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# Executive Summary

Massachusetts school districts and educational collaboratives design induction and mentoring programs to meet the needs of local educators and students. The 2017 Statewide Induction and Mentoring Report aggregates quantitative and qualitative data about these programs from 276 school districts and collaboratives. Data includes information on supports for novice or new-to-district teachers, administrators, and Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISPs, e.g., school counselors, social workers, psychologists, and nurses).

School districts responded to questions about their induction and mentoring programs, regarding:

* mentees
* mentor recruitment, selection and training
* program structure, activities and content
* funding
* evaluation and improvement
* educator retention

Readers can learn about how district responses varied based on:

* district accountability levels
* proportion of new teachers
* self-reported average amount spent per mentee

Several report items indicated that programs for teachers tend to be more intensive than programs for administrators and SISPs. For example, teachers are more likely than administrators and SISPs to observe their mentors or other role-alike educators working. Furthermore, in some program areas, supports are more common and structured in districts with larger proportions of new teachers, compared to districts with small proportions of new teachers. Responses showed that in districts with a large proportion of new teachers, mentees are more likely to meet weekly with their mentors.

Districts shared documents they use throughout the mentoring process, from mentor selection to program evaluation. Supplements to the report focus on supporting new Specialized Instructional Support Personnel, as well as recruitment and retention of educators of color and those in hard-to-staff positions such as special education, English as a Second Language (ESL), and Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM).
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# The 2017 Statewide Induction & Mentoring Report

The second annual Massachusetts Statewide Induction and Mentoring report provides quantitative and qualitative data on common practices in Massachusetts induction and mentoring programs, as well as advice and resources from organizations across the state. From mentor selection to program evaluation, school districts and educational collaboratives take diverse approaches to supporting new educators.

276 organizations reported on their local programs by the state deadline, and this statewide report aggregates their responses. Under state regulations ([603 CMR 7.12(3)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=12)), traditional school districts, Horace Mann charter schools, and collaboratives are required to submit local mentoring and induction reports. Nine Commonwealth charter schools also opted to submit reports. [Section IX](#_Respondents_who_submitted) lists all organizations who submitted responses by the deadline, and thus whose data is in this report.

In this report, **“mentoring”** refers to a formally designed learning experience between a new educator and a more experienced one; **“induction”** refers more broadly to all supports for new educators, including mentoring, peer meetings, district/school orientation, and other training ([603 CMR 7.02](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=02)). Due to interest expressed in district responses to the 2016 survey, this state report includes a focus on induction and mentoring for Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISPs), such as school counselors, social workers, nurses, and guidance counselors. While districts are not required to provide formal mentoring to SISPs, early supports can do much to increase SISPs’ capacity to help students and school teams.

Additionally, research on mentoring programs indicates connections between mentoring and retention of educators. For example, in a national longitudinal study, 92 percent of first-year teachers assigned a mentor returned to the classroom the following year, compared to 84 percent of those without a mentor. [[1]](#footnote-1) Over each of their first five years, teachers who had participated in first-year mentoring were **more likely to continue teaching** than those who did not have first-year mentoring. Although this evidence does not demonstrate a causal link between mentoring and retention, it does suggest that districts offering mentoring programs are more likely to retain their new teachers. This is particularly critical in areas where Massachusetts faces projected teacher shortages, such as special education and English as a Second Language (ESL).[[2]](#footnote-2) The state also faces a lack of educators of color when compared to the demographics of public school students.[[3]](#footnote-3) In their survey responses, districts shared experiences with strategies to recruit and retain educators in hard-to-staff roles and educators of color.

Districts responsed via survey. Note that some survey items did not receive responses from all respondents; data for those items are reflected as percentages of the number of respondents who answered that item, not the percentage of the 276 respondents overall. For the sake of clarity and consistency, the report uses the term **“district”** to refer to organizations providing mentoring and induction, including traditional school districts, charter schools, and collaboratives.

A 2017 study showed a causal link between mentoring and student outcomes. When beginning teachers participate in a high-quality induction and mentoring model, fourth- to eighth-grade students’ learning increases by an extra two to four months in English Language Arts/reading and two to five months in math.[[4]](#footnote-4) Through the following report, districts shared the strategies, obstacles and successes experienced in their own programs, with the aim of collaboratively enhancing supports for new Massachusetts educators and their students.

# Who are the mentees?

## Who receives induction and mentoring?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of educator** | **% of districts providing induction and mentoring** |
| Teachers in their 1st year of teaching in their career | 99% |
| Teachers in their 2nd year of teaching in their career | 85% |
| Teachers in their 3rd year of teaching in their career | 53% |
| Incoming teachers who are experienced but new to the district | 92% |
| Administrators in their 1st year of administration in their career | 81% |
| Administrators in their 2nd year of administration in their career | 45% |
| Administrators in their 3rd year of administration in their career | 19% |
| Incoming administrators who are experienced but new to the district | 67% |
| Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (e.g., school counselors, nurses, psychologists, etc.) in their first three years in their role | 92% |

See [**Supporting New Specialized Instructional Support Personnel**](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/sisp-supplement.docx) for advice on providing induction supports to new SISPs.

All but four responding districts reported that teachers in their first year of practice participate in an induction and mentoring program, while 46 organizations reported that they do not provide induction and mentoring to administrators in their first year of practice. This report shows an overall trend of **more** **frequent and thorough supports for new teachers** as compared to new administrators and SISPs.

In this and several other report items, responses show a divergence in answers among **districts in distinct categories**. DESE disaggregated data according to district accountability level, proportion of new teachers, and amount spent per mentee. Throughout this report, the analysis **notes substantial differences or trends across categories of districts, when they occur**.

Under the Massachusetts [accountability system](http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/), DESE uses statewide test scores over time, student growth percentiles, annual dropout rates, graduation rates, and participation rates to classify districts into five levels. Districts in Level 1 have the best performance in meeting their goals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Accountability level[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **# of districts represented in report** |
| Level 1 & 2 | 205 |
| Level 3—5 | 51 |

Some report items also show patterns based on the percentage of a districts’ teachers that have fewer than three years of experience. Districts can be divided into five categories according to their percentage of new teachers:[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **District category** | **% of teachers who have 0-2 years of experience** |
| Top fifth (large proportion of new teachers) | 30.2%+ |
| Second fifth | 23.8 to 30.1% |
| Third fifth | 20.1 to 23.7% |
| Fourth fifth | 16.7 to 20.0% |
| Bottom fifth (small proportion of new teachers) | 0 to 16.6% |

Additionally, districts reported the amount spent, on average, per mentee. This statewide report compares districts that reported large amounts spent per mentee (more than $1,000) to those that reported small amounts ($600 or less).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Average amount spent per mentee** | **# of districts represented in report** |
| $600 or less (small amount per mentee) | 102 |
| $601-$1,000 (moderate amount per mentee) | 85 |
| More than $1,000 (large amount per mentee) | 89 |

Districts are required to provide induction programs, including assigned mentors, to **all first-year teachers and administrators** ([603 CMR 7.12](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=12) and [603 CMR 7.13](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=13)). Furthermore, to obtain professional licensure, educators must participate in **at least 50 hours of mentoring beyond the induction (first) year** ([603 CMR 7.04](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=04)). DESE encourages districts to extend programs through a beginning educator’s second and third years of teaching. Research shows benefits in teacher effectiveness and retention when induction and mentoring extends into the second and third years of practice.[[7]](#footnote-7)

The following table provides an overview of requirements (per regulations) and recommendations (per the [Guidelines for Mentoring and Induction Programs](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/guidelines.docx)).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Induction and Mentoring Program Required Components | | | | |
|  | Beginning Teacher  **(new to the profession)** | Incoming Teacher  **(new to the district/role)** | Beginning Administrator  **(new to the profession)** | Incoming Administrator **(new to the district/role)** |
| Orientation | **Required** | **Required** | **Required** | **Required** |
| Assigned Mentor | **Required** | Recommended | **Required** | Recommended |
| 50 Hours of mentoring beyond induction year | **Required** | Possibly.[[8]](#footnote-8) | Recommended | Recommended |
| Support team, including at a minimum a mentor and qualified evaluator | **Required** | Recommended | **Required** | Recommended |
| Release time for mentor and mentee | **Required** | Recommended | **Required** | Recommended |
| Time and resources to learn hiring, supervision and evaluation methods included in the Professional Standards for Administrators | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | **Required** | Recommended |
| Additional induction supports in years 2 and 3 | Recommended | Recommended | Recommended | Recommended |

## 

## In what areas do mentees need mentoring?

The Massachusetts [Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03), used in educator evaluation, can provide insight into facets of new teachers that need development. Districts reported on the top three standards in which teachers in their first three years need the most support. The graph below shows the percentage of districts that selected each topic as one of the top three areas for support.

Overwhelmingly, the most common area of need reported for teachers is Curriculum and Planning, followed by Instruction and then by Assessment.

When selecting the top three areas for new teacher development, Level 1 and 2 districts are more likely to select Instruction, Learning Environment, and Reflection compared to Level 3, 4 and 5 district, which in turn are more likely to choose Engagement and Cultural Proficiency than are Level 1 and 2 districts.

Similarly, respondents reported on the top three [Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=04) in which administrators in their first three years of practice need the most support.

# 

# Who are the mentors?

## How are mentors selected (choose all that apply)?

For the purposes of licensure advancement, mentors must have **at least three years of experience** under an Initial or Professional license, in the **role for which they are providing mentoring** ([603 CMR 7.12(2)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=02)). Beyond this, individual districts define their own criteria for mentor identification and selection. The table below shows the percent of respondents that reported using various selection methods.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mentor selection methods** | **Mentors of teachers** | **Mentors of administrators** |
| Educator Evaluation Rating of Proficient or Higher | 70% | 57% |
| Recommendations by colleagues | 28% | 28% |
| Recommendations by supervisors | 88% | 74% |
| Application process | 58% | 17% |
| Interview | 9% | 7% |
| Mentee feedback from previous years | 56% | 30% |
| Other | 13% | 22% |

#### Districts reporting “Other” selection methods use Professional Teaching Status, mentors’ knowledge of district processes and goals, and observations of particular characteristics such as collaboration and commitment to supporting colleagues.

#### Districts with a high proportion of new teachers are more likely to use application processes and interviews when selecting mentors, compared to districts with relatively few new teachers. Level 3—5 districts are more likely than other districts to have a formal application process for all mentors, and especially for teacher mentors (73 percent compared to 57 percent).

## Is it difficult for your district to identify enough qualified mentors to meet the needs of educators in the following categories?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **No** |
| Teachers | 22% | 78% |
| Administrators | 26% | 74% |
| Specialized Instructional Support Personnel | 46% | 54% |

Almost half of respondents face **challenges in finding enough SISP mentors**. In smaller districts, there may be only one or a few educators in a given SISP role, and they may only work part-time in the district. Respondents note that it can be challenging to find mentors for less common or “singleton” roles, such as special educators in small districts.

Districts with large proportions of new teachers are about twice as likely to have difficulty identifying enough qualified teacher mentors, compared to districts with small proportions of new teachers (36 percent to 18 percent). As one district reported, even districts with numerous experienced teachers may have trouble finding mentors, as many of the teachers who might be successful mentors are already busy with extra duties.

Some approach these obstacles by contracting with **administrative or SISP** **mentors from outside the district**. Group mentoring for those in less common positions is one way districts can make the most of a small number of qualified mentors. Districts find mentors through professional organizations such as the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, Massachusetts Association of Vocational Administrators, Massachusetts School Administrators’ Association, and Massachusetts School Nurse Organization. For ideas on finding mentors for SISPs, see [Supporting New Specialized Instructional Support Personnel](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/sisp-supplement.docx).

## Do mentors maintain full teaching/administration responsibilities?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Mentors of teachers** | **Mentors of administrators** |
| Yes | 98% | 88% |
| No, they have reduced teaching/administration responsibilities | 0% | 1% |
| No, the mentor role is a full-time position | 1% | 0% |
| This varies among the mentors | 1% | 11% |

## How are mentors and mentees matched in your district (select all that apply)?

To learn more about successful **approaches to matching mentors and mentees**, see [Matchmaking in Mentoring Programs](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2016/matchmaking.docx).

## Do some of the mentors in your district work with multiple mentees by meeting with them at the same time (group mentoring)?

In almost half (41 percent) of districts, some mentors work with multiple mentees in group meetings. Many respondents found group mentoring successful, but others use it only when needed. When approaching group mentoring, consider **why it is needed** and **how to leverage the group mentoring structure**. Districts employ a variety of group mentoring structures depending on district needs and context.

*Mentors work with mentees both in a group and one-on-one:* Some topics and activities are more conducive to group mentoring. For example, a few districts use group mentoring for topics such as school procedures, reflective practice, and problem-solving, and individual mentoring for other topics.

*Two mentors with a group of mentees:* Mentors can complement one another in expertise, particularly if no available mentors can provide comprehensive expertise. In one vocational technical school, mentees meet in a group with one academic and one vocational mentor. Similarly, elementary mentees in another district meet in a group with one math and one literacy mentor.

*Mentee interaction in group mentoring:* When mentees would not otherwise have opportunities to interact, group mentoring allows them to learn from one another and feel supported.

*Mentees in the same position sharing a mentor:* When mentors and/or resources are stretched thin, several districts reported using group mentoring if multiple new hires are working in the same grade or department, and/or for mentees not in their first year of practice.

## 

## How are mentors trained (select all that apply)?

Mentors of teachers and administrators must be **“trained to assist a beginning educator”** ([603 CMR 7.12(2)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=02); districts determine who will implement the training and what topics to address. Below, districts indicated which training approaches they use.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mentor training approaches** | **Mentors of teachers** | **Mentors of administrators** | **Mentors of Specialized Instructional Support Personnel** |
| District-developed mentor training program, led by district personnel | 81%% | 62% | 80% |
| Mentor training from an educator preparation program or higher education institution | 14% | 11% | 8% |
| Mentor training from an external consultant (not ed prep or higher ed) | 27% | 38% | 23% |
| Online course | 12% | 3% | 8% |
| Other | 5% | 11% | 7% |

Districts with large proportions of new teachers are about 24 percent more likely to develop and lead their own mentor training program for teacher mentors—though training from an educator preparation program, higher education institute, or other external organization is still popular among districts with high proportions of new teachers. Several districts hire an external consultant to train a mentor coordinator or group of mentors, who then lead trainings for other district mentors.

Training approaches that have been found successful are often **based on the expressed needs of the current or previous year’s mentors**. Often, districts schedule trainings throughout the year, matched to topics relevant to that point in the school year. One district supplements training through monthly memos with timely resources and information. Another provides “master mentor” status to mentors who take a graduate course on mentoring.

**Examples of materials that districts use in mentor training are available in** [**Section VIII**](#_Resources_from_school)**.**

In addition to lectures, mentor training activities can include discussing books, articles or case studies, or collaboratively solving and/or role playing problem scenarios. In various districts, mentor training content includes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Adult learning * Personal/professional issues * Educator evaluation * Phases of the first year of teaching * Confidentiality * Coaching, observation and feedback skills | * Classroom management * Cultural proficiency * Growth mindset * Difficult conversations * Technology training * Reflective practice |

## How frequently are mentors required to complete training?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Mentors for teachers** | **Mentors for administrators** | **Mentors for Specialized Instructional Support Personnel** |
| Only once | 40% | 50% | 37% |
| Only once, but provide a yearly refresher training | 48% | 24% | 43% |
| Once every 3+ years | 9% | 4% | 11% |
| Other | 8% | 23% | 11% |

Some districts hire new administrators or SISPs infrequently, and therefore don’t need regularly scheduled mentor trainings.

# How are programs structured?

## What is the duration of the induction and mentoring program?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not provided** | **< 1 school year** | **1 school year** | **2 school years** | **3 school years** |
| Beginning teacher (fewer than 3 years of teaching experience) | 0% | 0% | 28% | 44% | 28% |
| Incoming teacher (new to the district or role with prior teaching experience) | 3% | 6% | 62% | 30% | 10% |
| Beginning administrator (fewer than 3 years of administration experience) | 10% | 2% | 49% | 26% | 12% |
| Incoming administrator (new to the district or role with prior administration experience) | 18% | 7% | 60% | 11% | 4% |
| Specialized Instructional Support Personnel | 6% | 2% | 46% | 30% | 17% |

On average, **programs for teachers are longer than those for administrators and SISPs**. In Massachusetts, school districts must provide novice teachers and administrators with mentoring in their first year, and 50 additional hours of mentoring beyond the first year ([603 CMR 7.04](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=04)).

Districts at Level 3—5 are **more likely to provide novice teachers with induction programs lasting only one year**, and less likely to provide three-year programs, compared to districts at Levels 1 and 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Duration of induction and mentoring programs for novice teachers, by district accountability level** | | | | | |
| **District level** | **Not provided** | **<1 school year** | **1 school year** | **2 school years** | **3 school years** |
| Level 1 & 2 | 1% | 0% | 26% | 44% | 29% |
| Level 3—5 | 0% | 0% | 34% | 48% | 18% |

## In general, how frequently do mentees in their first year of practice meet with mentors?

A few districts reported that first-year mentees meet with mentors more than once per week. In some districts, mentoring pairs meet more frequently in the first one or two months of the school year.

## In general, how frequently do mentees beyond their first year of practice meet with mentors?

Mentees in higher-spending districts tend to meet with their mentors more frequently, perhaps because more frequent meetings drive higher mentor stipends or other costs. Districts with larger proportions of new teachers are also more likely to hold weekly mentor meetings; induction and mentoring programs in such districts may be more structured, or more of a focus for the district.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of district** | **% meeting with mentors weekly** | |
| **First-year mentees** | **Mentees not in first year** |
| $1,001+ per mentee | 64% | 25% |
| $601 or less per mentee | 48% | 11% |
| High % of new teachers | 71% | 19% |
| Low % of new teachers | 55% | 7% |

## In general, when do mentor-mentee meetings occur (select all that apply)?

#### Districts with large proportions of new teachers are about twice as likely to have mentor-mentee meetings during common planning time (71 percent versus 46 percent), and are also substantially more likely to hold meeting during designated PD times (23 percent versus 14 percent); the differences may be due to these districts’ need to have more structured and integrated mentoring programs to meet the needs of a high proportion of new teachers.

#### “Other” meeting times include: lunch period, professional learning team times, during class when given coverage, and on the weekend. For more information about how districts find time for mentor-mentee activities, see [Making Time for Mentoring](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2016/makingtime.docx) from the 2016 Induction and Mentoring Report.

## Does your district partner with any other districts, educator preparation programs, or other organizations to support your induction and mentoring program (select all that apply)?

About 28 percent of respondents partner with outside organizations. This practice is more common among Level 3—5 districts; 39 percent use partner organizations, compared to 24 percent of Level 1 and 2 districts. “Other” responses include community organizations and the local superintendents’ roundtable.

# What is the programs’ content?

## Select the supports that are provided as part of an induction program for educators in your district.

#### In addition to mentors, induction programs can provide a variety of supports for new educators, such as the following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **School orientation** | **Release time for mentors/mentees** | **Support team, including an administrator who conducts evaluations[[9]](#footnote-9)** | **Targeted professional development** | **Reduced workload** | **Specific books/resources** | **Other** |
| Beginning teacher (fewer than 3 years of teaching experience) | 98% | 54% | 44% | 78% | 1% | 74% | 15% |
| Incoming teacher (new to the district or role with prior teaching experience) | 97% | 44% | 41% | 69% | 0% | 67% | 11% |
| Beginning administrator (fewer than 3 years of administration experience) | 87% | 31% | 34% | 61% | 1% | 56% | 14% |
| Incoming administrator (new to the district or role with prior administration experience) | 87% | 31% | 34% | 61% | 1% | 55% | 13% |
| Specialized Instructional Support Personnel | 98% | 44% | 37% | 68% | 1% | 65% | 12% |

#### School orientation is the most common for each category of educator, and each other type of support is more common for novice teachers than for other groups of educators.

## If you provide a second and/or third year of induction and mentoring, please briefly describe how the second and/or third year supports are differentiated from the first year.

A frequent approach to differentiating induction and mentoring beyond the first year is to provide **more personalized supports**, based on the mentee’s expressed needs. For example, a mentee may select from a range of trainings or activities. Discussions are often more focused on content area or grade-level topics. Department heads, teacher leaders, or instructional coaches sometimes serve as mentors, and building or district leaders become more involved.

A Professional Learning Community or other **group model** may replace one-on-one mentoring. A few districts reported that mentoring **becomes more reflective**, and culminates in a reflection paper, portfolio of activities, or other project. In one district, mentoring beyond the second year depends on teacher performance; those rated Proficient or above in evaluations participate in group rather than individual mentoring.

## During their time together, how frequently do teachers and their mentors focus on the following topics?

## 

## During their time together, how frequently do administrators and their mentors focus on the following topics?

­­­­­

The previous graphs show some **similarities across teacher mentees’ and administrator mentees’ most common topics**. For example, procedures, curriculum content, and instruction/instructional leadership are common topics for both groups of educators.

Earlier in the report, districts selected the top areas in which new educators need support. When comparing high need areas with the most frequent focal points for teacher-mentor interactions, the **most popular responses somewhat mirror each other**. The two top [Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03) identified as areas for development–Curriculum and Planning, and Instruction–align with the two most popular discussion topics of curriculum/content and pedagogy/instructional strategies.

While regulations do not specify topics of discussion for teacher mentees, they do require that administrators and their mentors “engage in professional conversations on learning and teaching as well as building leadership capacity within the school community” and that new administrators “learn how to use effective methods of personnel selection, supervision, and evaluation” ([603 CMR7 .13(2)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=13)). On that note, instructional leadership, educator evaluation, and providing coaching/feedback to teachers are among the most popular topics in the majority of responding districts.

Other common topics that respondents shared include: conflict with peers, data analysis, content-specific issues, moral support, and learning how to manage workloads.

## In which of the following activities do mentees and mentors participate (select all that apply)?

Districts are required to provide release time for both teacher mentees and their mentors to engage in regular classroom observations and other mentoring activities ([603 CMR 7.12 (2)(d)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=12)).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Teachers** | **Administrators** | **Specialized Instructional Support Personnel** |
| Mentee observes mentor's classroom/school | 94% | 51% | 81% |
| Mentor observes mentee's classroom/school | 94% | 63% | 81% |
| View a video of mentee teaching/working | 10% | 5% | 8% |
| Mentee observes/shadows other educators in the school/district | 74% | 48% | 62% |
| One-on-one meetings between mentor-mentee | 100% | 91% | 97% |
| Learning networks with other mentors and mentees | 30% | 19% | 33% |
| Joint training for mentors and mentees | 33% | 18% | 42% |
| Mentor, mentee, and supervisor meetings | 47% | 36% | 40% |
| Learning walks | 16% | 37% | 17% |
| Written communications (email, reflection journals, etc.) | 89% | 74% | 87% |
| Other | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| **Total number of organizations that indicated one or more activities** | **275** | **209** | **154** |

Districts were more likely to report one or more activities for teacher mentees than for administrator and SISP mentees–consistent with trends seen in some other report items. One respondent noted that observations of SISPs can be difficult due to confidentiality requirements when SISPs meet with students.

# How are programs managed and funded?

## Does the person who is primarily responsible for overseeing the district's induction and mentoring program hold another role as well?

#### In almost all districts (97 percent) the person who is primarily responsible for overseeing the induction and mentoring program holds another role as well. The most common “other” role was Director of Curriculum and/or Instruction.

## What is the estimated annual amount spent per mentee in the most recent year (2016-17)?

#### Districts with the largest proportions of new teachers are more than twice as likely to spend more than $1,200 per mentee, compared to districts with the smallest proportions of new teachers (30 percent versus 14 percent).[[10]](#footnote-10)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of district** | **Amount spent per mentee** | | | | | |
| **Under $400** | **$400-$600** | **$601-$800** | **$801-$1,000** | **$1,001-$1,200** | **More than $1,200** |
| Low % new teachers | 16% | 21% | 16% | 18% | 16% | 14% |
| High % new teachers | 9% | 28% | 11% | 17% | 4% | 30% |
| Level 1 & 2 | 10% | 27% | 14% | 16% | 11% | 21% |
| Level 3—5 | 20% | 14% | 18% | 8% | 12% | 28% |

## What rewards or incentives do mentors receive (select all that apply)?

## What is your district's average stipend for mentoring a first-year educator?

In 91 percent of districts, **mentor stipends are the largest cost associated with induction and mentoring** (professional development for mentees is a distant second, at 5 percent), and 92 percent of districts compensate mentors with stipends.

Level 3—5 districts are more likely to pay more than $1,200 as an average mentor stipend (30 percent, or 14 districts, compared to 18 percent, or 34 districts, for Levels 1 and 2). Districts with a high percentage of inexperienced teachers are about twice as likely as those with a low percentage of inexperienced teachers to spend more than $1,200 for an average stipend. There is substantial overlap between Level 3—5 districts and those with large proportions of inexperienced teachers.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **District** | **% with average stipends above $1,200** |
| Level 1 & 2 | 18% |
| Level 3—5 | 30% |
| Low % of new teachers | 17% |
| High % of new teachers | 37% |

## What funding is used to support your district's induction and mentoring program (select all the apply)?

# What are the program outcomes?

## Based on feedback collected from stakeholders (mentors, mentees, administrators, etc.), what are two things your program is doing well?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # of districts | Response |
| 51 | Matching mentors and mentees |
| 32 | Providing time for observations & other mentoring activities |
| 28 | Targeted PD to meet mentees’ needs |
| 26 | Mentees feel supported |
| 25 | Collaboration |
| 24 | Orientation |
| 21 | Differentiated supports |
| 20 | Training and support for mentors |
| 19 | Regular meetings among mentees |
| 18 | Quality of mentor-mentee relationships |
| 13 | Using feedback and data for program improvement |
| 13 | Training on curriculum & instruction |
| 12 | Quality of mentors |
| 12 | Organization/structure of program |
| 11 | Communication |
| 11 | Observations |
| 11 | Regular mentor-mentee meetings |
| 11 | Resources (such as mentoring log and handbook) |
| 10 | Mentor selection |
| 10 | Supports for educators beyond first year of practice |
| 10 | Reflection |
| 9 | Training on school/district procedures |
| 8 | Feedback for mentees |
| 8 | Setting expectations |
| 8 | Training on school/district culture |
| 7 | Regular meetings among mentors |
| 7 | Training on educator evaluation |
| 6 | One-on-one mentoring |
| 6 | Ongoing support for mentees |
| 5 | Training on classroom management |
| 4 | District leadership involvement |
| 4 | Starting program early in the year |

## Based on feedback collected from stakeholders (mentors, mentees, administrators, etc.), what are two things your program plans to improve upon?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # of districts | Respo­­­­nse |
| 52 | Providing time for observations & other mentoring activities |
| 44 | Supports for educators beyond first year of practice |
| 35 | Training and support for mentors |
| 31 | Differentiated supports (including by years of experience) |
| 21 | Observations |
| 18 | SISP induction and mentoring |
| 17 | Matching mentors and mentees |
| 17 | Mentor recruitment |
| 17 | Targeted PD to meet mentees' needs |
| 16 | Mentoring resources (such as mentoring handbook) |
| 15 | Program for administrators |
| 12 | Training on curriculum and instruction |
| 11 | Training on differentiated instruction for students with diverse needs |
| 11 | Training on educator evaluation |
| 10 | Training on classroom management |
| 10 | Training on technology use |
| 7 | Communication |
| 7 | Meetings among mentees |
| 7 | Orientation |
| 7 | Using feedback and data for program improvement |
| 6 | Training on cultural proficiency |
| 6 | Meetings among mentors |
| 6 | Setting goals and expectations |
| 6 | Starting program earlier in the year |
| 5 | Tracking mentor-mentee activities |
| 5 | Training on school/district culture |
| 4 | Training on assessment |
| 4 | Fewer meetings |
| 4 | Organization/structure of program |
| 4 | Program supervision |

Looking across both lists, some topics appear as both “things your program is doing well” and, for other districts, “things your program plans to improve upon.” Districts frequently responded that **providing time for mentors and mentees** to engage in observations and other mentoring activities is both an area of success and one for improvement. Nineteen percent of respondents reported “**matching mentors and mentees**” as an area of success, while 6 percent reported it as an area for improvement.

For more information on how districts provide time for mentoring and match mentors to mentees, see the following resources from the 2016 Induction and Mentoring Report:

* [Making Time for Mentoring](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2016/makingtime.docx)
* [Matchmaking in Mentoring Programs](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2016/matchmaking.docx)

Eighteen respondents selected **mentoring for SISPs** as something to improve upon. Statewide professional organizations representing SISP roles provided advice on how school and district leaders can better support new SISPs in [Supporting New Specialized Instructional Support Personnel](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/sisp-supplement.docx).

Throughout the report, districts often cited the importance of community-building and interaction. These themes appear on [pages 24-25](#_Based_on_feedback), as respondents often mention meetings among mentors and mentees.

Frequently, districts indicated success with, or desire to improve, components of mentor and mentee training. Six districts identified **cultural proficiency training** as a topic for improvement. Mentor training addresses cultural proficiency in about 40 percent of responding districts. Cultural proficiency is to the ability to serve students from diverse backgrounds by “recognizing the differences among students and families from different cultural groups, responding to those differences positively, and being able to interact effectively in a range of cultural environments.”[[11]](#footnote-11) Standards 2 and 3 of the Standards for Effective Practice include cultural proficiency and culturally proficient communication with family/community.

Learn how Massachusetts districts implemented cultural proficiency training in [**Strategies for Cultural Proficiency**](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/equitableaccess/resources/cultural-proficiency.pdf).

## Indicate any metrics your district uses to evaluate what you are doing well and what you can improve in your induction and mentoring program (select all that apply).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Metrics | Teacher induction and mentoring program | Administrator induction and mentoring program |
| Changes in mentor’s notes and/or feedback for mentees | 54% | 34% |
| Retention of new educators | 58% | 52% |
| Mentor and/or mentee surveys on induction and mentoring program | 77% | 36% |
| End-of-year interviews with mentors and/or mentees | 41% | 34% |
| Summative mentee assignment (e.g., reflection or portfolio) | 24% | 15% |
| Educator evaluation data | 46% | 51% |
| Formal/informal observations | 63% | 61% |
| Student feedback on teacher/administrator effectiveness | 11% | 10% |
| Teacher feedback on colleague/administrator effectiveness | 20% | 27% |
| Other | 2% | 3% |

#### Ongoing program evaluation is key to effective induction and mentoring. Evaluation can draw on both quantitative and qualitative measures. In the table above, 94 percent of respondents identified one or more methods of evaluating their teacher mentoring program, and 55 percent selected one or more methods of evaluating their administrator mentoring program. “Other” measures for program evaluation include end-of-year discussions, mentor logs, and mentee presentations.

For examples of districts’ **program evaluation materials**, see shared resources in [Section VIII](#_Resources_from_school).

## How has your induction and mentoring program supported the retention of educators?

In their mentoring and induction reports, almost all districts (94 percent) indicated that their **induction and mentoring program had a positive impact on educator retention**. When expanding on *how* induction programs support retention, respondents mentioned many of the successful program components listed on [pages24-25](#_Based_on_feedback). In end-of-year surveys and interviews, mentees reported positive responses to mentoring, particularly that they felt well-supported. Districts echoed the importance of support, recognizing that the first year or two can be challenging, and moral support during school or after hours can motivate teachers to stay the next year. Collaborating and problem-solving with mentors and fellow mentees also prevents isolation and forms a sense of community, respondents explained. Simply put, “when they feel supported, and they feel as if they are around people they want to work with, they stay.” Districts also see targeted training; timely and personalized supports; feedback to and from mentees; and program evaluation and improvement as components that aid retention.

Approaches to educator retention can specifically target educators that are in high demand. Currently demand in Massachusetts public schools is higher for new teachers certified in special education, English as a Second Language (ESL), or Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) fields.[[12]](#footnote-12) According to projections, Massachusetts schools will soon face a shortage of special education and ESL teachers. The relative difference between projected supply and demand for these teachers will approximately double over ten years.[[13]](#footnote-13) In their induction and mentoring reports, districts indicated any strategies used to retain or recruit educators in hard-to-staff roles.

Similarly, districts reported on strategies for retention or recruitment of educators of color. In Massachusetts public schools, 8 percent of teachers in 2016-17 were teachers of color,[[14]](#footnote-14) and students of color made up 39 percent of the student body.[[15]](#footnote-15) Recruitment into the field is particularly salient; data suggests that the state population of bachelor’s-degree-holders is diversifying more quickly than the pool of new teachers is.[[16]](#footnote-16)

About half of all respondents identified one or more strategies for the recruitment and retention of educators of color, and about three-quarters did so for the recruitment and retention of educators in hard-to-staff positions (such as special education or English as a Second Language). Level 3—5 districts are more likely than Level 1 and 2 districts to report strategies for recruitment and retention of educators of color—and to have higher proportions of students of color. Conversely, Level 1 and 2 districts are slightly more likely to report such strategies for educators in hard-to-staff roles.

For more information on **approaches to retaining educators of color and those in hard-to-staff roles**, see [Recruitment & Retention: Educators of Color](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/recruit-retain-diverse-educators.docx) and [Recruitment & Retention: Educators in Hard-to-Staff Roles](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/recruit-retain-hardtostaff-roles.docx).

# Resources from school districts & collaboratives

**Program Overview**

* [Program description and forms](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/sandwich.docx) (Sandwich)
* [Program description beyond the first year](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/milton.docx) (Milton)
* [Program description for third year](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/blackstone-valley-description.docx) (Blackstone Valley Regional Vocational Technical)

**Mentor Recruitment and Selection**

* [Mentor recruitment flyer](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/waltham-flyer.docx) (Waltham)
* [Description of roles in mentoring](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/norton.docx) (Norton)
* [Mentor job description](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/nauset.docx) (Nauset)
* [Mentor coordinator job description](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/northampton.docx) (Northampton)
* [Mentor job application](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/southcoast-collaborative-mentor.docx) (South Coast Educational Collaborative)
* [Paraprofessional mentor application and contract](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/southcoast-collaborative-mentor-professional.docx) (South Coast Educational Collaborative)

**Mentor Training**

* [School counselor mentoring handbook](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/chelmsford.docx) (Chelmsford)
* [Mentor and mentee obligations](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/minuteman.docx) (Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical)
* [Mentor course syllabus](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/framingham.docx) (Framingham)
* [Scenarios for mentor training](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/brookline.docx) (Brookline)

**Mentor/Mentee Activities**

* Monthly mentor checklist ([Ashburnham-Westminster](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/ashburnham-westminster.docx) and [Lexington](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/lexington.docx) *–also can be used for program evaluation*)
* [Monthly topics and resources](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/blackstone-valley-topics-resources.xlsx) (Blackstone Valley Regional Vocational Technical)

For an approach to **tracking and analyzing types of mentor-mentee interactions**, see [DESE’s mentor log template](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/mentoring-log-template.xlsx).

* [Structured observations for mentoring](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/accept-collaborative.docx) (ACCEPT Collaborative)
* Pre- and post-observation forms focused on classroom management (Walpole: [Form 1](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/walpole-from1.docx), [Form 2](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/walpole-from2.docx) and [Form 3](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/walpole-from3.docx))
* [Pre-observation and observation forms](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/wareham-forms.docx) (Wareham)
* [Observation form focused on student engagement & instructional practices](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/whittier.docx) (Whittier Regional Vocational Technical)
* [Group mentoring sample agendas](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/westport.docx) (Westport)

**Program assessment and improvement**

* [Monthly mentee and mentor reflection surveys](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/assabet-valley.docx) (Assabet Valley Regional Vocational Technical)
* [Mentor survey](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/lunenburg.docx) (Lunenburg)
* [Mentee portfolio rubric](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/firthburg.docx) (Fitchburg)
* [Reflection paper assignment](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/2017/valley-collaborative.docx) (Valley Collaborative)

# Respondents who submitted completed reports, and whose data is reflected in this report

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Abington | Cape Cod Collaborative | | Acton-Boxborough | Cape Cod Regional Vocational Technical | | Acushnet | CAPS Collaborative | | Agawam | Carlisle | | Amesbury | Carver | | Amherst (on behalf of Amherst-Pelham and Pelham) | CASE Concord Area SPED Collaborative | | Central Berkshire | | Andover | Chelmsford | | Arlington | Chelsea | | Ashburnham-Westminster | Chicopee | | Ashland | Clarksburg | | Assabet Valley Regional Vocational Technical | Clinton | | Attleboro | Cohasset | | Auburn | Collaborative for Regional Educational Services and Training | | Avon | | Ayer Shirley | Community Charter School of Cambridge | | Barnstable | Community Day Charter Schools - Prospect, Gateway and Webster | | Baystate Academy Charter Public School | | Bedford | Concord | | Belchertown | Concord-Carlisle  Danvers  Dartmouth | | Bellingham | | Belmont | | Berlin-Boylston | Dennis-Yarmouth  Douglas  Duxbury | | Beverly | | Bi-County Collaborative | | Billerica | East Bridgewater | | Blackstone Valley Regional Vocational Technical | East Longmeadow  Easthampton  Easton  EDCO Collaborative | | Blackstone-Millville  Blue Hills Regional Vocational Technical | | Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter | Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health Careers | | Bourne | Erving | | Boxford (on behalf of Topsfield and Middleton) | Essex North Shore Agricultural and Technical | | Braintree | Everett | | Bridgewater-Raynham | Fairhaven | | Bristol-Plymouth Regional Vocational Technical | Falmouth | | Brockton  Brookline | Farmington River  Fitchburg | | Burlington | Florida | | Cambridge | Foxborough | | Canton | Foxborough Regional Charter | |  |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Framingham  Franklin  Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical  Freetown-Lakeville  Frontier (on behalf of Conway, Deerfield, Sunderland and Whately)  Gill-Montague  Grafton  Granby  Greater Fall River Regional Vocational Technical  Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational Technical  Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical  Greater New Bedford Regional Vocational Technical  Greenfield  Groton-Dunstable  Hadley  Hamilton-Wenham  Hampden-Wilbraham  Hampshire (on behalf of Westhampton, Chesterfield-Goshen, Southampton, Williamsburg and Worthington)  Hanover  Hatfield  Haverhill (on behalf of Silver Hill Horace Mann Charter)  Hill View Montessori Charter  Hingham  Holliston  Holyoke  Hopedale  Hopkinton  Hudson  Hull  Ipswich  Lanesborough (on behalf of Williamstown and Mount Greylock)  Lawrence  Lawrence Family Development Charter  Lee  Leicester  Lenox  Leverett | Lexington  Lincoln  Lincoln-Sudbury  Littleton  Longmeadow  Lowell Community Charter  Lower Pioneer Valley Educational Collaborative  Ludlow  Lunenburg  Lynn  Lynnfield  MA Academy for Math and Science  Malden  Manchester Essex Regional  Mansfield  Marblehead  Marion (on behalf of Mattapoisett, Old Rochester and Rochester)  Marlborough  Marshfield  Masconomet  Mashpee  Maynard  Medfield  Medford  Medway  Melrose  Mendon-Upton  Methuen  Middleborough  Milford  Millbury  Milton  Mohawk Trail (on behalf of Hawlemont)  Monomoy Regional  Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical  Nahant  Nantucket  Narragansett  Nashoba Valley Regional Vocational Technical  Nauset (on behalf of Brewster, Eastham, Orleans and Wellfleet)  New Bedford  New Salem-Wendell  Newburyport |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Newton  Norfolk  North Adams  North Andover  North Attleborough  North Brookfield  North Middlesex  North Reading  North River Collaborative  Northampton  Northampton-Smith Vocational Agricultural  Northbridge  Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational Technical  Northern Berkshire Regional Vocational Technical  Northshore Education Consortium  Norton  Norwell  Norwood  Old Colony Regional Vocational Technical  Orange  Palmer  Pembroke  Pentucket  Petersham  Pilgrim Area Collaborative  Pioneer Valley  Pioneer Valley Performing Arts Charter  Plainville  Plymouth  Provincetown  Quincy  Ralph C Mahar  Reading  READS Collaborative  Revere  River Valley Charter  Rockland  Rockport  Salem (on behalf of Bentley Academy)  Salem Academy Charter  Sandwich  Saugus  Savoy (on behalf of Florida, Clarksburg and Rowe)  Scituate | Seekonk  SEEM Collaborative  Sharon  Shawsheen Valley Regional Vocational Technical  Shore Educational Collaborative  Shrewsbury  Shutesbury  Silver Lake (on behalf of Halifax, Plympton and Kingston)  Somerset (on behalf of Somerset-Berkley)  Somerville  South Coast Educational Collaborative  South Hadley  South Middlesex Regional Vocational Technical  South Shore Charter  South Shore Regional Vocational Technical  Southborough (on behalf of Northborough and Northborough-Southborough)  Southbridge  Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical  Southern Berkshire  Southern Worcester County Educational Collaborative  Southern Worcester County Regional Vocational Technical  Southwick-Tolland-Granville  Springfield  Stoneham  Stoughton  Sudbury  Sutton  Swampscott  Swansea  Tantasqua  Taunton  TEC Connections Academy Commonwealth Virtual School District  Tewksbury  The Education Cooperative  Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical  Triton  UP Academy Charter Schools of Boston and Dorchester  Upper Cape Cod Regional Vocational Technical  Uxbridge  Valley Collaborative  Wachusett  Wakefield  Walpole |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Waltham  Ware  Wareham  Watertown  Wayland  Webster  Wellesley  West Boylston  West Bridgewater  West Springfield  Westborough  Westfield | Westport  Westwood  Weymouth  Whitman-Hanson  Whittier Regional Vocational Technical  Wilmington  Winchendon  Winchester  Winthrop  Woburn  Worcester  Wrentham |

Weston
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