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Discussion:
Guest – Liam Goldrick – New Teachers Center
Question #1: What are other states and countries doing re policy?
Question #2: How does MD compare to other states?
Overview of Questions:
● On paper, Maryland’s state requirements look pretty good.
● It has deep and detailed policy on how mentors and selected and put to work.
● There are strong requirements for local programs to evaluate and self-assess and focus on retention.

TELL Survey 2015:
● ¼ of teachers statewide say they aren’t getting a mentor
● 30% are saying they don’t get dedicated time to work with mentors or be observed
  ○ No mentors
  ○ No instructional support
  ○ Opportunities for observations
  ○ Intentional work on instructional practices
● We could look at each district and compile an overview - Liam can look into having their team do this.
● Who is responsible for those who fall through the cracks?
● What is the role of the state in supporting this happening?
● How can the state position itself as the sister of support to the districts and make some changes?
  ○ State as support provider—state position as improver of programmatic design
  ○ Focus on programmatic improvements at the local level
  ○ Holding districts accountable—who is responsible?
● There are some states that oversee this work with a heavier hand - are there elements of policy regulations or state activities they could engage in to hold districts accountable?
● Who are these new teachers who are saying they are not getting support?
  ○ Are they dispersed throughout the state?
■ Are they teachers with provisional licenses--If dispersed everywhere and lost in the process, a different problem—look through various counties (NTC will see if they can compile info for us).

■ Question – what about partnerships between institutes of higher education (IHEs) and local school systems (LSS) in terms of induction in other states?
  ○ Tend to be more of a focus on perseverance until teachers become teachers of record
  ○ Policy does not really move work toward induction
  ○ Partnerships are difficult to do with a single institutions – come in with a myriad of teacher prep
  ○ Larger districts try to do things themselves to try to meet needs of various teachers
  ○ Anne Arundel County (AACO) – trying to share faculty – splits time between AAACo school and teacher in classroom who serves as a mentor
  ○ Can we look at different models like a residency model that brings people together in different roles?
  ○ Policy vs. practice
  ○ How do you make sure the neediest groups are getting served---create a center – consortium approach
  ○ Iowa -- $150 million – statewide teacher coaching program that includes teacher mentoring and induction – work across district lines

■ Question – Can we look at shared staffing requirements?
  ○ UMD is looking at having K12 teachers come to teach on campus for 3 year rotations
  ○ How do you bring people together into each other’s’ worlds?

Federal Schools and Staffing Data - Cross mapped with State Policy
● NTC compared this
● Presence of state policy requirements helps move induction work forward to a degree
● Does having a mentor increase achievement?

I3 Grants with 3 Districts (Broward County, FL -- Brantwood AEA Iowa -- Chicago)
● After 2 years of induction support, students of teachers exhibited 3-5 months greater reading achievement

What are the key components of a good induction program?
(1) a multi-year course of support – lasting impact on retention
(2) quality of the mentor - selection, foundational training and continuous support (take the role seriously and continually refresh—not volunteers or those wanting a stipend)
(3) tracking time is huge - some state policies qualify a minimum amount of time (observation, reviewing student work, coaching)—it can be a struggle to meet the hourly requirement
(4) Look at state’s role -- state’s push onus to the locals rather than requiring state to actually do something – if locals report back regarding low retention, what does that state then do? What can the state do realistically by law or by deed? Can the state target systems that have been identified as really needing support? Explicit things should be expected of the state – program
audits or site visits, set aside state funding for evaluation of induction activities. MD is actually very typical of states that refer responsibility to LSS’s – issue of capacity and finding ways to do this. Are there other systems of accountability that could be brought into the process?

2011 Richard Ingersoll—research re key characteristics

http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1127&context=gse_pubs

- Looking at expansion of monitoring role in MD – difficult when not in law to just have best practices. LSS’s are also limited budget-wise with that they can do.
- LSS’s can be protective of local induction programs.
- DE, IA, HI, CT – only four states that have dedicated state funding for multi-year induction – CT has a portfolio approach – centralized training: IA – state resources directed toward mentor stipends: HI – state policy structure with some centralization—complex areas.
- KY – has a statewide program – teacher intern program – very prescriptive – high rates of mentor involvement – one year program. Good feedback from teachers and mentors.

What is the biggest shift that needs to take place?

- Taking implementation of induction programs seriously
- Allow for differentiation locally –
  - Helps to communicate a vision regarding what induction is about
  - Core elements of a strong program
  - Used as a tool for programmatic improvement or oversight
  - Use standards to allow for granting of state dollars – drive awarding of funds
  - Multi-year course
  - Focus on time and track in a way that is simple
  - Do not lose the intent by making so bureaucratic —mentoring relationship can lose out
- Program standards approach – can enable differentiation at the local level

Keys for Success

- Take program design implications seriously
- Good set of Program Induction Standards
  - Helps to communicate a vision for what induction is fundamentally about
  - Lays out the core elements
  - Can be used as a tool to drive programmatic improvement and oversight
  - Program Continuum

How do we do this without taking the heart and soul out of it? We can’t make this a compliance exercise.

Funding

(1) Dedicated appropriation funding
  - Take the appropriation and spread it by per pupil allocation

(2) RFP - Texas uses this model - funding with no affirmative state requirement
Title I & Title II
● ESSA has not changed much in terms of induction – it has expanded grants to include both teachers and administrators
● It has injected evidentiary based definitions on the state level - but not at the LEA level.

Priority Schools (low performing)
● How have teachers been empowered to help figure out what needs to be done – gives them a stake in what is happening – make them want to stay
● Build capacity at the school – shift focus – induction programs to really be based in the school—feel less like something being put upon the school – different staffing models
● A lot of the change is cultural
● Change the way people interact – do not look upon it as a “program”

Recommendation regarding statewide network – need to really look into doing (Carnegie Foundation, NEA and NTA doing something similar)
● MD Induction Center – could be legislated
● How to ensure equitable access? Center could be a vehicle

How do we shift the focus to the local schools?
How do we empower the induction programs in the schools?
How do we change hearts and minds over time?
Create Regional Education Centers

Equitable access to support – can do if multiple universities would be part of a shared system supporting the schools in their areas

Friday Institute – hub for professional learning – in NC – Institute for Educational Innovation – NC State University -- William & Ida Friday – College of Education

Proposed recommendations for further discussion:

(1) Create a state-wide professional development pathways with career-wide learning opportunities for educators.

Leverage state, LEA, Union and higher educational expertise and resources to increase quality, transparency and portability of professional learning.

Leverage new knowledge, promising practices, and advanced technologies to increase access and success.

Leverage regional partnerships, resources, and delivery structures to ensure equitable access across the state.

2) Establish school-university partnerships in development and delivering professional development programs that link but are not limited to certification regulations for renewal.

Establish shared responsibilities and resources for induction and professional development programs that meet LEA and school priorities and address individualized needs for teachers
Establish professional development programs that incorporate evidence-based practices with context, content and pedagogical currency, such as cultural proficiency and technology integration, to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning.

Resources:

Maryland’s ESSA Webpage: http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Pages/DAPI/ESSA/index.aspx
PDF of Plan: http://marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DAPI/ESEA/MarylandConsolidatedStatePlanDRAFT1.pdf

NC State University - The Friday Institute
http://www.fi.ncsu.edu/about-us/


Consortium Approach to Teacher Induction:

Next Steps:

At the end of the Meeting Dr. Nancy Shapiro shared an email with recommendations for Committee 3 the email containing the recommendations is attached and will be shared with the committee at its April meeting for discussion.