



Public Schools of North Carolina  
State Board of Education  
Department of Public Instruction

---

# Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

---

Report on the Impact of the  
Flexible Use of Mentor Funds on  
Teacher Retention

*SL 2003-284, Sec. 7.30 (d)*

---

**Date Due: Initial Report was Submitted October 2004**

Report #9

DPI Chronological Schedule

## **STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**HOWARD N. LEE**

Chairman :: Raleigh

**JANE P. NORWOOD**

Vice Chair :: Charlotte

**KATHY A. TAFT**

Greenville

**MICHELLE HOWARD-VITAL**

Wilmington

**EDGAR D. MURPHY**

Durham

**SHIRLEY E. HARRIS**

Troy

**MELISSA E. BARTLETT**

Mooresville

**ROBERT 'TOM' SPEED**

Boone

**WAYNE MCDEVITT**

Asheville

**JOHN TATE III**

Charlotte

**PATRICIA (TRICIA) N. WILLOUGHBY**

Raleigh

**BEVERLY PERDUE**

Lieutenant Governor :: New Bern

**RICHARD MOORE**

State Treasurer :: Kittrell

## **NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

**June St. Clair Atkinson, ED.D., State Superintendent**

**301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825**

In compliance with federal law, NC Public Schools administers all state-operated education programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

### **Inquiries or complaints should be directed to:**

Dr. Elsie C. Leak, Associate Superintendent :: Office of Curriculum and School Reform Services  
6307 Mail Service Center :: Raleigh, NC 27699-6307 :: Telephone 919-807-3761 :: Fax 919-807-3767

**Visit us on the Web :: [www.ncpublicschools.org](http://www.ncpublicschools.org)**

## **Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on the Impact of Mentor Program Flexibility on Teacher Retention**

---

### **Background**

The 2003 Budget Bill contained a special provision to allow LEAs flexibility in the use of mentor funds. The provision required that LEA plans for the flexible use of mentor funds be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval and that the State Board of Education submit a report on the impact of the mentor programs on teacher retention.

In October 2003, LEAs were invited to submit plans for the flexible use of mentor funding. Twenty-one (21) LEAs did so and received approval from the Board for the flexible use of mentor funding. Seventeen (17) of the LEAs implemented their plans during the 2004-05 school year. The LEAs implementing their proposed programs were:

- Asheville City Schools
- Avery County Schools
- Bertie County Schools
- Buncombe County Schools
- Carteret County Schools
- Caswell County Schools
- Catawba County Schools
- Chapel Hill/Carrboro City Schools
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
- Cumberland County Schools
- Davie County Schools
- Guilford County Schools
- Henderson County Schools
- Orange County Schools
- Pitt County Schools
- Wake County Schools
- Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools

Reports from these LEAs on the programs they implemented are contained in the following pages.

Hoke County Schools, Iredell-Statesville Schools, Jones County Schools, and Wilson County Schools delayed implementation of their proposed programs.

<b>Asheville City Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Asheville City Schools proposed hiring one full-time lead mentor to serve approximately 50 beginning teachers during the 2004-2005 school year. A combination of site-based mentors and a full-time mentor were to be used. Funding sources for support of this program were to include state mentor funds and federal funds.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 70</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<p>The job of the Lead Mentor included but was not limited to the following responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Met individually with new teachers, mentors, for specific, requested support</li> <li>▪ Convened quarterly mentor support meetings</li> <li>▪ Watched/observed in classrooms of new teachers, offered feedback and suggestions</li> <li>▪ Modeled effective teaching practices in new teachers' classrooms</li> <li>▪ Did mentor training with assistance from Teacher On Loan</li> <li>▪ Oversaw Retired Teacher Program (provided a retired teacher full-time for the first week of classroom teaching of two laterals and then on a weekly basis with one. This is a grant-funded program through the Asheville City Schools Foundation )</li> <li>▪ Worked with the K-5 and 6-12 curriculum directors to find materials/resources to support new teachers</li> <li>▪ Met monthly with ILT Ones and Twos (separately) and their mentors, offered staff development in INTASC Standards and Reading across the Content Areas</li> <li>▪ Informed new teachers/mentors about appropriate professional development opportunities: (Praxis Review Sessions, Conferences, Second Semester New Teacher Orientation, courses, etc., )</li> <li>▪ Organized/conducted appropriate professional development for new teachers in monthly meetings and with curriculum coordinator(s)</li> <li>▪ Worked with principals</li> <li>▪ Worked with new teachers (especially laterals) on licensure issues, finding courses, conferring with RALC</li> <li>▪ Developed, facilitated New Teacher Orientation</li> <li>▪ Developed, facilitated New Teacher Orientation for Lateral Entry teachers in conjunction with University School Teacher Education Partnership (USTEP)</li> <li>▪ Worked with Asheville City Schools Foundation to provide financial assistance for New teachers</li> <li>▪ Worked with Elementary Curriculum Coordinator in order to serve as a literacy coach to several new elementary teachers</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<p>Based on the 70 beginning teachers served by the lead mentor for 2004-05:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, same site: 47</li> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, transferred site: 3</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, same site: 5</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, transferred site: 1</li> <li>➤ Non-reappointed: 4</li> <li>➤ Resigned: 12</li> </ul>

Asheville City Schools	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pregnancy: 3</li> <li>• Career change: 2</li> <li>• Spouse reassigned: 1</li> <li>• Pursuing advanced degree in education: 4</li> <li>• Illness: 1</li> <li>• Took job in another NC LEA: 1</li> </ul> <p>ILTs remaining in Asheville City Schools: 77.2%</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The above data suggests that, predominantly, new teachers in Asheville City Schools are very satisfied with their job assignments and job sites. It is evident that, of those that resigned positions, 75% did so for family reasons or to pursue an advanced degree in education. Anecdotal evidence strongly supports satisfaction with the professional and personal support provided by ACS and the lead mentor. All first, second and third year teachers and their mentors were constantly linked to the Lead Mentor through email, phone(s), and frequent personal contact in classrooms (daily) and monthly support meetings attended by mentors as well as new teachers. These meetings (for first and second year teachers, held separately and also separated by grade levels (K-5 and 6-12) focused on targeted needs of the beginning teachers; classroom management, planning, working effectively with parents, and curriculum design and support. In addition, three social events were held during the school year and hosted by the lead mentor.</p> <p>Each mentor/mentee kept a monthly log that documented individual issues/concerns and support. This log was turned in to and reviewed by the Lead Mentor monthly. In addition, all of our lateral entry teachers received individualized support in helping them find appropriate courses (and funding) to satisfy their licensure requirements.</p> <p>Finally, the lead mentor maintained frequent contact with principals concerning their beginning teachers. Input from principals helped drive the staff development offered in monthly meetings as well as classroom support.</p>

<b>Avery County</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Avery County Schools proposed to support 26 beginning teachers during the 2004-2005 school year. Three (3) retired teachers were to be employed as mentors to support ILTs. The retired teachers were to be compensated \$100 per beginning teacher. Additional funding from federal resources will be used to support this program.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 17</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Funded one mentor teacher for every two ILTs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nine mentor teachers total</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Mentor teachers were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Two Avery County Schools Teachers of the Year – LEA Level;</li> <li>▪ Three Avery County Schools Teachers of the Year – Building Level;</li> <li>▪ All other mentors are leaders in their school;</li> <li>▪ All mentors had high TPAI-R ratings;</li> <li>▪ All mentors are committed to improving beginning teacher induction</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ All mentors, except one, had mentor training from the Regional Level.</li> <li>➤ Focused areas: (number of teachers receiving support and area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Content pedagogy – 8</li> <li>▪ Student development – 4</li> <li>▪ Diverse learners – 4</li> <li>▪ Multiple Instructional strategies - 6</li> <li>▪ Motivation and management - 14</li> <li>▪ Communication and Technology - 15</li> <li>▪ Planning – 8</li> <li>▪ Assessment – 7</li> <li>▪ Reflective Practice -2</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Total number of classroom visits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Each mentor was committed to meeting with ILT on an as needed basis. Mentor logs reflect many meeting of 5, 10, 15 minutes.</li> <li>▪ Each Mentor/ILT was required to meet with their mentor at least twice a month for formal meetings addressing INTASC Standards. Mentor logs document these meetings. Most mentors and ILTs met once a week and addressed both formal and informal objectives. Mentor logs document these meetings. Time of these meetings is 30 to 45 minutes each.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, same site: 10</li> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, transferred site: 4</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, same site: 1</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, transferred site: 2</li> <li>➤ Non-reappointed: 0</li> <li>➤ Resigned: 2</li> <li>➤ ILTs remaining in Avery County Schools: 88.2%</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusions</b>	The above data suggests that this program in past year was effective in helping retain teachers in our system. We lost 2 ILTs. One moved to the neighboring LEA, and the other resigned to get an advanced degree. The ILTs who transferred from one school to another did so for reason like “moving to a vacant position closer to my home community”, “my coaching duties and my teaching duties are in the same school”, and “I have the opportunity to move from a 6 <sup>th</sup> grade position to an elementary, 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade position”. The turnover in our system was not for lack

<b>Avery County</b>	
	<p>of support. Administrators were pleased to have focused mentors. ILTs were pleased to forge a support bond with an experienced colleague who was committed to the mentor process.</p> <p>Each mentor kept a contact sheet on each ILT, which was provided by the ILT Coordinator. The focus for each meeting was “on demand”, “on time” support and the INTASC Standards. The mentors documented the type of support and which standards they were addressing with each meeting.</p> <p>Mentor teachers gave positive feedback of the program. ILTs liked the “on time” support of the program.</p>

<b>Bertie County Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Bertie County Schools proposed to use their mentor teacher funds to employ a retired educator on a contracted basis to serve all new teachers and to pay site-based mentor teachers for the number of new teachers they are serving. The proposed program was designed to improve student achievement by promoting and analyzing teacher effectiveness in the classroom. The teacher/mentor were to focus on effective instruction and the impact that instruction has on student success. The program was to provide new teachers with intensive on-site assistance from full-time mentors in the areas of instruction, assessment, positive discipline, and interpersonal communication. Twenty-nine beginning teachers were to be served by the program.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 43</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Funded one retired administrator for fifty days, flexible period form September 2004 – May 2005.</li> <li>➤ The retired administrator served identified ILT I's, II's and some III's at all school levels.</li> <li>➤ Focused areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Classroom management through early interventions</li> <li>▪ New Teacher Orientation (after school) for those employees who were hired after the opening of school in August - 2004.</li> <li>▪ Monthly Teacher Talk Sessions</li> <li>▪ Instructional Design Lesson Plans and standard course of study</li> <li>▪ Instruction delivery</li> <li>▪ Time-on-task</li> <li>▪ Classroom organization</li> <li>▪ Promoting positive and professional image in the school and community</li> <li>▪ Total number of classroom visits: 150 (minimum). Each teacher was visited a minimum of three (3) times followed with a post conference giving feedback and recommendations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, same site: 35</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, transferred site: 3</li> <li>➤ Resigned (transfer to another LEA): 2</li> <li>➤ Resigned (family care): 3</li> <li>➤ ILTs remaining in Bertie County Schools: 88%</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The above data suggests that this initiative was effective in the reduction in the New Teacher turn-over rate.</li> <li>➤ Increased teacher satisfaction relating to support for new teachers as indicated through survey results.</li> <li>➤ No TPAI – evaluation below standard</li> <li>➤ Reduction in discipline referrals to the office (Classroom Management)</li> </ul>



<b>Buncombe County Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	Buncombe County Schools proposed to use the flexible funding to employ three recently retired teachers on a part-time basis to serve as mentors to beginning teachers. The proposed program was to provide consistent and on-going support for all beginning teachers in Buncombe County, allow for the development of a network of support for beginning teachers based on needs observed or requests, draw from the wealth of experience and knowledge provided by recently retired educators, and help create/maintain open avenues of communication among all stakeholders. The funds were to be used for salaries for the three retired educators and to cover mileage.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 115</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<p>A. Each District Mentor Teacher served approximately 28 ILT's.</p> <p>B. ILT 3's were assigned a Buddy Teacher at the school level.</p> <p>C. Funded: Substitute Teachers for ILT's to observe others Lateral Entry Training – Two 10-day series for 21 Lateral Entry teachers</p> <p>D. Focused Areas (as a result of ILT surveys)...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Classroom Management</li> <li>▪ Time Management</li> <li>▪ Discipline</li> </ul> <p>E. Number of Classroom Visits/ILT Meeting Contacts: 2300+ Mentor Logs submitted and on file in ILT Office</p> <p>F. Staff Development Activities completed by District Mentor Teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Weekly/Monthly Meetings with ILT Coordinator</li> <li>▪ <i>Love and Logic</i> Training (copies provided for all ILT 2's)</li> <li>▪ <i>Fred Jones</i> Review (copies provided for all ILT 1's)</li> <li>▪ NC State Mentor Conference, Fall 2004</li> <li>▪ Reading Skills – Connie Prevatte Workshops</li> <li>▪ Technology – Palm Pilot and Excel Training</li> <li>▪ Teacher Academy – WCU – Classroom Management</li> <li>▪ Praxis Workshop</li> <li>▪ NC WISE Training</li> <li>▪ Wrote and received \$500 Foundation Grant for ILT's</li> <li>▪ Participated in the Development of Recruitment Disk for BCS</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Began with 250 ILT's including 21 Lateral Entry</li> <li>➤ Retained 223; lost 27, with 2 of those returning</li> <li>➤ ILT Retention: 89.2% (90%, including two returning)</li> </ul>

<b>Carteret County</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Carteret County Schools proposed supporting 54 beginning teachers during the 2004-2005 school year. Two (2) retired master teachers were to be contracted for a minimum of 20 hours per week for 36 weeks during the school year to support beginning teachers.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 55</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	Funded 1 retired mentor teacher for 50% employment from January, 2005 to May, 2005.
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interviews with Principals cited positive noted changes in ILT1's performances and the desire for continuation of the program</li> <li>▪ Interviews with ILT 1's stated that a feeling of great support was given to them by the Flexible Mentor.</li> <li>▪ Added support for ILT's will result in dramatic increase in his/her retention.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusions</b>	This program was praised by principals and ILT's alike as a necessary and effective support component to retain teachers. A mentor who is also a full time teacher does not have the optimum amount of time to devote to an ILT. The support of the Flex Mentor has positively affected the teachers involved.

<b>Caswell County</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Caswell County Schools proposed to use their mentor teacher funds to employ a certified teacher to serve as a mentor for first and second year initially licensed teachers. The individual employed in this position was to meet with each beginning teacher on a weekly basis, informally observe each beginning teacher and provide written feedback, model effective teaching practices, assess the professional growth needs of each beginning teacher and make recommendations regarding available staff development opportunities, and help beginning teachers access instructional resources. The program was to serve fifteen beginning teachers.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 10</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Funded one lead teacher mentor for 10 ILTs.</li> <li>➤ Lead Mentor teacher was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A retired teacher/administrator with 25 years of teaching experience and 8 years of administrative experience</li> <li>▪ Lead Mentor Teacher had high TPAI-R ratings and evaluations by the superintendent;</li> <li>▪ Lead Mentor Teacher is committed to improving beginning teacher induction</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Focused areas: (number of teachers receiving support and area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Content pedagogy – 10</li> <li>▪ Student development – 10</li> <li>▪ Diverse learners – 10</li> <li>▪ Multiple Instructional strategies - 10</li> <li>▪ Motivation and management - 10</li> <li>▪ Communication and Technology - 10</li> <li>▪ Planning – 10</li> <li>▪ Assessment – 10</li> <li>▪ Reflective Practice -10</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Total number of classroom visits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lead Mentor Teacher was committed to meeting with ILT on an as needed basis. Mentor logs reflect many meetings of 5, 10, 15 minutes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Each ILT was required to meet with the Lead Mentor Teacher mentor at least once per week for formal meetings addressing INTASC Standards. Mentor logs document these meetings. Most mentors and ILTs met once a week and addressed both formal and informal objectives. Mentor logs document these meetings. Time of these meetings was 30 to 45 minutes each.</p>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, same site: 7</li> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, transferred site: 0</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, same site: 0</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, transferred site: 0</li> <li>➤ Non-reappointed: 0</li> <li>➤ Resigned: 3</li> <li>➤ ILTs remaining in Caswell County Schools: 70%</li> </ul>

<b>Caswell County</b>	
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The above data suggests that this program in past year was effective in helping retain teachers in our system. We lost 3 ILTs. Two moved to a neighboring LEA, and the other resigned to get an advanced degree. The turnover in our system was not for lack of support. Administrators were pleased to have one Lead Mentor Teacher. ILTs were pleased to forge a support bond with an experienced colleague who was committed to the mentor process.</p> <p>The Lead Mentor Teacher kept a contact sheet on each ILT, which was designed by the Lead Mentor Teacher. The focus for each meeting was “on demand”, “on time” support and the INTASC Standards. The mentors documented the type of support and which standards they were addressing with each meeting.</p> <p>Mentor teachers gave positive feedback of the program. ILTs liked the “on time” support of the program.</p>

<b>Catawba County Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Catawba County Schools proposed to use their mentor funds to provide additional support to initially licensed teachers by creating a tiered system of assistance. Mentors were to serve two beginning teachers, lead mentors were to serve one beginning teacher and facilitate school-based activities for beginning teachers, and master mentors were to be employed centrally to serve beginning teachers identified by the system's Director of Professional Learning. Lead mentors were to apply and be selected centrally. Master mentors were to apply and be selected centrally. It was expected that the master mentors would be retired teachers. The program was to serve 154 beginning teachers. The system was to use a portion of its Title II funding to supplement the cost of the program.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 163</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<p><b>Funded 77 Individual Mentors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Worked with ILTs 1-3 on an individual basis</li> <li>▪ Documented support provided through use of monthly mentor checklists</li> <li>▪ Participated in mentor updates</li> <li>▪ Provided other support services as needed</li> </ul> <p><b>Funded 25 Lead Mentors (1 per school) who acted in the following capacity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Acted as primary liaison for the Director of Professional Learning</li> <li>▪ Worked as needed with the summer and monthly Beginning Teacher Institute sessions</li> <li>▪ Facilitated provision of school-based ILT support through regular, monthly sharing/learning opportunities</li> <li>▪ Instigated and documented support acts provided for ILT's by grade level/department peers</li> <li>▪ Assured Individual Mentors were adhering to district and state requirements for service, meeting attendance, and documentation</li> <li>▪ Participated in county level mentor training sessions</li> <li>▪ Provided other support services as needed</li> </ul> <p><b>Funded Eight Master Mentors who acted in the following capacity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Completed 541 total hours of ILT support</li> <li>▪ Served 14 ILTs including 8 Lateral Entry ILTs</li> <li>▪ ILT areas were high school math and business as well as elementary grades 1, 4, 5 and Exceptional Children</li> <li>▪ Focus areas included writing, classroom management, planning, organization and instructional strategies</li> <li>▪ 112 classroom visits total were made</li> <li>▪ Provided observations and timely feedback to ILT's</li> <li>▪ Modeled lessons in the ILT's classroom</li> <li>▪ Assisted with planning and resource development</li> <li>▪ Assisted ILT's with using student achievement data to plan instruction</li> <li>▪ Provide other support services as needed</li> </ul> <p>Note: Master Mentors also served veteran teachers in need through the use of Title I and II funds. These services were provided as requested by principals because of the effectiveness of the program for ILTs.</p>

<b>Catawba County Schools</b>	
<b>Outcomes</b>	<p><i>Based on the 14 ILTs served by the Master Mentors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, same site: 8</li> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, transferred site: 0</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, same site: 1</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, transferred site: 2</li> <li>➤ Non-reappointed: 2</li> <li>➤ Resigned: 1</li> <li>➤ ILTs remaining in Catawba County Schools: 78.6%</li> </ul> <p><b>Three-year Overall Retention Rate: 83.7%</b></p> <p>This percentage represents an increase of 6.7% over the previous three year rate.</p> <p><b>Goals from the original Mentor Flex Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The overall retention rate for ILT-1's at the end of the 2004-2005 school year will increase by 5% over the average of the previous three years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Met at an increase of 7.7% (76.3% in 03-04; 84% in 04-05)</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ The retention rate for lateral entry and provisional ILT-1's at the end of the 2004-2005 school year will increase by 10% over the average of the previous three years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Met at an increase of 10% (68% in 03-04; 78% in 04-05)</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ The overall retention rate for all ILT's at the end of the 2004-2005 school year will increase by 3% over the average of the three previous years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Met at an increase of 4.4% (76.3% in 03-04; 80.7% in 04-05)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Due to the changes in the overall mentoring program, both principals and central level administrators have increased buy-in to the program.</li> <li>➤ ILT perception of the mentoring program is more positive based on end of the year surveys and ILT meetings.</li> <li>➤ There are implications for increased support for struggling veteran teachers based upon the Master Mentor model. Two principals requested this type of support for veterans in their schools based on the positive effects the program had with ILTs. This strategy, supported by funding from Title I and II, will be put into place for the 2005-2006 school year as needed.</li> <li>➤ The placement of a Lead Mentor in each school site was also viewed positively by ILTs and Mentors based on survey results. More effort will be made to build the program at the middle and high school level during the 2005-2006 school year. The upper grade levels struggled to overcome time issues with after school activities. An online discussion board has been constructed to meet some of these needs.</li> </ul>

### Baseline Data for All ILTs in Catawba County Schools

		Number in Cohort in 2002-2003	Number in Cohort in 2003- 2004	Retention Rate	Number in Cohort in 2004-2005	Retention Rate	Number in Cohort in 2005-2006	Retention Rate
<b>Cohort I 2002-2003</b>	<i>All ILT I</i>	53	42	79%	42	79%	42	79%
	<i>LE/Prov</i>	12	5	42%	5	42%	5	42%
	<i>CEdG</i>	41	37	90%	37	90%	37	90%
<b>Cohort II 2003-2004</b>	<i>All ILT I</i>		53		47	88%	42	79%
	<i>LE/Prov</i>		26		22	84%	20	77%
	<i>CEdG</i>		27		25	92%	22	81%
<b>Cohort III 2004-2005</b>	<i>All ILT I</i>				51		43	84%
	<i>LE/Prov</i>				18		14	78%
	<i>CEdG</i>				33		29	88%

**Note:**      **LE/Prov** = lateral entry/provisional  
                 **CEdG** = college education department graduate

<b>Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools was to support 144 beginning teachers during the 2004-2005 school year. A comprehensive program of support was to include traditional one-to-one mentoring, full-time mentoring by a retired teacher, school level coordination by lead mentors and focused assistance to identified beginning teachers. One (1) retired teacher was to be hired to serve 15 new teachers and contract for \$150 for 90 days. A lead mentor was to be designated per school for 15 schools with \$1,000 per year compensation. Site-based one-to-one mentors were to be paid to work with beginning teachers not served by the full-time mentor. A focused assistance mentor was to be hired part-time to provide additional assistance to identified beginning teachers.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 137</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Provided focused mentoring support via Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Consulting Teachers from August 2004-May 2005 (approximately one-tenth of time for the three persons) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In collaboration with the Mentor</li> <li>▪ To Lateral Entry teachers in collaboration with the Mentor</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Funded school-based mentoring services to 13 ILT1's across the district</li> <li>➤ Supported New Teacher Support Group which was facilitated by the Coordinator of Teacher Recruitment and the 3 PAR Consulting Teachers. The new teacher support group met monthly. Support was provided in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Classroom Management</li> <li>▪ Classroom Organization</li> <li>▪ Lesson Planning</li> <li>▪ Teacher/ Teacher Assistant Communication</li> <li>▪ Parent/Community Communication</li> <li>▪ Collaboration with the Mentor</li> <li>▪ Testing</li> <li>▪ Cooperative Learning</li> <li>▪ Licensing/ILT Requirements</li> <li>▪ Coursework</li> <li>▪ General Support</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Experienced a 87% return rate of ILT1's (54 out of 62 returned)</li> <li>➤ Experienced a 100% return rate for Lateral Entry Teachers (3 of 3)</li> <li>➤ Surveys from ILT's indicated that a strong sense of support was provided by the PAR Consulting Teachers and the New Teacher Support Group</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>Principals and Teachers greatly value the support components of Mentoring. Feedback data supports this conclusion. Because consulting Teachers are released from classroom responsibility, they are available to provide focused services that the Mentor who is also a classroom teacher is not. They are able to meet with a teacher at the teacher's convenience. This is greatly valued across the district.</p> <p>The impact of these activities helps to ensure that a qualified teacher is in each classroom. Having a qualified teacher in each classroom ensures high levels of student achievement.</p> <p>This has proven to be an effective program and would like to continue it for the 2005-2006 school year.</p>



<b>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools proposed to support approximately 1,650 beginning teacher in the 2004-2005 school year. Twenty-four (24) full-time mentors were to be employed. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg plan included a combination of full-time mentors and site-based mentors with a combination of funding from state mentor funds, grants, and federal monies. Site-based mentors were to serve up to 2 ILTs. The full-time mentor pilot has strengthened the site-based mentoring program in Charlotte-Mecklenburg.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program:</b> 1,661 (Full time mentors served on average 408 teachers at a ratio of 1:15-18. Site-based mentors served on average 1,253 teachers at a ratio of 1:1-3.)	
<b>Activities</b>	<p><b>Full-time Mentor Program:</b></p> <p>Full-time Mentors are released classroom teachers that work with up to eighteen 1<sup>st</sup> and/or 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers who are not mentored by anyone at the school site. The Full-time Mentor spends an average of two or more hours per week with the teachers in their caseload, based on individual teacher needs. The Full-time Mentors receive continuous training to enhance skills and knowledge. They may provide teacher development workshops after school. In addition, Full-time Mentors may work with one or more school sites.</p> <p><b>Full-time Mentor selection criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minimum of five years teaching experience</li> <li>▪ Site-based Mentor Training</li> <li>▪ Served as a Site-based Mentor</li> <li>▪ Excellent written and verbal communication skills</li> <li>▪ Knowledge of CMS policies and procedures</li> <li>▪ Masters Degree in Education preferred</li> <li>▪ Valid North Carolina teaching license</li> <li>▪ Administrative recommendation</li> </ul> <p><b>Services provided by Full-time Mentors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Informal classroom observations</li> <li>▪ One-on-one conferences</li> <li>▪ Team teaching opportunities</li> <li>▪ Demonstration lessons</li> <li>▪ Assistance with lesson design/plans</li> <li>▪ Modeling of effective teaching strategies</li> <li>▪ Modeling of effective management strategies</li> <li>▪ Assist with State Licensure requirements and process</li> <li>▪ Emotional support</li> <li>▪ On-going professional development opportunities</li> <li>▪ Act a resource</li> <li>▪ Knowledge of CMS and State policies and procedures</li> <li>▪ Arrange observations of experienced teachers</li> </ul> <p><b>Full-time Mentor training is ongoing monthly and includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coaching strategies – peer coaching and cognitive coaching</li> <li>▪ TPAI-R and INTASC Standards</li> <li>▪ Analysis of Student Work</li> <li>▪ Effective teaching strategies</li> <li>▪ Up-to-date Licensure requirements and information</li> </ul>

<b>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ System initiatives as they are implemented (i.e. Open Court, A+ Focus Lessons)</li> <li>▪ Peer Collaboration</li> <li>▪ Communication skills</li> <li>▪ Leadership training</li> <li>▪ Learning styles</li> <li>▪ Cooperative learning strategies</li> <li>▪ Technology skills</li> <li>▪ Praxis training</li> <li>▪ Understanding of new teacher development/needs</li> </ul> <p><b>Site-based Mentor Program:</b></p> <p>Site-based Mentors are teachers at the school site who work with one 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> year teacher at the mentor's own school site in conjunction with their regularly assigned duties. They may actually mentor more than one teacher, but currently receive payment for the mentoring of only one teacher. They must attend and complete state-mandated mentor training to qualify. The mentors of entry-level instructional support personnel are included in this program.</p> <p><b>Site-based Mentor selection criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tenured or experienced teachers with a minimum of three years successful teaching (no Lateral Entry or Initially Licensed teachers)</li> <li>▪ Valid North Carolina teaching license</li> <li>▪ Principal recommendation</li> <li>▪ Appraisal rating among highest in school</li> <li>▪ Same content and/or grade level preferred</li> <li>▪ Familiarity with district initiatives, resources, and curriculum</li> </ul> <p><b>Site-based Mentor Services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One-on-one conferences</li> <li>▪ Emotional support</li> <li>▪ Assist with State Licensure requirements and process</li> <li>▪ Act as a resource</li> <li>▪ Knowledge of CMS and State policies and procedures</li> <li>▪ Optional informal classroom observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Site-based Mentor training:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One-time training within a five year period utilizing the State Based Mentor Standards</li> <li>▪ Introduction to coaching strategies</li> <li>▪ Initial licensure information</li> <li>▪ Understanding of new teacher development</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Full-time Mentor program retained 82.5% in the first year, 87% in the second year, and 81.9% in the third year</li> <li>➤ Site-based Mentor program retained 68% in the first year that two models were in place, 75% in the second year, and 80.94% in the third year</li> <li>➤ Because of the success of the Full-time Mentor program model, the training for Site-based Mentors now incorporates strategies from that program along with the new State Mentor Standards</li> <li>➤ Retention rate of teachers served by the Site-based mentor program continues to improve</li> </ul>

<b>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools</b>	
	➤ Important to note that population currently served by Full-time Mentor model consists of teachers in lower-income, lower-achieving schools
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>Since the implementation of the Full-time Mentor program, CMS has seen improved retention of first and second year teachers. Because of the success of the Full-time Mentor program model, the training for Site-based Mentors now incorporates and adapts strategies from that program. As a result, the retention rate of teachers served by the Site-based Mentor program has seen improvement.</p> <p>Research shows that the cost of replacing each new teacher who leaves education is in the tens of thousands of dollars. Improved teacher retention not only will save money in mentor funding, but also in the replacement costs such as recruitment, of hiring new teachers every year.</p> <p>Research also shows the direct correlation between increasing teacher quality and student achievement. Teacher quality has the greatest impact on student achievement, more than reduction in class size and other non-instructional programs. Improving teacher competency leads to increased student achievement at a fraction of the cost of recruitment, lost productivity and other direct and indirect costs.</p> <p>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools would like to use state funds for the Full-time Mentor program, in addition to the Site-based program. Additionally, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools would like the option of using State funds to pay Site-based Mentors for up to two teachers being mentored (i.e. maximum of \$200 monthly), where no other well-qualified, experienced teachers are available. Funds would continue to be supplemented for full-time mentors by additional funding sources to comprise the remainder of the teacher-level, Full-time Mentor salaries. Our district favors reinstatement of State mentor funds for mentors of locally funded teachers.</p>

<b>Cumberland County Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Cumberland County Schools proposed to use their mentor funds to hire retired teachers to serve as mentors for first year teachers at the middle school and high school levels at a ratio of one retired teacher for every 15 first year teachers. The middle and high school levels were selected as the focus because the ratio of new teachers to mentors and turnover rates are highest at these levels. The retired teacher mentors were to be selected based on demonstrated excellence in teaching. If sufficient numbers of retired teachers were not available, the system was to use the funds to provide released time for on-staff veteran teachers to serve in these roles. The proposed program was designed to address needs identified by the system. It will provide a support person who has the flexibility to create an accommodating schedule to assist new teachers without having full-time teaching responsibilities. The proposed program was to serve four hundred eighty-nine (489) teachers.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program:</b> 1065 (1 or 2 by Classroom Mentor Teachers Maximum 15 ILT 1's by Retired Teachers [PALS])	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Funded 15 retired mentor teachers (PALS) for 25% employment from August 2004-May 2005 who mentored ILT 1's at Middle Schools and High Schools</li> <li>➤ An on-site mentor was assigned to the ILT 2's and 3's in Middle Schools and High Schools</li> <li>➤ An on-site mentor was assigned to all ILTs at the Elementary Schools</li> <li>➤ The PALS met every week with the ILT 1's at the Middle Schools and High Schools to offer support in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Classroom Management</li> <li>▪ Diversity/Instructional Strategies</li> <li>▪ Learning Styles</li> <li>▪ Lesson Planning</li> <li>▪ Parent/Community Communication</li> <li>▪ Testing</li> <li>▪ Cooperative Learning</li> <li>▪ Licensing/ILT Requirements</li> <li>▪ Coursework</li> <li>▪ General Support</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The number of ILT 1's dropped from 200 during the 2004-2005 SY to an anticipated 150 for the 2005-2006 SY</li> <li>➤ Interviews with Principals cited positive noted changes in ILT 1's performances and the desire for continuation of the program</li> <li>➤ Interviews with ILT 1's stated that a feeling of great support was given to them by the PALS (Retired Teachers)</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusions</b>	After conducting interviews with ILT 1's and Principals, this program was highly praised as a necessary and effective support component to retain teachers. The data also supports this conclusion. The PALS who worked with the ILT 1's at high schools and middle schools stated, "they did not know how a classroom teacher could possibly meet all the needs of support of the first year teachers." With the dynamics of high schools and middle schools mentors of ILT 1's are disadvantaged by size of the school and limited mentors in subject areas. When the needs of the ILT decrease the 2 <sup>nd</sup> year the mentor can more effectively mentor within those parameters. The dynamics of the elementary schools provide a closer proximity for mentoring and it is suggested to the principals they assign mentors from the same grade level whenever possible.

<b>Cumberland County Schools</b>	
	<p>The mentors maintained contact sheets to record the meetings with ILTs. This was done by every mentor at every level and reported to the Mentor Facilitator. The INTASC Standards were addressed and documented also on this record.</p> <p>This has proven to be an effective program and would like to continue it for the 2005-2006 school year.</p>

<b>Davie County Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Davie County Schools proposed to serve approximately 50 beginning teachers in the 2004-2005 school year. Up to ten (10) retired Master Mentors were to be hired to serve no more than 5 ILTs per month. The Master Mentor will be employed for \$100 per month per ILT served.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 50</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<p>In order to better serve the needs of our beginning teachers and to substantially increase the amount of quality contact time between mentors and their mentees, we recruited a core of qualified retired teachers to deliver mentoring and support services to our ILTs.</p> <p>These 11 mentors were designated MasterMentors, were assigned a maximum of 5 mentees each, and were able to deliver services to each of our 50 ILTs with the expectation that they would average 1-2 hours of contact time with each mentee weekly. MasterMentors were also required to attend Central Office meetings in order to assure quality control of the services delivered throughout our county.</p> <p>Each MasterMentor received instruction/training in each of the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mentor Training</li> <li>▪ TPAI-R</li> <li>▪ Mentor Handbook</li> <li>▪ Mentor Requirements and Expectations</li> <li>▪ Mentor Contact Logs</li> <li>▪ IGP Development and Support</li> <li>▪ INTASC Standards</li> <li>▪ Observations/Data Collection</li> <li>▪ Classroom Management Plans</li> <li>▪ NC Standard Courses of Study</li> <li>▪ Communications/Scheduling</li> <li>▪ Documentation of services delivered</li> </ul> <p>Each MasterMentor delivered the following services to their mentees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1<sup>st</sup> workday site orientation</li> <li>▪ 1-2 hours of weekly contact</li> <li>▪ Classroom discipline/procedure plan development</li> <li>▪ Establishment of professional reflection journal</li> <li>▪ Lesson planning formats</li> <li>▪ Development of IGP/INTASC Standards assessments</li> <li>▪ Establishment of a professional folder/file</li> <li>▪ Parent conferencing</li> <li>▪ Classroom problem-solving</li> <li>▪ Use of technology in the classroom</li> <li>▪ Informal observations</li> <li>▪ Formal observation/evaluation review and feedback</li> <li>▪ Individual ILT requested services</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	Our original proposal cited our need to substantially increase the number of weekly contact hours an ILT spends in quality conference time with his/her assigned mentor in order to insure beginning teacher retention and improve the

<b>Davie County Schools</b>	
	<p>quality of our program.</p> <p>As our baseline date, we used a report from our 2003-2004 ILTs which indicated that our ILTs had spent an average of 32.71 minutes in sit-down conference time per week with their mentors.</p> <p>The same report of data gathered from our 2004-2005 ILTs indicated an increase of 30 minutes of mentor/mentee conference time per week bringing our average weekly contact time to 73 minutes per week.</p> <p>Also of the 50 ILTs;</p> <p>36 remained in the same position, same site  1 remained in the same position, different site  3 were not reappointed  10 resigned- 3 returning to home state, 2 due to inability to proceed with licensure requirements, 4 took jobs in other NC LEAs, 1 reason not known</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>We believe that the significant increase in the amount of mentee/mentor contact time as documented by mentor logs and anecdotal data strongly suggests that the bonds between the mentors and their mentees were significantly strengthened. For most of our retired mentors, their work as a MasterMentor was their only employment and we believe that this allowed a greater focus on helping our ILTs.</p> <p>By meeting with the MasterMentors as group and soliciting and implementing their suggestions for changes to the program, these mentors assumed an ownership of the program and were continually seeking ways to better deliver support services.</p> <p>One of the most significant changes in mentors was their ability to strongly advocate for their ILTs without fear of repercussion from the site principal. Many of our MasterMentors who were mentors in our former mentoring program cited this as a great advantage in that they were not supervised by nor were they accountable to site administrators and felt they had great freedom to advocate for any changes they felt need to be made to assist their ILTs.</p> <p>We had much positive feedback from our administrators as they believe that MasterMentors were able to deliver quality support services to the ILTs due to focusing on that one job instead of having to deliver services while maintaining their own classroom assignments.</p>

<b>Guilford County Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Guilford County Schools proposed to serve approximately 780 beginning teachers during the 2004-2005 school year. A comprehensive program of site-based mentors, lead mentors and full-time instructional specialists was to be used in this program. Five (5) full-time Instructional Specialists were to work with beginning teachers to do lesson planning and aligning teaching strategies with the NCSCOS. The Instructional Specialists were to be contracted at \$100 per day for 90 days. Building level lead mentors were to be compensated \$500 per year. Site-base mentors were to serve up to 2 ILTs.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program:</b> 1,004	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Funded an ILT Coach and a Lateral Entry Coach who coordinated orientation, orientation make-up, Right Start Academy classes, Right Start Seminars for ILTs and orientation and planning sessions for Professional Learning Coaches, Induction Coordinators (ILT building coordinators), and mentors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A Three Day Orientation was held on July 30<sup>th</sup>, August 2, and August 3<sup>rd</sup> attended by 205 ILT1s</li> <li>▪ A Three Day Orientation Makeup was held September 11, 25, and October 2 attended by 50 ILT1s</li> <li>▪ Three system-wide Right Start Seminars were held for all ILT1s (September 11<sup>th</sup>, Classroom Management (Marzano's "Classroom Management that Works") attended by 186 ILT1s, December 8, Stress Management attended by 250 ILT1s, and April 27, Mentor of the Year celebration and Update from Mark Doane "What are the NC Requirements for an ILT2" attended by 205 ILT1s</li> <li>▪ Three Right Start Academy Sessions which focused on Classroom Management were held. 15 elementary ILT1s attended 5, 2-hours sessions which were held in November, December, and January. 21 middle and high school teachers attended a 10 hour session on November 5 and 6. These teachers requested additional assistance in classroom management or were required by the building principal to attend. On February 21<sup>st</sup>, 104 lateral entry teachers attended a 4 hour session on Setting Limits in the Classroom (Robert J. MacKenzie). They each received a copy of the book by the same title.</li> <li>▪ Four system wide meeting were held with Induction Coordinators between July, 2004 and June, 2005. The Induction Coordinators were asked to complete an evaluation at the last session in May. The results indicated that most felt the ILT Coach and Lateral Entry Coach have been readily available to answer their questions and provide needed resources.</li> <li>▪ Provided 10 Day Lateral Entry Certification prior to school beginning and throughout the year for 130 new lateral entry teachers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Funded 100 Induction Coordinators (building level lead mentors) The Induction Coordinators coordinated the support for new teachers in their school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assisted principals in assigning mentors and buddies. As a result of their help, mentors were assigned much earlier.</li> <li>▪ Held monthly meetings with ILTs in the school and semester meetings with mentors</li> <li>▪ Submitted two semester reports documenting the number of meetings held with topics, number of ILTs and mentors served, and the number of new teachers who had been hired or who had resigned during each semester.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



<b>Guilford County Schools</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Distributed the GCS New Teacher Notebook and other support materials to the new teachers and the mentor handbooks and updates to the mentors.</li> <li>▪ Helped ILTs and mentors or requested help for the new teachers or mentors from the ILT Coach or Lateral Entry Coach when needed.</li> </ul> <p>➤ Funded 3 retired master teachers (Professional Learning Coaches) 10 days each month beginning July, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PLCs were professionally competent and experienced, had excellent knowledge of pedagogy and subject matter, enthusiastic and passionate for teaching, fair and consistent observers of classroom practice, and were able to effectively communicate using higher order thinking questions prompting reflection, and were able to critique new teachers in a positive and productive way</li> <li>▪ PLCs served identified ILTs in schools impacted by a large number of new teachers and/or difficult teaching assignments</li> <li>▪ 101 ILT1s received additional mentoring from PLCs in the following areas: 32 were elementary, 31 middle school, and 38 high school. 18 schools were served. Of the 101 ILT1s, 50 of these teachers were lateral entry. These teachers received support in classroom management, planning, instructional strategies, time management, and organizational skill. .</li> <li>▪ During the months the PLCs worked, each assigned ILT received a minimum of one classroom visit per month with each teacher they were assigned. If a teacher was having great difficulty they received additional visits and had phone conferences with their PLC. Of the 101 ILT1s served by PLCs, 85 of these teachers will be returning to GCS for 2005-2006 year</li> </ul> <p>➤ Funded 615 mentors (Most mentors served two teachers.)</p> <p>➤ Funded materials for new teachers and mentors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Materials for all new teachers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right Start New Teacher Notebook used in orientation</li> <li>• GCS Right Start Resource CD (hyperlinks to educational websites, lesson planning formats, banners, etc) used in orientation</li> <li>• <u>First Days of School</u> by Harry Wong- given to all lateral entry teachers and used in 10 Day Lateral Entry Certification training</li> <li>• <u>First-Class Teacher</u>, Canter and Associates- given to all new elementary teachers and used in orientation</li> <li>• <u>Why Didn't I Learn This in College?</u> by Paula Rutherford- given to all new middle and high school teachers and used in orientation</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Materials for Induction Coordinators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Induction Coordinators received a set of the materials that were distributed to the ILTs at their school so they could use the same materials in the monthly seminars.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Materials for mentors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentors received the GCS Mentor Handbook</li> <li>• Newly trained mentors receive the NC Mentor Handbook and other training materials</li> <li>• Note: 65 new mentors were trained in GCS. Beginning dates for the 4 sessions were September 22, September 23, 2004, February 5, and June 6, 2005</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	➤ Remained in the Guilford County Schools: 903

Guilford County Schools	
	<p>➤ Resigned: 101 Reasons for resigning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Failure to obtain or maintain license: 1</li> <li>▪ Teaching in another NC LEA: 28</li> <li>▪ Educational: 4</li> <li>▪ Relocation of family: 21</li> <li>▪ Teaching in another state: 11</li> <li>▪ Dissatisfied with teaching: 1</li> <li>▪ Health: 2</li> <li>▪ Other: 7</li> <li>▪ Unknown: 8</li> <li>▪ Teaching in NC Charter School: 3</li> <li>▪ Teaching in private school : 2</li> <li>▪ Career Change: 6</li> <li>▪ Family Responsibilities/child care: 7</li> </ul> <p>➤ ILTs remaining in Guilford County Schools: 90%</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The above data suggests that this program was effective in helping retain teachers in our system. The unanimous support of the administrators was vital in implementation. The Induction Coordinators in each school were new to this responsibility and were learning. Administrators and new teachers felt that most of the Induction Coordinators were helpful and available. The Induction Coordinators submitted semester reports regarding the number of new teachers and mentors at their school and information regarding the monthly meetings held. More than half of the Induction Coordinators will return to this position for next year. The most common reason an Induction Coordinator will not return to this position for next year is reassignment to an administrative role.</p> <p>Classroom management continues to be the number one priority in working with new teachers. The Right Start Seminars and the Right Start New Teacher Academy classes were additional support in this area. We plan to expand classroom management support in the academy. Sessions will be available throughout the year for new teachers.</p> <p>The Professional Learning Coaches were a great support to our new teachers in difficult assignments at the beginning of the year. We had difficulty retaining our PLCs. Reasons cited were salary and number of new teachers to be served. We plan to focus PLC support by having them serve in no more than three schools each and monitor the number of new teachers each serves.</p> <p>Evaluations from new teachers and Induction Coordinators indicated that the ILT Coach and Lateral Entry Coach were available and supportive. It is very important to continue to create this community of support for our new teachers.</p>

<b>Henderson County</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Henderson County Schools proposed to serve approximately 150 beginning teachers during the 2004-2005 school year. Three (3) full-time mentors were to be employed for 80 days at \$175 per day to work with first and second year teachers. Additional funding to support this program was to come from federal sources.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 55</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Funded one retired administrator for an eighty-five day, flexible period from November 2004 -May 2005</li> <li>➤ The retired administrator served identified ILT II's and some III's at all school levels</li> <li>➤ Focused areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ classroom management</li> <li>▪ student supervision</li> <li>▪ instructional planning</li> <li>▪ instruction delivery methodology</li> <li>▪ time-on-task</li> <li>▪ classroom organization</li> <li>▪ promoting positive public relations in the school and community</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Total number of classroom visits: 220 (minimum). Each teacher was visited a minimum of four (4) times – one (1) consultation and a minimum of three (3) observations and conferences</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remained in the same position, same site: 52</li> <li>➤ Changed positions, transferred site: 1</li> <li>➤ Resigned (transfer to another LEA): 1</li> <li>➤ Resigned (family care): 1</li> <li>➤ ILTs remaining in Henderson County Public Schools: 53 of 55 = 96.4%</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The above data suggests that this initiative was quite effective in helping retain teachers in our system. The support of the building-level administrators was vital in its implementation and success.</p> <p>I look forward to the continuation of this initiative for the 2005-2006 school year. The success of this year's initiative proved to be beneficial in enhancing the quality of teaching as well as teacher retention.</p> <p>Additionally, for the 2005 – 2006 school year, Henderson County Public Schools will be contracting with a retired Director of Education to work exclusively with our ILT-I's in a capacity similar to that for which we had formerly contracted with NCCAT.</p>

<b>Orange County</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Orange County Schools proposed to serve 48 beginning teachers during the 2004-2005 school year. Four (4) full-time mentors were to be contracted to work a minimum of 20 hours per week and serve 12 to 16 beginning teachers. Contracted pay rate was to be \$25 per hour for these fulltime-mentors. Schools with the highest turn-over rate were to be targeted by the full-time mentoring program.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 84</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<p><b>77 Individual Mentors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Worked with ILTs 1-3 on an individual basis</li> <li>▪ Documented support provided through use of monthly mentor checklists</li> <li>▪ Participated in mentor updates</li> <li>▪ Provided other support services as needed</li> </ul> <p><b>Funded Three Master Mentors who acted in the following capacity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Help the ILT to establish grading policies. Explain report card procedures.</li> <li>▪ Spend time reviewing the SCOS with the ILT. Make sure they are aware of any End-of-Grade testing for their subject area. Guide them in ways to prepare their students for testing.</li> <li>▪ Help Exceptional Children's teachers to establish a relationship with classroom teachers.</li> <li>▪ Review the SCOS with Exceptional Needs teachers so that they are aware of curriculum requirements set by the state. Help to form a collaborative working relationship between the EC teacher and regular classroom teacher.</li> <li>▪ Guide the ILT as he/she establishes discipline policies, routines and procedures. Explain county discipline policies.</li> <li>▪ Introduce ILT to all support staff in the building. Help them to understand how each support person is able to assist them.</li> <li>▪ Teach ILT the EC process. Assist them as they go through the process with any students. Help ILT develop strategies to use with special needs students.</li> <li>▪ Act as a support person in parent conferences when needed.</li> <li>▪ Meet with each ILT on a regular basis.</li> <li>▪ Explain the evaluation process. Go over the TPAI-R with the ILT. Make sure they understand how to show evidence in each area of the TPAI.</li> <li>▪ Assist ILT in development of IGP.</li> <li>▪ Assist ILT in the process of differentiation within the classroom.</li> <li>▪ Assist ILT with retention policies; make sure they are aware of deadlines associated with retentions.</li> <li>▪ Assist ILT with EOC/EOG testing procedures. Make sure they know what is tested and when testing occurs.</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<p>The turnover rate for beginning teachers (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year) and entry-level instructional support personnel in the LEA will be reduced from a total number of 36 at the end of the 2002-03 school year. The number 36 will be reduced by 10% from the 2004-05 to the 2005-06 school year.</p> <p>➤ More than met with only fifteen (18%) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers leaving. That is a decrease of 58%.</p> <p>Based on an annual survey of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year ILTs, the percentage of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year ILTs who "strongly agree" or "agree" that their mentor was an effective role model, advisor and resource person will increase from 84% in 2002-03 to 90% in</p>

<b>Orange County</b>	
	<p>2004-05 school year.</p> <p>Based on an annual survey of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year ILTs, the percentage of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year ILTs who “strongly agree” or “agree” that their mentor interacted with them on a regular basis to maintain open communication and to assess progress will increase from 88% in 2002-03 to 92% in 2004-05 school year.</p> <p>Based on an annual survey of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year ILTs, the percentage of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year ILTs who “strongly agree” or “agree” that their mentor was effective as a mentor to them will increase from 86% in 2002-03 to 95% in 2004-05 school year.</p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Fewer ILT 1’s and 2’s left the school system</li> <li>➤ Effective mentors supported beginning teachers and helped their self confidence.</li> <li>➤ Veteran mentors felt empowered helping preserve good teachers.</li> <li>➤ ILTs developed closer relationships with peers and the community.</li> <li>➤ The open sharing of teacher’s “best practices” became the norm.</li> <li>➤ A system of professional collegiality was established and maintained.</li> </ul>

<b>Pitt County Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	Pitt County Schools proposed to use the flexible funding to hire three retired master teachers/administrators to mentor beginning teachers through a “content area assignment configuration.” The proposed program was to allow for expanded mentoring support based on continued assessment of the needs of beginning teachers, improved selection and matching of mentors and beginning teachers, provide the beginning teacher with several different mentors, and affect change in the classroom by providing additional on-site assistance to beginning teachers. The system proposed to pay 127 mentors \$125 per month to mentor two beginning teachers each, 33 mentors \$125 per month to mentor one beginning teacher and serve as lead mentors, and three retired teachers/administrators on a contracted basis to serve as content specialists.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 418</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Funded one retired master teacher (RMT) August 2004 – April 2005.</li> <li>➤ RMT was a former Teacher of the Year and Regional Teacher of the Year.</li> <li>➤ RMT served identified ILTs at the elementary level.</li> <li>➤ Funded one retired master teacher (RMT) January 2005 – May 2005.</li> <li>➤ RMT was a former Assistant Principal and during 2004-05 taught one Advanced Placement English course.</li> <li>➤ RMT served identified ILTs at the high school level.</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Elementary level: 65.2% retention of those receiving services.</li> <li>➤ High School level: 89.3% retention of those receiving services.</li> <li>➤ Middle School level: a RMT was not hired to work specifically with this level (see section IV); however, there were no referrals for RMT assistance; school site mentors were able to provide needed assistance.</li> <li>➤ Of the 88 ILTs receiving significant support from the RMT, 3.4% were non-reappointed, 12.5% resigned, 1.1% moved to TA position (working in PCS '05-06), and 83% will continue with Pitt County Schools during 2005-06.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>The above data suggests this program is effective in helping retain teachers in the Pitt County Schools system. The unanimous support of the administrators was vital in implementation. One RMT noted that in working with the ILTs she “often had to focus on the need for their awareness that students should be engaged in the lesson. Lateral entry teachers were more open and willing to receive help. Classroom management continues to be the number one priority in working with lateral entry teachers and overall it is their weakest area.”</p> <p>The RMTs maintained a contact sheet on each ILT, which was provided by the ILT Coordinator. The focus for the initial visit was given to the RMTs who had the flexibility to add focus areas, as deemed necessary in order to provide sustained feedback.</p> <p>During 2004-05 we still were not at full implementation toward the goal to hire three RMTs, which would add one to the middle school level. We were fortunate this year that on-site mentors were able to assist their mentees and with administrative support none were referred for specific help from the RMT. Our program will be fully implemented with the 2005-06 school year. There has been some difficulty in finding RMTs for the program. Many of them seek additional employment at schools in remediation positions; therefore, affording them more income than the \$100 rate currently paid to the RMTs. The key to this position related to incentives is time flexibility. There has been more interest in these positions for the 2005-06 school year.</p>

### Additional Information Submitted by Pitt County Schools

#### Beginning Teachers at the Elementary Level

	ILT-1	ILT-2	ILT-3	LATERALS	TOTAL
ILTs Receiving Services	10 43.5%	8 34.8%	5 21.7%	2	23
Non-Reappoints	1	1	1	0	3 13.1%
Resignations	2	2	1	1	5 21.7%
Retained	7	5	3	1	15 65.2%

- Of the five resignations, ILT responses indicated two due to family relocations and three due to personal reasons.
- Served one teacher who was experienced probationary but new to PCS who needed help with classroom management and planning.

Areas of Focus	ILTs K-5 receiving support from RMT
Class Management	18
EOG Preparation	2
Follow-up from 04-05	9
Grouping	1
Planning	3
Teaching Strategies	10
Time Management	3
Transitions	7

Number of classroom visits	Number of ILTs receiving visits from RMT
2	5
3	4
4	1
5	4
6	6
8	1
9	2
11	1
TOTAL NUMBER VISITS 119 ( = Number of ILTs x number of classroom visits).	

## Beginning Teachers at the High School Level

	ILT-1	ILT-2	ILT-3	LATERALS	TOTAL
ILTs Receiving Services	22 33.8%	28 43.1%	15 23.1%	31	65
Non-Reappoints	0	0	0	0	0
Resignations	3	2	1	1	6 9.2%
Moved to TA position for 05-06 (needs to pass Praxis)		1			1 1.5%
Retained	19	25	14	29	58 89.3%

- Of the seven resignations, ILT responses indicated one due to family relocation, two due to career change (neither of these was a lateral entry; however, one was only employed 1/3/05-6/305), one due to continuing education, and two due to employment by another NC LEA.

Areas of Focus	ILTs Grades 9-12 receiving support from RMT
Acquisition of Instructional Resources	5
Class Management	43
Conferences to Determine Concerns	75
Instructional Techniques	44
Student Motivational Methods	5
Planning	7

- In addition to the ILT visits, the RMT had 13 administrator conferences and 3 mentor conferences.



<b>Wake County Schools</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Wake County Schools proposed to support approximately 1700 beginning teachers for the 2004-05 school year using currently employed mentor teachers who are also teaching. Additionally, twelve (12) retired teachers were to be employed as mentors. The retired teachers were each to serve 1-15 initially licensed teachers. The retired teachers were to be compensated \$100 per beginning teacher. Two of the retired teacher mentors were to serve as Initial Licensure Program Coordinators at the school level.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program: 50</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	<p>The Wake County Public School System recruited eleven retired mentor-trained teachers to mentor initially licensed teachers. These mentors were assigned to mentor initially licensed teachers in schools where mentor availability was limited. These mentors were involved in our mentor-update meetings.</p> <p>There were twenty initially licensed first-year teachers and thirty initially licensed second-year teachers mentored by retired mentor-trained teachers. Eighteen of the initially licensed teachers had teaching assignments at the elementary level, twenty-six had teaching assignments at the middle school level, and six had teaching assignments at the high school level.</p>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Fourteen or 78% of the elementary teachers are still employed with WCPSS for the 2005-2006 school year.</li> <li>➤ Twenty-three or 88% of the middle school teachers are employed with WCPSS for the 2005-2006 school year.</li> <li>➤ Six or 100% of the high school teachers are employed with WCPSS for the 2005-2006 school year.</li> <li>➤ Twenty-nine or 97% of the initially licensed second-year teachers submitted interim requirements.</li> <li>➤ No additional retired mentors were added to the list of current mentors during the 2004-2005 school year from the previous year.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusions</b>	The Wake County Public School System will open new schools every year if the school population continues to grow at a high rate. Most new schools will have a limited number of trained mentors to provide mentor services to initially licensed teachers on staff. However, the formula used to determine the amount of funds given to schools using flexible funding to pay mentors is not advantageous to our school system. The school system had to pay over \$200,000 locally to cover mentoring costs because the formula did not take into consideration the additional teachers that are hired because of the high-growth rate. For example, the majority of ninety additional teachers that were allotted to our school system to reduce class size late in the hiring season were inexperienced teachers that were designated as initially licensed teachers. In addition, approximately three hundred teachers agreed to work with their mentees prior to the first day of school, which resulted in \$30,000 paid to mentors out of the same funds. It is our hope that the formula will be modified to take into consideration the challenges that we face with the continued population growth, the opening of new schools every year, and the need to support the best teachers available to teach our students.

<b>Winston-Salem/Forsyth County</b>	
<b>What Was Proposed</b>	The Winston-Salem Forsyth County Schools proposed to pilot a Dedicated Mentor Program that would utilize personnel whose full responsibilities were to serve as mentors for new teachers in the system. Dedicated mentors were to be selected based on successful teaching experience in the school system, current knowledge and theory regarding teaching and learning, demonstrated strong classroom management skills, and a history of successful supervision of student teachers or previous mentoring experiences. Eighty-one (81) beginning teachers and sixteen (16) dedicated mentors were to participate in the pilot program.
<b>Number of Teachers Served by the Program:</b> 655 (1:15 for dedicated mentors 1:1 for traditional mentors)	
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Dedicated Mentors attend four planning sessions per year</li> <li>➤ Dedicated Mentors complete a rubric of required mentoring responsibilities at each of the four planning sessions</li> <li>➤ Dedicated Mentor responsibilities include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meet one hour per week</li> <li>▪ Observe during instruction</li> <li>▪ Complete Weekly Mentor Log Sheet</li> <li>▪ Review evaluation process</li> <li>▪ Complete one formal observation</li> <li>▪ Meet with teacher to plan instruction</li> <li>▪ Meet to discuss classroom management techniques</li> <li>▪ Determine assessment plan of student achievement</li> <li>▪ Discuss parent involvement plan</li> <li>▪ Meet with Principal/Designee</li> <li>▪ Provide motivation, social and emotional support</li> <li>▪ Attend Dedicated Mentor planning meetings</li> <li>▪ Keep documentation of all interactions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes</b>	See the table on the following page.
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>Dedicated Mentors work one on one with each novice. Dedicated Mentors give support in the areas listed above. They do not evaluate or have input in the decision making regarding retention.</p> <p>In interviews Dedicated Mentors reported that one or more of the following affected retention rates of novice teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Performance</li> <li>▪ Working within the culture of the school or the educational environment</li> <li>▪ Personnel reason for relocation (spouse transfer, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Health</li> </ul> <p>The major effect on the retention rates was based on teacher performance and not on the primary responsibility of support from Dedicated Mentors. Evaluation indicates the support of Dedicated Mentors was effective and appropriate. Teacher performance evaluations were not a role of the Dedicated Mentor. Dedicated Mentors made observations and reviewed them with the principal.</p>

**Retention of Beginning Teachers in the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools**

ALL SCHOOLS	All Mentors	Dedicated Mentors	Traditional Mentors
Total New Teachers	655	71	584
No longer employed in 2005-06	141	22	119
Turnover percentage	21.5%	31.0%	20.4%

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	All Mentors	Dedicated Mentors	Traditional Mentors
Total New Teachers	292	11	281
No longer employed in 2005-06	40	1	39
Turnover percentage	13.7%	9.1%	13.9%

MIDDLE SCHOOLS	All Mentors	Dedicated Mentors	Traditional Mentors
Total New Teachers	167	30	137
No longer employed in 2005-06	53	11	42
Turnover percentage	31.7%	36.7%	30.7%

HIGH SCHOOLS	All Mentors	Dedicated Mentors	Traditional Mentors
Total New Teachers	196	30	166
No longer employed in 2005-06	48	10	38
Turnover percentage	24.5%	33.3%	13.9%

## **Appendix A**

### **Legislative Requirement**

From **Session Law 2003-284**

#### **MENTOR TEACHER FUNDS MAY BE USED FOR FULL-TIME MENTORS**

**SECTION 7.30.(a)** The State Board of Education shall grant flexibility to a local board of education regarding the use of mentor funds to provide mentoring support, provided the local board submits a detailed plan on the use of the funds to the State Board and the State Board approves that plan. The plan shall include information on how all mentors in the local school administrative unit have been or will be adequately trained to provide mentoring support.

Local boards of education shall use funds allocated for mentor teachers to provide mentoring support to all State-paid newly certified teachers, second-year teachers who were assigned mentors during the prior school year, and entry-level instructional support personnel who have not previously been teachers.

**SECTION 7.30.(d)** Each local board of education with a plan approved pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall report to the State Board on the impact of its mentor program on teacher retention. The State Board shall analyze these reports to determine the characteristics of mentor programs that are most effective in retaining teachers and shall report its findings to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee by October 15, 2004.