete one or two years of on-the-job employment indicates a new policy direction. It removes initial teacher certification from the direct responsibility of state agencies that automatically granted certification upon verifying that applicants had completed teacher training programs. Instead, it places the certification decision on the assessment of a teacher's performance in a local school district.

Further research is needed, however, to determine whether this policy change in beginning teacher certification is to be judged successful. How many beginning teachers are required to spend an additional year in a beginning teacher program or are refused certification at the local level? How successful are local school districts, state agencies, and higher education personnel in providing developmental programs to increase skills needed by novice teachers? Beginning teacher programs that incorporate certification decisions are a national policy trend, and substantive program evaluation is necessary to determine the success or failure of this legislated effort. Recurring Themes in State-level Beginning Teacher Programs

Analysis of the state-level beginning programs identified four major recurring themes. These themes in beginning teacher programs were the use of support teams and mentor teachers, the development of training programs for participants, and the determination of summative evaluation decisions.

Support Teams for Beginning Teachers

State-level programs provided support teams for the beginning teacher. These teams changed the usual dyadic nature of the mentoring process to a support "team" of coaches. The support team normally consisted of three members: a mentor, the principal, and a central office staff member or higher education faculty member. The principal served in a formative and summative evaluation role, while the other team members usually served in formative evaluation roles.

The Mentor Teacher

"Master" or experienced teachers served as models to provide assistance to beginning teachers. The mentors were usually appointed by a school committee or by the school principal and were not selected by or mutually matched with the beginning teacher.

In most instances, the mentor served as a peer coach and worked in a formative evaluation role. Mentors observed lessons taught by the beginning teacher and provided feedback and advice. Mentors were usually given released time for working with beginning teachers. In most instances, the mentor did not provide judgments about the beginning teacher's performance for re-employment or certification decisions.

Stipends for mentors of beginning teachers were a common characteristic found in state programs. The amount of the stipend varied from \$4,300 in California to \$1,000 in Kentucky to \$500 in Oklahoma. Mentors in California, however, performed other duties in addition to assisting beginning teachers.

Training for Participants in Beginning Teacher Programs

A highly visible component of state-level programs was the development of training programs for participants in beginning teacher programs. An annotated reference list of the materials developed for these training programs is found in Appendix C.

Mentors, administrators, and other support team members were provided training in techniques for assisting beginning teachers; Twelve states reported special programs designed to train mentors, assessors, or other members of the support team for the beginning teacher (Alabama, California, Kentucky, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia). In addition, the consortium of states working with the Northeast Regional Laboratory developed an extensive training program to prepare mentor teachers.

Summative Decision: Certification

A new theme identified in beginning teacher programs was the involvement of local school district personnel in determining certification of beginning teachers. Prior to the reform movements, local school districts only determined continuing employment within their school district and states exercised exclusive rights over statewide certification of personnel. Thirteen states that implemented beginning teacher programs involved local school systems in determining ongoing certification and made them active participants in this "high stakes" decision-making. The recommendation for certification was usually the responsibility of the school principal, but in some instances other members of the support team contributed to summative, certification decisions.

The four themes identified in beginning teacher programs have implications for state-level policy. One focus of the second wave of educational reform was the need to enhance professionalism in teaching and teacher training programs. Beginning teacher programs were one vehicle to achieve this goal. The use of teams and experienced personnel to provide support for beginning teachers changes the climate at the school building level from one of teacher isolation to one of increased professional collaboration. Teams of professionals work with novices to improve their teaching skills and to improve the school. Conversely, the training of exemplary personnel to become mentors and support team members provides a new opportunity for their professional development and collaboration.

The fourth theme, summative evaluation decisions for certification, is not congruent with the philosophy of mentoring nor with the under girding philosophy of beginning teacher programs. This theme is also not in concert with the goal of increased professionalism declared in the second wave of educational reform. Did the quest for accountability from the first wave of reform become embedded in beginning teacher programs? Did that mute the formative outcomes for new teachers intended by these programs?

Conclusions

This study provides a comprehensive status report on these state-level programs and an analysis of state policy actions. State policy makers, teacher educators, local school districts, and other interested parties concerned with beginning teacher programs should benefit from the study's findings. State initiatives to create beginning teacher programs occurred as a major improvement effort during the second RwaveS of the education reform movement.

Thirty-four states enacted regulations for beginning teacher programs that included mandated statewide initiatives, pilot programs, or competitive grant money. Higher education personnel participated in these programs in seven states and worked with state agencies and local

school districts in assisting novice teachers. Among the policy issues that emerged from this analysis was the function of evaluation. Beginning teacher programs did not resolve the dilemma of formative vs. summative evaluation. Six states required that the programs be exclusively formative in nature. In 13 other states, however, there was a strong movement toward "high stakes" decisions for continuing employment and certification.

Shifting responsibility for teacher certification from the state to local districts was a radical change in state-level policy. Beginning teacher programs that were tied to re-employment or certification were usually two years in length, rather than the common year-long program.

Four themes recurred in state-level beginning teacher programs. First, states often relied on a support team approach rather than on the sole use of a mentor teacher. Second, mentor teachers served as peer coaches and participated in formative evaluation. They were provided released time and stipends for assisting novice teachers. Third, training of participants in beginning teacher programs became a function of the state, and most states instituted extensive training programs and created their own training materials. Fourth, 13 states relinquished their certification rights and allowed local school districts to recommend beginning teachers for state certification.

Beginning teacher programs were more successful than other reform initiatives related to school personnel--particularly testing of inservice teachers and pay-for-performance programs--but they wrestled with the lack of state fiscal resources. Two extensive beginning teacher programs were eliminated because of fiscal reasons and changes in the political climate within their states. Three states increased funding for their programs, but more often, lack of state funding deterred the successful implementation of many pilot programs and state-mandated programs.

The active involvement of states in beginning teacher programs raises several policy issues. Should states be involved in program implementation and staff development of local school personnel, or should their role be one of policy and technical assistance? Should states relinquish the responsibility for certification of personnel, and, if so, what benefits accrue at the local school level? Is future state funding available that will lead to progress in beginning teacher programs, or will beginning teacher programs ultimately become another unfunded state mandate?

References

- Ashburn, E. (1987). Current developments in teacher induction programs. *Action in Teacher Education*, 8(4), 4-44.
- Association of Teacher Educators. (1989). *Assisting the beginning teacher*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Berliner, D. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher*, 15, 5-13.
- Bowers, G. R., & Eberhart, N. A. (1988). Mentors and the entry-year program. *Theory Into Practice*, 27, 226-236.
- Center for Policy Research in Education. (1989). *State education reform in the 1980s*. CPRE Policy Briefs, 3, 1-6.
- Eissenberg, T. E., & Rudner, L. M. (1988). State testing of teachers: A summary. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 21-22.
- Furtwengler, C. B. (1994). *The rise and demise of performance pay: A 50-state summary of the reform initiative*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research

Association, New Orleans, LA.

Gehrke, N. J., & Kay, R. S. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers through mentor-protg relationships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(3), 233-242.

Hawley, W. D. (1988). Missing pieces of the educational reform agenda: Or, why the first and second waves may miss the boat. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 24, 416-437.

Henry, M. A. (1988). Multiple support: A successful model for inducting first-year teachers. *Teacher Educator*, 24(2), 7-12.

Huling-Austin, L. (1989). Beginning teacher assistance programs: An overview. In *Assisting the beginning teacher* (pp. 5-13). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Littleton, M., Tally-Foos, K., & Wolaver, R. (1992). Mentoring: A support system for new teachers. *Clearing House*, 65(3), 172- 174.

Mastain, R. K. (Ed.). (1991). *The NASDTEC manual: Manual on certification and preparation of educational personnel in the United States*. Seattle, WA: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

Sclan, E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). *Beginning teacher performance evaluation: An overview of state policies*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1991) *Career ladder clearinghouse*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1992) *Career ladder clearinghouse*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1993) *Incentive programs: A focus on program evaluation*. Career ladder clearinghouse. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Theis-Sprinthall, L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentor training: A working model. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(6), 13-20.

Appendix A

A State-by-State Summary of Beginning Teacher Programs

Alabama

Alabama designed and pilot tested its Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP) in 1989-90 and made the program available to all school districts. At this time, BTAP is voluntary for local districts but mandatory for beginning teachers in pilot projects. Funding has not been provided for statewide implementation.

The BTAP is a structured program designed to assist in the induction and development of beginning teachers. A mentor is assigned to a beginning teacher to observe, comment, and critique the beginning teacher's performance. The mentor and beginning teacher work in a formative mode and all information between the two remains confidential. A suggested time sequence is provided for the BTAP, and the role of the mentor is described. Training activities are provided for the mentor and include suggested activities for the mentor to use with the

beginning teacher. The local school district provides time, training, and release time for the mentors; identifies the beginning teachers; monitors the program; and assists with the program development and evaluation. Regional Inservice Centers, utilizing higher education personnel, serve as mentor training sites.

California

The California New Teacher Project (CNTP) was initiated in 1988 by the legislature and governor and was co-administered by the California Commission of Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the California Department of Education. Thirty-seven programs were piloted, each varying in the type of support, services offered, and methods used. The state funded or supplemented these pilots. In March, 1992, after evaluating the pilot programs, the CTC made recommendations to the legislature regarding a statewide policy. They recommended that a state teaching framework be developed that clearly identifies the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected of beginning teachers. They also recommended more coordinated evaluation efforts, increased assessor training, increased formative feedback to the beginning teacher on teaching skills, and assistance in improvement of these skills.

In addition to the CNTP, the Hughes-Hart Education Reform Bill of 1983 includes the California Mentor Teacher Program. The intent of the program is to encourage teachers currently employed to remain in the profession and for these teachers to provide assistance and guidance to new teachers, career teachers, and teacher trainees. The mentors are not to become evaluators but are to provide formative assistance to teachers. Mentors are selected by teacher committees at the local level for a period not to exceed three years. Responsibility for the program is delegated to local school districts who select mentors and implement various programs. The legislature allocated a \$4,000 stipend per mentor and an additional \$2,000 per mentor to local districts for training, substitute pay, release time, and travel (23 days). Mentors duties range, however, beyond the assistance to beginning teachers. The Southern Regional Education Board (1992) has reported an increase in these amounts to \$4300 (average) for mentors and \$2,100 to local school districts for training. The program has received increased funding from an original cost of \$35 million to an estimated cost of \$65 million in 1992. SREB (1993) reports that 10,000 mentors are now serving in a variety of professional development positions and that an advisory committee has been appointed to review the program and make recommendations for its continued operation.

Connecticut

The Beginning Teacher Support and Training (BEST) Program was developed by the State Department of Education to enhance the quality of beginning teachers. Mentor teachers serve as the support system to beginning teachers. The assessment component includes interviews in an assessment center context to ascertain the teacher's pedagogical-content knowledge, administrator attestations, teacher portfolios, and classroom-performance assessment. The Connecticut Competency Instrument (CCI) is the performance assessment tool. Six trained assessors conduct independent classroom observations of the beginning teacher. The beginning teacher receives notice of strengths and areas that need improvement and is encouraged to share this information with the mentor and principal. A beginning teacher who is not recommended for certification may participate in the BEST program a second year, if recommended by the superintendent.

Responsibility for the CCI is assigned to the local district, district facilitators, principal, mentor, and the beginning teacher. The local district provides release time for the participants, and the state provides substitute reimbursement for a maximum of six days per school year.

Funding for the program has been reduced due to the state's economic conditions. In 1990- 91, \$8 million was provided for the program; in 1991-92 only \$3 million of the requested \$11 million was granted. Delaware

Delaware provides \$100,000 which local school districts can request to use toward beginning teacher programs. Local school systems design, implement, and provide training for a support system for beginning teachers.

Florida

The Florida Beginning Teacher Program was passed by the legislature in 1982. Funded by the state and revised in 1990, the program is now called the Professional Orientation Program (POP) for Beginning Teachers. The program requires that all beginning teachers participate in POP. Local districts develop their own POP which must meet certain legal requirements, be reviewed by the Department of Education, and be approved annually by the Commissioner of Education. A support staff is assigned to each beginning teacher. Members of the support staff are a principal, peer teacher, and another professional educator. They conduct clinical activities to assist the teacher in refining teaching competencies and provide induction into the profession. This staff observes the teacher at least five times: one diagnostic/screening observation, three formative observations, and one summative observation. Most districts use the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS), a formative and summative instrument.

Georgia

Georgia eliminated its beginning teacher certification program in 1990. SREB (1993) reports that \$750,000 has been allocated by the legislature in 1993 for a Teacher Induction/Mentor-Teacher Stipends Program. Mentors must obtain a certification endorsement through participation in ten quarter- hours of training. The role of the mentors is to provide support to teachers during their first three years of service or to teachers who are serving their first year in a new position.

Idaho

A voluntary beginning teacher program was begun in Idaho in 1989. The state provides \$1,000 per each first-year certificated employee, and all school districts have elected to participate in the program. The funds may be used for release time, supplementary pay, professional growth activities for beginning employees, or for contracting with higher education institutions to provide support to beginning teachers and administrators. School districts determine the criteria and processes for the one- year program.

Indiana

Beginning in 1988-89, all school districts were required to have a mentor teacher program for all beginning teachers. Mentor teachers in the program must have at least five years of experience, be recognized as an outstanding teacher, and be recommended by their school principal. The program includes a support system for the beginning teacher and training for the support team. Evaluation of the beginning teacher is done by the principal using the Beginning Teacher Assessment Inventory. Teachers who are unsuccessful in the first year may continue in the program for a second year. The program is summative and determines state certification. Those who are unsuccessful after two years may not teach in the schools in Indiana. The program

is funded annually at \$2 million; mentor teachers receive \$600 per year, and districts receive \$200 for mentor release time (SREB, 1993).

Kentucky

Legislation, effective January 1, 1985, requires that all beginning teachers and out-of-state teachers with less than two years of successful teaching experience pass written tests and complete a one-year internship program.

Beginning teachers are issued a provisional certificate for their internship year. The teacher internship committee consists of three members: the principal, resource teacher, and a teacher educator. All members are trained to use a separate supervision and assessment process for the beginning teacher. The Classroom Observation Instrument was developed by the State. The team observes the beginning teacher at least three times for one hour or one class period and meets a minimum of four times. The resource teacher, who serves as a mentor, is appointed by the Department of Education and spends a minimum of 70 hours working with the intern, which consists of 20 hours inside the classroom and 50 hours outside the classroom. The teacher educator is appointed by a regional university.

The Department of Education contracts with local school districts to pay resource teachers for extra meetings and work done outside the normal working hours. This amount does not exceed \$1,000. Substitutes are also provided for the resource teachers. The department also contracts with the universities for partial reimbursement of the travel expenses and staff time for the teacher educators. The program was funded at \$3.2 million during 1991.

Louisiana

SREB (1993) reports that Louisiana implemented a pilot mentor teacher program in 24 sites during 1992-93. In these sites, 24 mentors are providing assistance to beginning teachers and receive \$2,000 in additional pay and \$850 for staff development travel expenses. Mentors are selected by their local schools systems based upon seven qualifications defined by the state. In addition, Louisiana is developing and field testing an Intern Teacher Assessment Program.

Maine

A beginning teacher component was part of a new, mandatory certification program enacted on July 1, 1988. Beginning teachers receive a two-year provisional certificate and receive assistance from their local school district during this time. A support team originally was provided for the beginning teacher, but local school districts now have the option of assigning a single mentor. Local districts develop their own evaluation procedure. Beginning teachers must successfully complete the provisional term before receiving a professional certificate.

Minnesota

Minnesota does not have a mandated statewide program for beginning teachers. In 1990-91, \$500,000 was available for local pilot programs. Legislation has allocated \$700,000 for the 1992- 93 school year for local school districts to implement a teacher mentoring program or to expand an existing one. Funding exists for up to \$5,000 for five or more beginning teachers and up to \$10,000 for ten or more beginning teachers.

Mississippi

One of the outcomes of the Education Reform Act of 1982 was the development of assessment instruments for a variety of certified school personnel, including beginning teachers. Three instruments were developed to assess the beginning teacher: Teaching Plans and Materials, Position Skills, and Interpersonal Skills. These instruments are administered twice during the school year, once each semester. The instruments are completed by an external evaluator, building principal or designee, and a peer teacher. The external evaluator or peer teacher must be certified for the same grade level as the beginning teacher. The beginning teacher must prepare a portfolio of instructional plans that is given to the evaluators before the observations. The beginning teacher selects the lesson to be observed for at least one class period. The state provides training for the evaluators and each evaluator must be certified as a provisional teacher evaluator.

Legislation was passed in 1991 for a statewide Mentor Teacher Program. Developing and piloting this program is to be a joint effort of the State Department of Education and a selected university. Depending on funding, full implementation is scheduled for 1994.

Montana

Montana began a new teacher mentor program in the fall of 1992. A beginning teacher support program is being piloted in fifteen locations across the state (SREB, 1992).

New Hampshire

New Hampshire provides \$20,000 to local school districts for participation in beginning teacher programs. Mentor teachers must be excellent, experienced teachers and meet other criteria determined by the local school district. The state recommends that the mentor not be involved in summative evaluation; the decision is the option of the local school district. Approximately 10% of the state's teachers are involved in the program (Mastain, 1991). New Hampshire, along with other northeastern states, is working with the Northeastern Regional Laboratory on the development of an extensive mentor handbook.

New Jersey

New Jersey's beginning teacher program was an outgrowth of the Provisional Teacher Program, an alternative route for state certification. Effective September 1, 1992, all first-year teachers must participate in the beginning teacher program. Students who graduate from an approved preparation program, who are recommended by their dean, and who make a passing score on the NTE are considered provisional teachers with advanced standing. Students in the alternative route are considered provisional teachers (no advanced standing). State regulations require that a Professional Support Team be assigned to each provisionally certified teacher to provide support, supervision, and evaluation. This team includes the principal or designee, mentor teacher, college faculty member, and a curriculum supervisor.

The principal is the chairperson of the support team and serves as the liaison with the state department and evaluates the provisional teacher. The mentor teacher has a close working relationship with the provisional teacher, orients the teacher to district policies, visits the classroom, models effective teaching techniques, and gives feedback. The curriculum supervisor gives the provisional teacher perspective in current/new teaching techniques, access to resources, and assistance in developing an improvement plan. The college faculty member visits the provisional teacher, gives assistance with making connections between theory and practice, and provides inservice education. The State Department of Education provides orientation for the

support team. Evaluations, conducted at 10, 20, and 30 weeks, are done by at least two members of the team, excluding the mentor teacher. Stipends for mentors and support team members are \$450 to \$550. In addition, \$800 is provided for 200 hours of formal instruction to a provisional teacher with no advanced standing.

New Mexico

New Mexico grants beginning teachers a three-year certificate. School personnel who have a Level II or III license are provided local training for assisting beginning teachers. The training includes observation skills, conference skills, skills and strategies for working with adults, and strategies for addressing the six essential teaching competencies. Local personnel are to provide beginning teachers instructional support, emotional support, and information about the local district. During the three-year period, beginning teachers must demonstrate six essential teaching competencies before the local school system recommends a state Level II certificate.

New York

The Mentor Teacher Internship Program was one of three programs established by the legislature for the purpose of improving teaching. State funds are used for release time for mentors, mentor and intern training, coordination, and development of materials. Districts may be reimbursed at a rate of 10% for part-time mentors, 100% for full-time mentors, and up to 20% for interns. In 1986-87, 25 projects were funded with \$4 million. This increased each year and by 1990-91, 78 projects were funded with \$16.5 million.

A booklet with start-up suggestions and regional and state meetings is provided for communication among program participants. Mentors are recommended by a committee of certified employees, with final selection by the district superintendent. Based on a normal contract, interns are restricted to no more than 80% classroom instruction assignment. Part-time mentor teachers (no more than four interns) are restricted to no less than 60% classroom instruction assignment, and full-time mentor teachers (from five to 10 interns) are assigned 100% of contractual time. These restrictions allow the interns and mentor teachers time for assistance. Program evaluation results indicate that interns make greater progress toward induction and professional maturation than do other beginning teachers. Effective in 1993, all provisionally certified teachers must participate in an internship program as a requirement for a permanent teaching certificate.

North Carolina

A statewide mentor program for beginning teachers was implemented in 1985 as part of the North Carolina Initial Certification Program (ICP). A Continuing Certificate is issued at the end of the second year if teaching competencies are satisfactorily demonstrated.

Each local education agency is required to develop a two-year plan for beginning teachers and provide a mentor/support team for guidance, counseling, and assimilation into the profession. The members of the mentor team include a trained mentor and principal or designee. The mentor/support team conferences with the beginning teacher regarding expectations, observes the teacher three times during the first year, provides data on areas of strengths and areas that need improvement, assists in designing a Professional Development Plan, models teaching behavior, provides resources, assists with problem solving, and interprets individual teachers' needs to the principal. Three state training programs that support beginning teacher programs are available to the local school districts.

The North Carolina Professional Practices Commission conducted a study of the Initial Certificate Program and reported in May, 1991, that participants rated the program worthwhile. They recommended that (a) additional funds be made available for mentors, (b) more release time be provided, (c) more consistency among districts be sought, (d) paperwork be reduced, and (e) structure be better defined.

Ohio

The Ohio Entry-Year Program became effective July 1, 1987. The statute requires local districts to establish their own beginning teacher programs and assign a mentor to each beginning teacher for one year. Beginning teachers are given inservice regarding the program and information about their assigned schools. Mentors are provided an orientation, training for mentoring responsibilities, and time to consult and assist the beginning teachers. The local school district and the Ohio Department of Education separately evaluate the program every five years.

Oklahoma

Legislation enacted in 1981 mandates an entry-year assistance program for beginning teachers. An assistance committee, composed of a peer teacher, a local administrator, and an education professor, guide and assist the beginning teacher for the first year through a structured program. The peer teacher receives \$500, and higher education institutions receive reimbursement for faculty time. This committee makes recommendations regarding certification and designs a staff development program for the beginning teacher. A beginning teacher may be recommended for certification or for a second-year in the program. A recommendation for noncertification may occur at the conclusion of the second year. The principal evaluates the beginning teacher for renewal of the contract; the committee evaluates the teacher for certification recommendations.

The assistance committee meets with the beginning teacher during the first 20 teaching days to explain the program. The committee meets three times and each member of the committee independently observes the teacher's classroom and completes two observation instruments. The beginning teacher is given feedback from these observations. Then, the third round of observations is completed. The committee makes a recommendation concerning certification during its third meeting based on a majority vote of the members.

Oregon

The Beginning Teacher Support Program (BTSP) was enacted in 1987 and requires that assistance be provided to beginning teachers by experienced classroom teachers, designated as mentors. The program was piloted in 1987-1988 in 55 school districts. Biennial funding of \$3 million was provided for the 1991-93, a reduction from the previous biennial budget of \$3.9 million. The program is mandatory for teachers in the pilot sites.

The mentor teacher provides information, direct assistance, and collegial support to promote success for the beginning teacher. The Oregon Department of Education provides workshops for mentor teachers that focus upon the mentor's role, instructional assistance, strategies and skills in delivering information to the beginning teacher, and collegial support.

Pennsylvania

A Teacher Induction Program (TIP) for beginning teachers became effective June 1, 1987.

State program guidelines were revised in 1990 and require that each school establish an induction council to develop individual goals/objectives for its TIP and to structure the program to meet the school's needs. Local schools must select a mentor or mentor teams and define responsibilities of the mentor or teams and the district administration. A mentor or mentor team is comprised of certified personnel who are recognized by peers for excellence in teaching. Completion of the TIP is one criterion for an Instructional II Certificate.

Texas

A framework for a teacher induction program was developed in 1989. In 1990-91, three pilot programs were conducted by Southwest Texas State University, Abilene Independent School District, and Education Service Center VI - Huntsville. The program, however, has not received statewide funding. The state agency sought funds of \$2,000 per teacher for 1992-93. The program is designed to be formative in nature and to rely on interactions between a mentor and beginning teacher for its success. The local district appoints a policy committee comprised of one or more persons from the following positions: administrator, faculty member from higher education, experienced teacher, and if possible, a former beginning teacher who has completed the induction program. The local district is responsible for providing new teacher orientation and a minimum of 30 clock hours (five days) of release time for the beginning teacher and mentor.

A support team consisting of the mentor, an induction-year teacher, and another individual is part of the plan. Mentors receive a stipend of \$1,500 and are trained in communication and conferencing skills, observation techniques, models of instruction, and use of the Texas Teacher Appraisal System. They visit the classrooms of induction-year teachers at least two times each semester and conduct a follow-up conference. Induction teachers receive training in district policies and procedures, needs of the school and community, activities relating to the opening and closing of the school, student assessments and reports, instructional strategies, content knowledge and curriculum assistance, classroom management, communication and conferencing skills, self-evaluation techniques, and utilization of instruction media. Representatives of higher education institutions serve in several roles: (a) membership on policy committees, (b) research and evaluation, and (c) training.

Utah

Utah requires that local school systems operate a mandatory beginning teacher program. The program includes a teacher support team and the conduct of three evaluations each year by trained evaluators. The criteria and processes for evaluations are local decisions. The state provided \$70,000 during 1990-91 to fund training activities for beginning teachers and mentors (Mastain, 1991).

Washington

A Teacher Assistance Program (TAP) was begun in 1985-86 when 100 mentor positions received state funding to assist beginning teachers. State funds of \$1.5 million were provided for the next two years, and other educational personnel (counselors, nurses, school psychologists, reading resource specialists, social workers) became qualified to participate in the program.

In 1989-90, state funds provided \$950 to the mentor and \$250 to the beginning teacher, plus travel expenses to the mentor- teacher workshops and substitute teachers' cost for both mentor and beginning teacher. Nine hundred beginning teachers and 100 mentors from 109 school districts were accepted to participate in the program. State support increased to \$3.7

million for the biennium budget.

The program was evaluated in 1989-90 and the recommendations were to: (a) continue the program as voluntary, (b) provide more support for the teams, (c) continue the local district-sponsored training, and (d) consider assigning the educational service districts the responsibility for program administration. State funds for the program recently decreased from \$3.7 million to \$2.3 million, and mentor participation decreased from 1000 mentors in 1990 to 600 mentors in 1991.

West Virginia

The mandatory Beginning Educator Internship Program became effective on August 1, 1991, and is funded at 1.5 million dollars. A three-member professional support team is chaired by the principal and includes a person from the professional staff development council and a mentor who is an experienced classroom teacher. The mentor teacher must be from the same or a similar subject or grade level as the beginning teacher. Inservice professional development programs are provided for the beginning teacher and mentor. The mentor and teacher meet weekly, and the mentor observes the classroom at least one hour weekly during the first semester. During the second semester, observations and meetings are biweekly. The mentor receives release time and a stipend of at least \$600. The professional support team meets monthly. The principal makes the final evaluation and recommends the beginning teacher's status to the county school superintendent.

Appendix B

Beginning Teacher Programs: Proposed, Eliminated, or Locally Implemented

This appendix summarizes three types of beginning teacher programs that have been reported by various states. These include proposed programs, programs implemented but later eliminated, and local programs reported by states that have a major statewide impact.

Proposed Programs

Four states reported that they have proposed programs for beginning teachers. Maryland field tested a beginning teacher program in 1986-87. Since then, the Maryland State Board of Education has moved toward considering the inclusion of performance assessment criteria for initial certification for students in teacher education programs. There is, however, no beginning teacher program at this time.

Massachusetts plans to implement a beginning teacher program in 1994 that will be a two-year certification program (SREB, 1992). Missouri adopted state guidelines for a beginning teacher program but has no state requirements for local districts and has provided no state funding for the program since June, 1991. North Dakota completed a three-year study in 1992 that assessed the needs of beginning teachers in rural school districts. The state agency plans to ask the legislature to provide the Department of Public Instruction with more capacity in staff development and quality assurance in teacher education. Tennessee adopted a beginning teacher program in 1988 but has not received state funding for program implementation. Programs Implemented but Eliminated

Five states--Georgia, Kansas, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin--implemented but later eliminated their beginning teacher programs. Georgia's statewide beginning teacher program, operational from 1980-1990, determined certification. This program was discontinued

in 1991 due to lack of funding and the implementation of a new teacher evaluation system. Kansas piloted a beginning teacher program during 1987-88 and 1988-89, but the legislature did not approve funding for the Kansas Internship Program for 1989-90. The program was discontinued. South Dakota repealed its induction program for teachers in 1989 and no longer provides state funds for its operation. Virginia implemented a comprehensive Beginning Teacher Assistance program in 1985 that was rescinded in 1991. State agency personnel also reported political reasons for recession of these programs. During 1985- 1988, Wisconsin piloted eight beginning teacher programs but funding has not been provided for implementation since 1988.

Local Programs

Two states--Alaska and Hawaii--reported information on locally implemented beginning teacher programs. The Alaska Staff Development Network, in collaboration with the University of Alaska at Anchorage and the Anchorage School District, has developed the Alaska Mentor Teacher Program. This program provides a three-member team to assist the beginning teacher. Hawaii reported that the Honolulu School District has developed the Teacher Assist Program (TAP). TAP provides a three member team to assist the beginning teacher.

Appendix C

Annotated Bibliography

State Publications and Materials on Beginning Teacher Programs (Note: *These documents contain structured programs that include handbooks for mentors.)

*Alabama State Department of Education. (1990). Alabama's beginning teacher assistance program training manual. Montgomery, AL: State Department of Education. A guide and training tool for local school districts. Handouts, transparencies, and activities are included.

*Barrow, G. M. The new teacher, the mentor and the lesson cycle. Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District. Contains methods for the mentor to help the beginning teacher increase proficiency of the lesson cycle, a model of teaching.

Billings, J. A., Winter, D. E., & Andrews, T. E. (1991). The 1989-90 teacher assistance program (TAP). Olympia, WA: State Superintendent of Public Instruction. An annual report of the Teacher Assistance Program, including statistical reports and personal comments of the TAP participants.

Bureau of School Improvement. (1990). Mississippi teacher assessment instruments. Jackson, MS: Mississippi State Department of Education. Gives the specific indicators for each competency for three assessment instruments: Teaching Plans and Materials, Positions Skills, and Interpersonal Skills.

Bureau of School Improvement. (1987). Mississippi teacher assessment instruments. Jackson, MS: Mississippi State Department of Education. Contains the teaching competencies and assessment instruments for the beginning teacher.

*California Department of Education. (1991). New teacher success: You can make a difference. Sacramento, CA: State of California. Contains practical information on developing beginning teacher programs and descriptions of 37 pilot programs in California.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (1989). Feedback report for beginning teachers. Hartford, CT: Secretary of the State of Connecticut. Contains information on the contents of the Connecticut Competency Instrument and a draft for the Beginning Educator Support and Training Program.

Division of Teacher Education Services. (1990). North Carolina initial certification program. Raleigh, NC: State Department of Public Instruction. Includes guidelines, procedures, and forms for the initial certification program.

*Division of Teacher Education Services. (1986). North Carolina mentor/support team training program. Raleigh, NC: State Department of Public Instruction. Includes materials and literature for the mentor/support team.

Georgia Department of Education. (1989). Evaluation manual. Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education. Outlines the steps in the teacher evaluation process and includes the evaluation instruments.

Georgia Department of Education. (1980). Teacher performance assessment instruments. Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education. Provides the basis for the statewide assessment of beginning teachers that Georgia requires for teacher certification.

Gorton, S. P. (1990). Assisting the entry-year teacher: A leadership resource. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education. Contains a rationale for assisting the beginning teacher, identifies the skills and knowledge for mentoring, and provides a framework for a program; includes examples of programs in Ohio and examples of needs assessment instruments used with mentors and beginning teachers .

Honolulu District Office. (1991). Teacher assist program. Honolulu, HI: Department of Education, State of Hawaii. Provides an overview of the Teacher Assist Program and includes a profile of an effective teacher, teacher assessment forms, and tips for beginning teachers.

Kansas State Department of Education. (1989). Internship program. Topeka, KS: Kansas State Department of Education. Certification, Teacher Education, and Accreditation Section. Discusses the 1988-89 pilot of the Kansas Internship Program that the legislature did not fund subsequently. Four sets of materials provide detailed program information.

*Kentucky Department of Education. (1990). Kentucky teacher internship program (TIP). Frankfort, KY: Department of Education. Contains handbook for teacher interns and the teacher internship committees.

Lind, K., & T. (n.d.) Wisconsin's teaching incentives pilot program. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Provides an overview of the effectiveness of Wisconsin's incentives programs. The programs were designed to enhance the quality of teaching and attractiveness of the profession.

Maryland State Department of Education. (1987). A manual for classroom observers: Maryland teaching. Baltimore, MD: Maryland State Department of Education. Contains the Maryland Teacher Competencies and the Maryland Competency Observation Instrument.

Minnesota Board of Teaching. (1992). A report on teacher preparation and licensing. St. Paul, MN: State of Minnesota. Contains a proposal for restructuring the teacher preparation and licensing system.

New Jersey State Department of Education. (1991). Provisional teacher program implementation guidelines. Trenton, NJ: State Department of Education. Provides state guidelines for local districts to develop their own beginning teacher program.

New Jersey State Department of Education. (1991). The provisional teacher program sixth year report. Trenton, NJ: State Department of Education. Reports New Jersey's alternative route to certification.

New York State Education Department (1990). 1989-90 report on the New York state teacher and computer training centers, New York state mentor teacher-internship program, the fund for innovation. Albany, NY: State Education Department. Provides information on Mentor Teacher-Internship Program.

Northeast Regional Laboratory. (1992). Mentoring: A resource and training guide for educators, Draft Copy. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands. Contains a comprehensive manual on mentoring developed in conjunction with northeastern state departments of education.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. (n.d.) Guidelines for developing and implementing teacher induction programs. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education. Includes guidelines and state criteria for developing and implementing a local teacher induction program.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. (1987). Perspectives on teacher induction: A review of the literature and promising program models. Baltimore, MD: Maryland State Department of Education. Provides information on current teacher induction programs.

State Department of Education. (1992). Entry-year assistance program packet 1992. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education. Contains a detailed framework, timeline, and forms for the Entry-Year Assistance Program.

Virginia Department of Education. (1985). Assisting the beginning teacher. Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Education. Contains an in-depth discussion of the 14 competencies used in the Virginia Beginning Teacher Assistance Program.

*Virginia Department of Education. (1986). Beginning teacher assistance program. Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Education. Includes questions and answers about the assessment and assistance components of the Virginia Beginning Teacher Assistance Program.

Wildman, T. M. (n.d.) The colleague teacher's supplement to the beginning teacher's handbook. Blacksburg, VA: College of Education. Provides Virginia's experienced teachers with a framework for inducting beginning teachers into the profession.

*Wildman, T. M., & Borko, H. (1985). Beginning teacher's handbook . Blacksburg, VA: College of Education. Provides information to guide first- and second-year beginning teachers.

*Wildman, T. R., et al. (1989). Teachers learning from teachers: Mentor's guide for supporting beginning teachers. Richmond, VA: Department of Education. Provides research-based guide to support mentor training.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1988). Report of the state superintendent's advisory committee on beginning teacher assistance programs. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Contains recommendations for establishing a beginning teacher assistance

program in Wisconsin.

About the Author

Carol B. Furtwengler

cfurtwen@wsuhsu.edu

Associate Professor

Box 142

Wichita State University

Ph.D., George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

Carol Furtwengler is a former teacher and administrator. She served as Assistant Commissioner for Research and Development and Assistant Commissioner of Career Ladder Program for Tennessee Department of Education and then as educational aide for Governor Lamar Alexander. Her academic and research interests include personnel evaluation, applied inquiry, and school choice. Dr. Furtwengler's other published work includes articles on teacher observation and evaluation, (*Educational Leadership*, Phi Delta Kappan, Education Policy Analysis Archives); career ladder programs, (*Educational Leadership*), book chapter on cooperative learning in higher education (NEA), administration preparation (*Journal of School Leadership*)

Copyright 1995 by the *Education Policy Analysis Archives*

EPAA can be accessed either by visiting one of its several archived forms or by subscribing to the LISTSERV known as EPAA at LISTSERV@asu.edu. (To subscribe, send an email letter to LISTSERV@asu.edu whose sole contents are SUB EPAA your-name.) As articles are published by the *Archives*, they are sent immediately to the EPAA subscribers and simultaneously archived in three forms. Articles are archived on *EPAA* as individual files under the name of the author and the Volume and article number. For example, the article by Stephen Kemmis in Volume 1, Number 1 of the *Archives* can be retrieved by sending an e-mail letter to LISTSERV@asu.edu and making the single line in the letter read GET KEMMIS V1N1 F=MAIL. For a table of contents of the entire ARCHIVES, send the following e-mail message to LISTSERV@asu.edu: INDEX EPAA F=MAIL, that is, send an e-mail letter and make its single line read INDEX EPAA F=MAIL.

The World Wide Web address for the *Education Policy Analysis Archives* is <http://seamonkey.ed.asu.edu/epaa>

Education Policy Analysis Archives are "gophered" at olam.ed.asu.edu

To receive a publication guide for submitting articles, see the *EPAA* World Wide Web site or send an e-mail letter to LISTSERV@asu.edu and include the single line GET EPAA PUBGUIDE F=MAIL. It will be sent to you by return e-mail. General questions about appropriateness of topics or particular articles may be addressed to the Editor, Gene V Glass, Glass@asu.edu or reach him at College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-2411. (602-965-2692)

Editorial Board

John Covaleskie <i>jcovales@nmu.edu</i>	Andrew Coulson <i>andrewco@ix.netcom.com</i>
Alan Davis <i>adavis@castle.cudenver.edu</i>	Mark E. Fetler <i>mfetler@ctc.ca.gov</i>
Thomas F. Green <i>tfgreen@mailbox.syr.edu</i>	Alison I. Griffith <i>agriffith@edu.yorku.ca</i>
Arlen Gullickson <i>gullickson@gw.wmich.edu</i>	Ernest R. House <i>ernie.house@colorado.edu</i>
Aimee Howley <i>ess016@marshall.wvnet.edu</i>	Craig B. Howley <i>u56e3@wvnm.bitnet</i>
William Hunter <i>hunter@acs.ucalgary.ca</i>	Richard M. Jaeger <i>rmjaeger@iris.uncg.edu</i>
Benjamin Levin <i>levin@ccu.umanitoba.ca</i>	Thomas Mauhs-Pugh <i>thomas.mauhs-pugh@dartmouth.edu</i>
Dewayne Matthews <i>dm@wiche.edu</i>	Mary P. McKeown <i>iadmpm@asvm.inre.asu.edu</i>
Les McLean <i>lmclean@oise.on.ca</i>	Susan Bobbitt Nolen <i>sunolen@u.washington.edu</i>
Anne L. Pemberton <i>apembert@pen.k12.va.us</i>	Hugh G. Petrie <i>prohugh@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu</i>
Richard C. Richardson <i>richard.richardson@asu.edu</i>	Anthony G. Rud Jr. <i>rud@purdue.edu</i>
Dennis Sayers <i>dmsayers@ucdavis.edu</i>	Jay Scribner <i>jayscrib@tenet.edu</i>
Robert Stonehill <i>rstonehi@inet.ed.gov</i>	Robert T. Stout <i>stout@asu.edu</i>