

**REPORT OF THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION AND STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER
EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA**

**PLAN FOR STRENGTHENING
TEACHER EDUCATION AND
INDUCTION**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 23

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1996**



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

JAMES P. JONES
PRESIDENT

BOARD OF EDUCATION

P. O. Box 2009
Bristol, Virginia 24203
(703) 466-4800

December 15, 1995

**The Honorable George Allen
Governor of Virginia, and
The General Assembly of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia 23219**

Dear Governor Allen and Members of the General Assembly:

House Joint Resolution 629 of the 1995 General Assembly requested the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) to develop a plan for strengthening teacher education and induction. In November, the Board approved the attached report. At that time, however, the Board emphasized that its approval of this report for submission to you and the General Assembly does not alter its budget priorities for the 1996-98 biennium, adopted at its July 1995 meeting.

I am pleased to provide you a copy of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "JPJ".

James P. Jones

**JPJ/lch
Attachment**

**c: The Honorable Beverly H. Sgro, Secretary of Education
William C. Boshier Jr., Superintendent of Public Instruction**



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Gordon K. Davies
Director

COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION
James Monroe Building, 101 North Fourteenth Street, Richmond, Va. 23219

(804) 225-2137
FAX (804) 225-2804
TDD (804) 371-8017

December 12, 1995

The Honorable George F. Allen
Governor
Commonwealth of Virginia
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Governor:

At its meeting on December 11, 1995, the Council of Higher Education approved two studies on teacher education, responding to House Joint Resolutions Numbers 628 and 629 of the 1995 General Assembly. The Council suggests that an evaluation of the results of the mentor teacher program be made by the Board of Education before funding for the program is authorized for the second year. The Council further understands that any funding required for these initiatives would be in the Department of Education's appropriation.

In addition, the Council approved a study on high-school graduation requirements and admission standards at Virginia's colleges and universities, which responds to House Joint Resolution No. 470. The Council specified that the recommendation to develop a common application for admissions to Virginia's public colleges and universities should not interfere with each institution's right to ask for additional information from prospective students.

I am pleased to transmit to you copies of these reports.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gordon K. Davies", written over a horizontal line.

Gordon K. Davies

GKD\gmp

Enclosure

c: The Honorable Beverly H. Sgro

PREFACE

The 1995 General Assembly approved House Joint Resolution 629 (HJR 629) requesting the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia to develop a plan for strengthening teacher education by training and supporting experienced teachers as clinical supervisors for trainees and mentors for beginning teachers. The Board and the Council, in collaboration with the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure, were requested to include, but not limit this plan to: (i) criteria for clinical colleague/mentor teachers; (ii) training and support needed by clinical faculty and colleague/mentor teachers; (iii) appropriate compensation for teachers who serve as clinical faculty or colleague/mentor teachers; and, (iv) dedicated funding for collaboration between school divisions and higher education for improving teacher preparation and induction. HJR 629 is included as an appendix to this document.

The Department of Education provided staff support for the development of the plan. Staff members involved in the study included William C. Boshier, Jr., Superintendent of Public Instruction; Thomas A. Elliott, Division Chief for Compliance; Jo Smith Read, Specialist for Special Education Personnel Development; and Patty S. Pitts, Manager for Professional Licensure. Staff members for the Council of Higher Education for Virginia included Gordon K. Davies, Director; Margaret A. Miller, Associate Director for Academic Affairs; and Gene M. Pavlidis, Academic Affairs Coordinator.

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education of the Board of Education established to examine teacher education issues in Virginia served as discussants and reviewers for the study. The Ad Hoc Committee is composed of representatives from the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV); Director of the State Council of Higher Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Virginia Teacher of the Year, and a representative from each of the following organizations: the Virginia Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (VACTE), the Association of Teacher Educators in Virginia (ATE-VA), the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL), the Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia (CICV), the Virginia Education Association (VEA), the Virginia School Boards Association (VSBA), and the Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS). The membership of the Ad Hoc Committee is listed in the appendices of this document.

The format used for presentation of the plan is based on the structure of legislative documents required by the General Assembly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i
Executive Summary	iii
Chapter 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 2 - BACKGROUND	3
Chapter 3 - RESEARCH ON VIRGINIA PROGRAMS	12
Chapter 4 - CONCLUSION	18
References	21
Appendices	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Throughout the United States, induction programs are being initiated to provide better support and guidance for beginning teachers. A dominant characteristic of these programs is the use of experienced teachers to help new teachers understand the culture of the school and make a smooth transition from understanding concepts to applying them effectively. Often, the support teacher is designated as the "mentor teacher." Responsibilities of the mentor teacher are often broad in scope and may range from helping the new teacher understand the school's academic standards and expectations to providing professional and personal guidance.

The research suggests that novice teachers face dual challenges; they must fulfill their contract obligations to their employing school boards and they must learn and practice the craft of teaching. The assistance of an experienced and supportive colleague during a teacher's earliest classroom experiences has been shown to be very important in assisting first-year teachers' entering their profession. For experienced teachers, serving in the role of a mentor to an inexperienced colleague leads to continued professional growth and satisfaction.

Linda Darling-Hammond, in the report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future stated:

Maintaining an adequate supply of well-prepared recruits is even harder during times of substantial new hiring, because new teachers leave at much greater rates than mid-career teachers, particularly if they do not receive mentoring or support during their first years of teaching. Typically, 30% to 50% of beginning teachers leave teaching within their first five years. Teachers in shortages fields, such as the physical sciences and special education, also tend to leave more quickly and at higher rates. New teachers often leave because they are given the most challenging teaching assignments and left to sink or swim with little or no support. The kinds of supervised internships provided for new entrants in other professions -- architects, psychologists, nurses, doctors, engineers -- are largely absent in teaching, even though they have proven to be quite effective in the few places where they exist. (Linda Darling-Hammond, National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, November, 1994).

Between 1985 and 1990, several programs to support beginning teachers in their earliest classroom experiences were implemented in Virginia. From 1985 to 1988 the Colleague Teacher Project was a required component of the licensure program known as the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP). In 1988, the Virginia General Assembly appropriated funds to provide grants to institutions of higher education for the development of pilot Clinical Faculty Programs. Six state and private institutions worked cooperatively to design and implement preservice and inservice clinical faculty programs from selected public schools. Virginia's last statewide effort to assist beginning teachers was during the 1991-1992 school year. With an appropriation of about \$435,000, the Board of Education requested the Department of Education to develop criteria (favoring the less affluent divisions) for competitive grants to fund locally designed programs.

Grants were awarded to 31 school divisions and the Southwest Consortium representing 19 divisions in southwest Virginia.

As already noted, House Joint Resolution 629 of the 1995 session of the General Assembly of Virginia requested the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education to develop a plan for strengthening teacher education and induction by training and supporting experienced teachers as clinical supervisors for trainees and mentors for beginning teachers. In developing their response to the resolution, the Ad Hoc Committee recognized that support for beginning teachers may be viewed as a continuum which spans the preservice and inservice periods. The Ad Hoc Committee thus envisions that partnerships between school divisions and institutions of higher education will be formed that allow for collaborative cross training of mentor teachers and clinical faculty.

The recommendations contained in this report are tempered by the reality of restricted financial resources. Recognizing that new appropriations may be limited, the Ad Hoc Committee proposes a plan to strengthen teacher education and induction in Virginia with three priorities:

1. Establishment of a Mentor Teacher Program for newly hired teachers that will be jointly funded by participating school divisions and the General Assembly;
2. Identification of existing resources to support clinical faculty programs, including an amendment to the Code of Virginia that may allow state-supported institutions of higher education more flexibility in using unfunded scholarships as compensation for clinical faculty; and,
3. A request for General Assembly appropriations to support a Clinical Faculty Program described in Section 22.1-290.1 of the Code of Virginia.

A Mentor Teacher Program to assist newly hired beginning teachers is proposed for statewide implementation during the 1996-98 and 1998-2000 bienniums. This will be a voluntary program to allow school divisions to give first-year teachers access to an experienced colleague for one-to-one support. It is designed solely to assist newly hired teachers in making a successful transition into full-time teaching, and will not include an assessment to determine individuals' eligibility for receiving a continuing contract. The plan provides for a program based on a 50-50 funding split -- 50 percent from general funds and 50 percent from resources provided by school divisions volunteering to participate in the program. Funding for this program will allow approximately 4,000 experienced teachers to be trained over a four-year period to serve as mentor teachers throughout the state. Cost for each mentor trained will be \$800 for the first year of involvement in the program, including training and administrative costs (\$500), and a \$300 stipend. For each year a mentor continues to work in the program, the cost is simply \$300 for the stipend.

The budget for the Mentor Teacher Program is based on mentoring approximately 4,000 new teachers in the fourth year of the initiative. By training a pool of 4,000 mentors, by 1999-2000 each beginning teacher will be assured access to an experienced colleague for support in their first year of teaching. The following table shows the four-year projected budget for 1996-98 and 1998-2000.

FOUR-YEAR PROJECTED BUDGET FOR 1996-98 AND 1998-2000				
Year	1	2	3	4
Mentors Trained	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total Mentors Trained	1,000	2,000	3,000	4,000
Training Costs	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
Stipends for All Mentors	300,000	600,000	900,000	1,200,000
Annual Costs*	\$800,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,700,000
Biennium Funding Requested	1996-98 Biennium Funding Request \$950,000		1998-2000 Biennium Funding Request \$1,550,000	
	1996-97 Year \$400,000	1997-98 Year \$550,000	1998-1999 Year \$700,000	1999-2000 Year \$850,000

* These are total costs. General funds would support 50 percent of the annual costs. The additional 50 percent would be supported from school division funds. To the extent school divisions chose not to participate, the cost would be lower.

The plan to train mentor teachers also may provide an opportunity for training clinical faculty. As a requirement for receiving state funds, school divisions will be required to demonstrate collaboration with institutions of higher education.

To promote establishment or expansion of clinical faculty programs, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the General Assembly consider an amendment to Section 23-31 of the Code of Virginia to make it explicit that state-supported colleges and universities may use unfunded scholarships as compensation for clinical faculty. This provision of the Code allows institutions to establish a limited number of unfunded scholarships for designated graduate students. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that Section 23-31 be changed as follows:

The number of such scholarships annually awarded by an institution to graduate students shall not exceed the total number of graduate students who are employed as teaching or research assistants with significant academic responsibilities and who are paid a stipend of at least two thousand dollars in the particular academic year[, or who are serving as clinical faculty as described in Section 22.1-290.1, Clinical Faculty Programs]. The total value of all such scholarships shall not exceed in any year the amount arrived at by multiplying the applicable figure for graduate tuition and required fees by the number of graduate students so employed [and paid]. All graduate scholarships shall be awarded and renewed on a

selective basis to graduate students of character and ability who are so employed [and paid].

Finally, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the General Assembly provide an on-going appropriation to initiate the Clinical Faculty Program that is fully described in Section 22.1-290.1 of the Code of Virginia. Over a four-year period, this program will provide training and stipends to approximately 3,600 experienced teachers who will support teachers in their student teaching placements. The budget for implementation of this program is in the following table.

FOUR-YEAR PROJECTED BUDGET FOR 1996-98 AND 1998-2000				
Year	1	2	3	4
Clinical Faculty Trained	900	900	900	900
Total Clinical Faculty	900	1,800	2,700	3,600
Stipends	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$270,000
Annual Costs	\$270,000	\$540,000	\$810,000	\$1,080,000
Biennium Funding Requested	1996-98 Biennium Funding Request \$810,000		1998-2000 Biennium Funding Request \$1,890,000	
	1996-97 Year \$270,000	1997-98 Year \$540,000	1998-1999 Year \$810,000	1999-2000 Year \$1,080,000

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The General Assembly requested a plan for strengthening teacher education and induction by training and supporting experienced teachers as clinical supervisors for trainees and mentors for beginning teachers. The resolution was requested in response to the following developments:

- * The Interim Report of the Governor's Commission on Champion Schools recognized the importance of increasing classroom experience for teacher candidates and the need for teacher mentor programs and support networks to keep talented people in the teaching profession.
- * From 1985 through 1990, the Virginia Department of Education sponsored several initiatives for the involvement of classroom teachers as clinical supervisors of teacher trainees and as mentors for new teachers.
- * Formal evaluation by the Department of Education and the State Council of Higher Education of pilot programs using teachers as clinical faculty in teacher preparation validated the effectiveness of this model.
- * Formal evaluation of the colleague teacher model for mentoring new teachers indicated a sharp reduction in the loss of beginning teachers and an increase in their effectiveness.
- * Experience and research indicate that service as clinical faculty or as a mentor/colleague teacher promotes continuing professional growth for experienced teachers.
- * Many teacher education institutions in Virginia have increased the hours of classroom experience for students preparing for teacher licensure.
- * Many school divisions and teacher education institutions have begun to collaborate for more effective preservice education and induction of teachers.

The resolution requests the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education to develop a plan for strengthening teacher education and induction by training and supporting experienced teachers as clinical supervisors of trainees and mentors of beginning teachers. The plan should include, but not be limited to: (i) criteria for clinical faculty and colleague/mentor teachers; (ii) training and support needed by clinical faculty and colleague/mentor teachers; (iii) appropriate compensation for teachers who serve as

clinical faculty or colleague/mentor teachers; and (iv) dedicated funding for collaboration between school divisions and higher education for improving teacher preparation and induction.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

Learning to Teach

National literature confirms that beginning teachers who go to their first assignment immediately following graduation from a college or university teacher education program are confronted with dual challenges. First, they must provide instruction to students. Second, they must learn to use the knowledge and skills they gained through their formal instruction at the college or university level. A growing body of literature and research in teacher induction programs confirms what is common knowledge among those who have taught in a classroom: 1) The work of beginning teachers is extremely difficult; 2) mastering the bodies of substantive and pedagogical material provided in a teacher preparation program does not ensure an individual will be able to teach effectively;* 3) support from an experienced colleague teacher can make the difference between a successful or an unsuccessful first year in the classroom; and, 4) beginning teachers who have successful experiences are more likely to remain in the teaching profession.

In the 1980s, education reform movements swept across the United States. A central theme of many of those reform efforts was improvement of teacher performance, facilitated in part by strengthened teacher preparation and induction programs. As a result, teacher mentor programs were established in many states and school divisions. Research that accompanied these efforts provided significant insights regarding effective practices in supporting beginning teachers.

The major findings across the body of national literature generated during this period were synthesized by a team of researchers at Virginia Tech (Wildman, Niles, McLaughlin, and Magliaro, 1988) into five practical considerations regarding how beginning teachers learn to teach. They reported:

1. Much of learning to teach will occur after new teachers assume their first full-time position. Formal training, such as encountered in the college or university, should ensure a certain degree of content expertise, a beginning repertoire of teaching skills, and foundation knowledge pertaining to learners, the school curriculum and schools as social systems, to give the most typical examples. Becoming an accomplished teacher involves a great deal more learning, however, and this will occur on the job, over several years. During this time, early career teachers will repeatedly test, revise and retest what they understand and believe about teaching....Knowledge and insight into teaching emerges slowly as teachers learn from teaching.

* Many professions, notably medicine and dentistry, recognize the need for hands-on experience assisted by a mentor as a prerequisite for the profession.

2. In keeping with the above point, it is useful to understand explicitly that new teachers, although assigned full teaching responsibilities, are still primarily learners. More than fifty years ago Waller (1932) observed that beginning teachers:

...do not know how to teach, although they may know everything that is in the innumerable books telling them how to teach. They will not know how to teach until they have got the knack of certain personal adjustments which adapt them to their profession...those recruits that face teaching as a life work are ready to learn to teach, and they are ready, although they know it not, to be formed by teaching.

Contained in this observation and reiterated strongly in the literature during recent years, is the notion of just how powerful the teacher's work place is in shaping what one becomes as a teacher. Many have suggested that how beginners negotiate the first few years will determine not only whether they will stay in the profession, but also what kind of teachers they will become. School leaders and veteran teachers, failing to recognize just how much novices are shaped by experience often seem not to understand the potential negative effects of careless handling of beginners. Teachers can learn the wrong things from their initial experience. This is why it is so important that beginning teachers encounter role models who demonstrate attitudes and behaviors in their work that represent the best in the profession.

3. It is useful to keep in mind that learning from teaching usually springs from an internal locus of control. That is, teachers will focus on what is important to them at the time, on the questions they need answers to. Staff development practices in schools (and in universities!) have been slow to pick up on the fact that the teacher is in control... at least intellectually. Today we are seeing a slow, but unmistakable shift toward training and staff development practices which acknowledge explicitly that teacher learning is most effective when internally (not externally) guided. It is somewhat ironic that for decades we have recognized the internal control which very young children bring to their own learning, while totally missing the point that adults require the same freedom to learn, unfettered by excessive regulation and control.

4. The type of learning we have been describing is not necessarily easy. Basic requirements for the learner are an attitude of inquiry and a propensity toward active reflection on one's behavior and beliefs. This may represent a problem, especially in heavily bureaucratic environments where little encouragement and support is given for questioning, debate, and open inquiry into schooling practices. Over time, teachers' willingness to expend energy in self-reflection or cooperative learning with other teachers will fade and disappear if not properly supported.
5. Finally, building on the notion that active learning is not easy, we must point out that certain conditions are necessary to ensure continued learning in teaching....These are autonomy, time and collaboration.

Past and Present Teacher Mentor Programs in Virginia

Virginia has a well-established history of research, development, and demonstration of teacher mentor programs. Beginning with the Colleague Teacher Program in 1985, these initiatives have been designed and implemented through collaborative partnerships among institutions of higher education, school divisions, the Department of Education, and the State Council of Higher Education. Between 1985 and 1990, several programs were implemented to support beginning teachers in their earliest classroom experiences. These included:

- * The Colleague Teacher Project (1985-1988);
- * Grants to institutions of higher education for the development of Clinical Faculty Programs (1988-1990); and,
- * Grants to school divisions for the development of Mentor Teacher Programs (1991-1992).

One mentor teacher initiative is currently funded in Virginia. The Special Education Endorsement Mentor Program began in 1992 and ends in 1995. This project is administered through a contract with Virginia Tech.

PROFILES OF VIRGINIA PROGRAMS

Colleague Teacher Project (1985-1988)

The first program for beginning teacher support initiated at the state level in Virginia was the Colleague Teacher Project, which was implemented through a cooperative arrangement between a team at Virginia Tech and personnel from two cooperating school divisions. The Colleague Teacher Program was designed as the teacher mentor and support component of the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP). BTAP was operational from 1985 to 1991, when it was rescinded by the General Assembly.

The origin of BTAP and the Colleague Teacher Project may be traced to actions of the Board of Education. In February 1982 the Board adopted requirements affecting initial certification and continuing professional certification of teachers. These included the following:

1. Beginning July 1, 1985, first-time applicants for initial teacher certification were granted a two-year non-renewable teaching certificate.
2. To receive a five-year renewable Collegiate Professional Certificate, beginning teachers were required to demonstrate satisfactory performance in the classroom within the two-year provisional period as required in the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program.
3. The two goals to be met in the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program were:
 - (a) To provide assurance that every teacher who receives the Collegiate Professional Certificate possesses specified competencies; and,
 - (b) To assist beginning teachers in developing these competencies. Teachers who were unable to demonstrate the required competencies were not eligible to receive the Collegiate Professional Certificate.
4. The Beginning Teacher Assistance Program was concerned with the responsibility of the state to ensure that each individual who is granted the Collegiate Professional Certificate has demonstrated the minimum competence necessary to meet state certification requirements. Eligibility for continuing employment and the determination of effective or successful teaching are the responsibilities of school divisions as a part of their employment policies and practices.

In response to these requirements, BTAP was designed as a two-component teacher assistance and assessment program. The first component, teacher assessment, was developed by a team of researchers at the University of Virginia who identified competencies that beginning teachers should demonstrate in the classroom and developed an assessment system to measure teachers' performance of those competencies. Experienced educators were trained to serve as classroom observers who, using the BTAP assessment, observed on-the-job instructional performance of novice teachers.

The second component of BTAP was the Colleague Teacher Project, designed to foster close, supportive relationships between experienced mentor teachers and beginning teachers. The Colleague Teacher Project had three objectives:

1. To understand teachers' professional development during the first three years of employment and to document the various adaptations they make, professionally and personally, to the conditions of teaching;
2. To understand how expert teachers can work productively with beginners, including what they need to know about mentoring and how their schedules can be adapted to accommodate their work with beginners; and,
3. To design induction programs that can be successful within typical school contexts.

From 1985 to 1988, the concept of the colleague or mentor teacher was piloted on a limited scale through implementation of the Colleague Teacher Project at pilot sites in Chesterfield and Fairfax Counties. During the period of the pilot projects, colleague teachers were selected and trained, administrators received training in the project, and mentors and mentees engaged in a variety of planned and spontaneous activities focused on those objectives. The mentor programs in both counties continue to provide support for beginning teachers. In 1994, a team of researchers from Virginia universities reported longitudinal teacher retention information collected over a six-year period. As reported by the authors,

...national teacher retention data has shown that beginning teachers leave the profession at a higher rate than veteran teachers. While the average teacher attrition rate is 4.1% (Feistrizzer, 1990), estimates of beginning teachers leaving the first year vary from 15% to 30% (Schlechy and Vance, 1993; Mark and Anderson, 1985). Review of the data from the [Chesterfield County] program shows that beginners have remained in teaching after the first year at higher rates than the national trends. An average of 94% of beginners who participated in the program during the first six years have returned to teaching their second year (Magliaro, Niles, Wildman, Walker, and Maddex, 1994, p. 29).

Clinical Faculty Program Grants (1988-1990)

In 1988, the Virginia General Assembly provided \$245,000 for pilot programs to train and compensate teachers to serve as clinical faculty and supervisors for teacher interns. These funds were made available in the form of competitive grants to Virginia institutions of higher education by the State Council of Higher Education. Four grant projects received funding. Awards were made to:

- * The University of Virginia;
- * Virginia Tech and Hollins College;
- * Christopher Newport College and Hampton University; and,
- * Lynchburg College.

In correspondence dated January 17, 1989, The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) provided an overview of the Clinical Faculty Programs to Delegate James H. Dillard, III. Margaret Miller of the Council reported that these four projects had four common characteristics designed to provide clinical faculty with skills to supervise and support student interns nearing the end of their formal teacher training programs. These included:

1. Compensation for clinical faculty -- By adequately compensating clinical faculty for their responsibilities, recognizing them as faculty, and providing for their professional development and a chance to talk with other teachers and university faculty, the projects sought to recruit the best qualified teachers to supervise student interns.
2. Recognition of clinical faculty as faculty of the institutions -- The institutions participating in this project believed that clinical faculty deserved recognition as faculty. At several institutions, there was an expectation that clinical faculty would participate actively in research about the practical problems confronting classroom teachers.
3. Close coordination with public schools -- The institutions utilized a variety of means to collaborate with school divisions. By designating practicing teachers as faculty members, those individuals served as liaisons among organizations. Additionally, advisory boards with school division representatives were present in each of these programs.
4. Strong evaluation components -- Each program included the design and implementation of an evaluation procedure to measure progress toward achieving goals.

As reported in a 1991 evaluation of the four clinical faculty programs, which was conducted by Pamela Buckley and Janice Williamson, the roles of clinical faculty differed at each institution.

Christopher Newport College/Hampton University asked clinical faculty to:

- work with a student teacher for one semester per school year;
- serve as an ongoing consultant to other cooperating teachers not trained as clinical faculty; and,
- serve on education faculty committees.

Lynchburg College asked clinical faculty to:

- work directly with a student teacher for one semester per school year;
- consult with and be available to provide information to three or four cooperating teachers located in close geographic proximity;
- observe and consult with two or three other student teachers twice during the student teaching period; and,
- share in the teaching of a clinical faculty course under the direction of college faculty during the second and third years as a clinical faculty member.

The University of Virginia asked clinical faculty to:

- work with a student teacher each fall;
- consult with that same student on a research project during the spring semester;
- serve on education faculty committees; and
- be willing to teach methods courses (with remuneration).

Virginia Tech/Hollins College asked clinical faculty to:

- work with a student teacher one semester a year; and
- participate in action research projects.

Grants to School divisions for the Development of Mentor Teacher Programs (1991-1992)

When BTAP was rescinded by the General Assembly in 1991, the Department of Education proposed the development of a mentor assistance program for beginning teachers to be developed and implemented at the local level. The General Assembly responded by providing funding for this effort. Subsequently, the Mentor Teacher Project

was established to assist and support school divisions wishing to establish new mentor teacher programs or improve existing programs.

Five major activities were conducted through the Mentor Teacher Project, including the following:

- * twenty-six grants were awarded to school divisions -- a consortium of five school divisions in the Shenandoah Valley region, and another consortium serving 19 school divisions in the far southwestern region of Virginia (no single division received over \$10,000);
- * a training institute was established to assist participating school divisions in developing or improving their teacher mentor efforts;
- * two statewide teleconferences were held to enable participating school divisions to exchange ideas and receive information from recent research;
- * technical assistance was provided to participating school divisions; and,
- * a resource notebook and videotape profiling the individual projects was developed to assist other school divisions in initiating new teacher mentor programs.

Approximately 1,950 beginning teachers received support through local or regional mentor programs that received funding through this initiative.

Special Education Endorsement Mentor Program (1992-1995)

A chronic and pervasive shortage of teachers with special education endorsements has caused many school divisions in Virginia to place teachers without the proper endorsement in special education assignments. Teachers in these assignments are issued a two-year Conditional Special Education License that requires each individual to complete the requirements to earn the necessary endorsement(s) within the validity period of the license. The employing agency must assign a mentor to assist each teacher working through a Conditional License who has no special education endorsements and no previous special education teaching experience.

Through a contract with Virginia Tech, the Special Education Endorsement Mentor Program offered each school division an opportunity to develop a new colleague teacher/mentor program for teachers who hold a Conditional License or to improve beginning teacher support program. Mentor institutes were held at sites across the state for two consecutive summers to allow teams of school division personnel to receive information regarding the needs of beginning teachers in special education, to share information, and to plan for implementation of their programs. In addition to institutes,

the Special Education Endorsement Mentor Program made \$250 mini-grants available to school divisions for use in their teacher mentor efforts. One-hundred-eleven school divisions took part in this three-year project which ended in August 1995.

The Special Education Endorsement Mentor Program also included a research and evaluation component. During the summer of 1995, data were requested from each school division in Virginia to determine the extent to which mentor programs for beginning teachers (general or special education) are being made available and to gain descriptive information about those programs.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH ON VIRGINIA PROGRAMS

Findings from studies of Virginia teacher mentor programs may be used to develop understanding of some past and present programs across the state. Studies conducted by researchers at Virginia Tech, the Commonwealth Center for the Education of Teachers at James Madison University, and the Department of Education are summarized below.

Clinical Faculty Models: A Study of Four State-Funded Projects in Virginia

In 1991 the four pilot programs that received clinical faculty grants were evaluated by Pamela Buckley and Janice Williamson of the Commonwealth Center for the Education of Teachers at James Madison University. Their evaluation answered four questions:

1. How do the four models compare in selecting, training, and rewarding teachers?
2. What problems in the recruitment and training of cooperating teachers were solved because the pilot model funds were available?
3. What impact has the clinical faculty model had on the school divisions?
4. What were the differences among models?

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the evaluation are summarized below.

1. How do the four models compare in selecting, training, and rewarding teachers?
 - a. All four projects required similar qualifications for teacher selection:
 - a valid Virginia Collegiate Professional Certificate;
 - certification in the assigned subject/grade level;
 - at least three years of successful classroom teaching;
 - recognition as an accomplished teacher by peers and supervisors;
 - personal experience as a student teacher or intern; and
 - a master's degree (required only by Christopher Newport College/Hampton University).

- b. The length of training varied in each project:
- Christopher Newport College/Hampton University offered a two-hour graduate level course;
 - Lynchburg College offered a three-day summer orientation and a three-hour graduate course;
 - the University of Virginia conducted a one-week summer training seminar for new clinical faculty followed by a three-day session for experienced clinical faculty; and
 - Virginia Tech/Hollins held seminars twice a month throughout the school year.
- c. Incentives for participation in the four projects included:
- recertification points (awarded by the state);
 - adjunct faculty status including parking, library, and bookstore privileges, special event discounts, and use of athletic facilities;
 - Christopher Newport College/Hampton University offered a training stipend;
 - the University of Virginia offered stipends for training and for participation in a refresher course;
 - Virginia Tech/Hollins paid for a substitute teacher for the clinical faculty to attend all-day workshops;
 - Lynchburg College did not offer a training stipend; and,
 - compensation ranged from \$250 to \$500 for student teacher placements.
2. What problems in the recruitment and training of cooperating teachers were solved because the pilot model funds were available?
- State funds provided a vehicle for encouraging qualified classroom teachers interested in supervising student teachers to participate in systematic, carefully designed programs to improve their observation, conferencing, and interpersonal skills. Classroom teachers were more willing to accept student teachers knowing they would have the continuous support and guidance of clinical faculty members.
 - State funds supported school/university collaboration to provide extensive, consistent training in supervisory skills to qualified classroom teachers to improve the preparation of new teachers.

- State funds enabled the participating colleges/universities to provide a level of compensation appropriate for highly qualified teachers providing service to the profession.
3. What impact has the clinical faculty model had on the school divisions?
- The clearly defined role of the cooperating teacher reflects the careful selection process, training specific to the supervision of student teachers, professional status of the cooperating teacher as adjunct faculty, and increased involvement of school personnel in the preparation of new teachers.
 - The clinical faculty models provided opportunities for professional growth and development to classroom teachers selected to participate.
 - Clinical faculty reported that they enjoyed exchanging ideas, sharing problems, feeling a sense of empowerment, increasing their knowledge and understanding, and developing greater self-esteem.
 - As a result of the pilot clinical faculty models, 358 teachers received training to enable them to function more effectively in the preparation of new teachers.

The evaluators formulated the following conclusions regarding the pilot clinical faculty programs:

- The four pilot clinical faculty model projects demonstrated the importance of providing extensive supervisory training to qualified classroom teachers, recognition for their expertise, and appropriate compensation.
- The four pilot clinical faculty models improved the quality of the student teaching experience at the participating institutions.
- Although there were differences among the programs, all four of the pilot clinical faculty models were effective.
- Virginia's investment in the clinical faculty model for teacher preparation is a considerable one, but evaluation results, including improved student teaching experiences and clinical faculty satisfaction with the programs, suggest the benefits justify the cost.

Six recommendations resulted from the evaluation of the pilot projects:

1. Clinical faculty training should be a prerequisite for all supervising teachers in Virginia.
2. The resource of talented, knowledgeable people who participated in implementing the pilot clinical faculty models should be tapped to serve as consultants as the state expands the concept.
3. A state task force should be selected from the college faculty and school personnel who participated in the pilot clinical faculty models to establish guidelines for selecting, training, and rewarding clinical faculty. These guidelines should be similar to those for mentor teachers developed by the State Professional Development Advisory Council.
4. Schools and colleges should form collaborative partnerships to select and implement a clinical faculty model that best meets the needs of their communities.
5. Release time for clinical faculty is essential to enable them to carry out their teacher preparation responsibilities; further study is required on the issue of incentives and the disparity in stipends and perquisites for cooperating teachers.
6. Clinical faculty training is similar to the preparation for mentor teachers. It would be cost-effective to combine the two programs, thus giving classroom teachers an opportunity to assist either new teachers or student teachers.

Evaluation of the Teacher Mentor Project Grants to School Divisions

In 1992 a team of Department of Education staff members conducted an evaluation of the mentor programs that received funding through the Mentor Teacher Project. Each grant recipient was asked to provide information describing the program's accomplishments and examples of success. The report of that evaluation states:

School divisions reported a variety of accomplishments and examples of success. Several common themes emerged from among them, however, that exemplify the benefits of the DOE Mentor Teacher Project. One of the most revealing findings about the success of this effort was that no school division indicated it planned to discontinue its mentor teacher program. In fact, seven divisions will be expanding their programs

by either increasing the amount of release time, size of staff, and/or the number of schools and beginning teachers served. Fourteen divisions reported documented decreases in new teacher turnover ranging from a 50% reduction to no turnover at all.

The opportunity for networking and enhanced professional dialogue provided many benefits for beginning teachers. Divisions reported that their mentor programs eased tensions, reduced anxiety, and reduced isolation of their beginning teachers. Beginning teachers felt comfortable and welcomed from the start of the school year. They felt free to communicate openly with their mentors and with other teachers in the schools because of the trusting relationships that were developed.

The non-evaluative nature of mentor teacher programs provided an informal setting for ongoing collaboration and exchange of ideas among teachers. Consultations and close working relationships between mentors and beginning teachers facilitated instructional planning and delivery; classroom management; and the understanding and application of procedures, policies, and regulations.

Beginning teachers reported that participation in the mentor teacher programs helped them develop feelings of confidence that they could be successful in teaching. Because of the professional and emotional support they received, they have been able to assume the responsibilities of a beginning teacher and get a head start on becoming successful, self-directed professionals.

Mentor Programs: Challenges, Changes, and Chances for Professional Development in the 90's

In 1993, a Virginia research team (Magliaro, Niles, Wildman, Walker, and Maddex) conducted a three-part study of the status of teacher mentor programs in the state. Their methods included: 1) a survey of all school divisions known to have operated a mentor program since the mid-1980s; 2) a survey of mentors and mentees; and 3) a case study of a program in Chesterfield County Public Schools which has operated since it was established as a pilot site through the Colleague Teacher Project.

It is beyond the scope of this report to provide a detailed description of the findings of this study, which in large part are complementary to, and expand upon, research described earlier in this report. The authors' conclusions, however, provide significant insights into the major issues and considerations regarding teacher mentor programs in Virginia:

Perhaps the greatest challenge to the development of mentor programs is the fact that schools are not typically designed as learning environments for teachers, or for adults in general. Data from many sources converge on this point. Major elements of the problem tend to center around 1) the culture of the school as it relates to the importance or self-renewal, the availability of collaborative networks and leadership for teacher growth, and 2) the tremendous time constraints that teachers must work around to find any space at all for work in their own learning. Our experience over the years combined with the results of these studies suggest that tremendous energy and persistence is required to shift the odds to favor opportunities for systematic growth opportunities. This is the main challenge that successful programs have managed in various degrees to make some progress with.

Programs also do not run themselves or maintain any consistent course once put into operation. The fragile conditions supporting authentic teacher collaboration of the type reported by some mentors and mentees in this study and others we have conducted (e.g., Wildman, Magliaro, McLaughlin, and Niles, 1992) are in constant need of attention. The more people who develop a stake in the program and actively provide leadership to maintain the program in a problem solving posture, the better are the program's chances for long-term success. We attribute much of the success of the Chesterfield program to the fact that, early on, a solid cadre of teacher leaders developed a strong professional and personal stake in the support of beginning teachers. At the same time we recognize that fully half of the programs started in Virginia during the late 80's may have drifted into a state of low-level maintenance or worse due to the lack of such commitment and attention. Programs that did report varying degrees of vitality attributed this to a willingness to change based upon identification of local needs -- particularly the needs of beginning teachers (p. 31-32).

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS

The Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education reviewed the literature on teacher induction and the reports of the results of previous teacher induction, clinical faculty, and mentor programs across the Commonwealth. The Committee found that Virginia has a well-established history of research, development and demonstration of clinical faculty and teacher mentor programs since 1985. These programs have been designed and implemented through collaborative partnerships among institutions of higher education, school divisions, the Department of Education, and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Based on this review, the Ad Hoc Committee acknowledges and supports the concept of a continuum of professional development and support for the emerging professional which starts in preservice preparation and continues through the inservice period. The Committee also acknowledges and supports the need for collaboration and commitment from all the partners noted above to implement effective preparation and induction programs for future teachers.

During deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee, considerable discussion was devoted to balancing the need for programs at the preservice and inservice levels with the potential of limited state resources. In order to maximize the cost benefits of any new program, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded that the priorities for new funding should be: 1) a mentor program to support newly hired teachers; and, 2) a clinical faculty program to support preservice teachers in their student teaching placements.

A PLAN TO STRENGTHEN TEACHER INDUCTION IN VIRGINIA

The Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education proposes a plan to strengthen teacher education and induction in Virginia with three priorities:

1. Establishment of a Mentor Teacher Program for newly hired teachers that will be jointly funded by participating school divisions and the Virginia General Assembly;
2. Identification of existing resources to support clinical faculty programs, including an amendment to the Code of Virginia that may allow state-supported institutions of higher education more flexibility in using unfunded scholarships as compensation for clinical faculty; and,
3. A request for General Assembly appropriations to support a Clinical Faculty Program which is already described in the Code of Virginia.

Mentor Teacher Program

The following plan is designed to assist newly hired beginning teachers commencing with the 1996-98 and 1998-2000 bienniums. All school divisions will be eligible to participate in this new incentive program, which will be funded equally through state and local dollars. The program is designed solely to assist newly hired teachers in making a successful transition into full-time teaching, and will not include an assessment to determine individuals' eligibility for receiving a continuing contract.

Historically, approximately 4,000 beginning teachers are hired to work in school divisions each year. Accordingly, 1,000 experienced teachers will be selected and trained to serve as mentors to their beginning colleagues each year for four years. By the end of the fourth year, an adequate number of mentor teachers will have been trained for each beginning teacher to have a mentor assigned for one-to-one support and assistance. Following the fourth year, the need for newly trained mentor teachers will be significantly reduced. Based on cost data from previously funded projects the approximate costs for each teacher trained to serve as a mentor will be as follows for each individual's first year as a program participant:

\$ 500	First Year Costs -- Training, program administration, minimal travel expenses, and evaluation
<u>300</u>	Recurring Cost -- Annual stipend for mentor teachers
<u>\$ 800</u>	Total Cost

Following their first year of participation in the program, the cost for each mentor teacher will be limited to the \$300 stipend. The following table displays the four-year projected budget for 1996-98 and 1998-2000. Table 1 displays the four-year projected budget for 1996-1998 and 1998-2000.

The plan to train mentor teachers also may provide an opportunity for training clinical faculty. As a requirement for receiving state funds, school divisions will be required to demonstrate collaboration with institutions of higher education. This prerequisite should encourage cross training of individuals who can serve in either capacity.

Table 1. Four-Year Projected Budget for Mentor Teacher Program

FOUR-YEAR PROJECTED BUDGET FOR 1996-98 AND 1998-2000				
Year	1	2	3	4
Mentors Trained	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total Mentors Trained	1,000	2,000	3,000	4,000
Training Costs	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
Stipends for All Mentors	300,000	600,000	900,000	1,200,000
Annual Costs*	\$800,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,700,000
Biennium Funding Requested	1996-98 Biennium Funding Request \$950,000		1998-2000 Biennium Funding Request \$1,550,000	
	1996-97 Year \$400,000	1997-98 Year \$550,000	1998-1999 Year \$700,000	1999-2000 Year \$850,000

* These are total costs. General funds would support 50 percent of the annual costs. The additional 50 percent would be supported from local school division funds. To the extent school divisions chose not to participate the cost would be lower.

Suggested Procedures for Implementing the Mentor Teacher Program

All Virginia school divisions will be invited to submit proposals to participate in the beginning teacher mentor program. In their proposals, divisions will be required to provide the following information:

1. A description of the criteria for selection of mentor teachers

Each proposal will include selection criteria that assure that teachers who serve as mentors are effective, experienced teachers who have the desire to assist beginning colleagues.

2. Training and support that will be provided to mentor teachers

Each proposal will describe the training and support mentor teachers will receive. This should include training that will promote these teachers' ability to supervise and observe novice teachers, develop skills in principles of adult learning, and build strong communication techniques. This training also should provide the core of training needed by clinical faculty. Individual colleges and universities may provide supplemental information for specific institutions as appropriate.

3. **Compensation for teachers who serve as mentor teachers**

Each proposal will describe the minimum financial reward for each clinical faculty/mentor teacher's personal use. A minimum stipend of \$300 per year will be established for the program.

4. **Collaboration between the school divisions and institutions of higher education**

Each proposal should demonstrate how school divisions and institutions of higher education will be engaged in on-going collaboration focused on meeting the needs of mentors and beginning teachers. Cross training of individuals who will be prepared to serve as mentors or clinical faculty is one example of such collaboration.

5. **Assignment**

Each proposal will describe how mentor teachers will be assigned mentees and what the expectations are for mentor-mentee interaction. Preference will be given to proposals which contemplate that mentors and mentees will teach in the same building.

6. **Evaluation**

Each proposal must clearly show how the project will be evaluated. All proposals must include a plan to collect and report the following minimum information:

- * the numbers of mentor teachers trained;
- * the numbers of novice professionals who received support;
- * participant satisfaction; and,
- * beginning teacher classroom performance data.

In addition, each proposal shall describe a plan for determining the proportion of beginning teachers who receive mentor teacher support and are awarded continuing contracts.

Utilization of Existing Resources to Support Clinical Faculty Programs

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the General Assembly consider an amendment to the Code of Virginia which may encourage institutions of higher education to use unfunded scholarships, as authorized by Section 23-31 of the Code of Virginia as compensation for clinical faculty. This provision of the Code allows state-supported colleges and universities to establish a limited number of unfunded scholarships for designated graduate students. Specifically, the Committee recommends that the General

Assembly consider amending Section 23-31 of the Code to explicitly allow institutions of higher education to use unfunded scholarships as compensation for clinical faculty. Suggested changes would be as follows:

The number of such scholarships annually awarded by an institution to graduate students shall not exceed the total number of graduate students who are employed as teaching or research assistants with significant academic responsibilities and who are paid a stipend of at least two thousand dollars in the particular academic year[, or who are serving as clinical faculty as described in Section 22.1-290.1, Clinical Faculty Programs]. The total value of all such scholarships shall not exceed in any year the amount arrived at by multiplying the applicable figure for graduate tuition and required fees by the number of graduate students so employed [~~and paid~~]. All graduate scholarships shall be awarded and renewed on a selective basis to graduate students of character and ability who are so employed [~~and paid~~].

This proposed Code change was endorsed by the institutions' chief academic officers on September 29, 1995, as a potentially workable plan. Acknowledging that the specific use of unfunded scholarships is a discretionary matter for institutions, the Committee believes that the allocation of scholarships should be determined by the individual colleges and universities.

It is hoped that the recommended changes to §23-31 of the Code of Virginia will be considered by the General Assembly in its 1996 session. Designation of clinical faculty as potential recipients of these scholarships should offer institutions an opportunity to reward clinical faculty members through use of existing resources.

In addition, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the Department of Education, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, and institutions of higher education work cooperatively to define incentives and compensation for clinical faculty which are not dependent on new appropriations and may be non-monetary. For example, clinical faculty might receive privileges to use athletic facilities, free parking on campus, reduced admission to sports and cultural events, and discounts in college book stores.

General Assembly Funding for the Clinical Faculty Program Described in Section 22.1-290.1 of the Code of Virginia

The Code of Virginia, at Section 22.1-290.1, fully describes a Clinical Faculty program that has been piloted in Virginia and proven to be effective. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the General Assembly provide an appropriation to support full implementation of this program.

Based on studies conducted by the Commonwealth Center for the Education of Teachers in 1992 and 1994, it is estimated that 3,500 students will complete student teaching during a typical academic year. Requested appropriations for §22.1-290.1 would provide stipends at a rate of \$300 per year for individuals serving as clinical faculty. Institutions of higher education, working with participating school divisions, would provide training for clinical faculty in collaboration with the training provided by the schools in the proposed Mentor Teacher Program. Table 2 shows the projected budget for this program for 1996-1998 and 1998-2000.

Table 2. Four-Year Project Budget for the Clinical Faculty Program

FOUR-YEAR PROJECTED BUDGET FOR 1996-98 AND 1998-2000				
Year	1	2	3	4
Clinical Faculty Trained	900	900	900	900
Total Clinical Faculty	900	1,800	2,700	3,600
Stipends	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$270,000
Annual Costs	\$270,000	\$540,000	\$810,000	\$1,080,000
Biennium Funding Requested	1996-98 Biennium Funding Request \$810,000		1998-2000 Biennium Funding Request \$1,890,000	
	1996-97 Year \$270,000	1997-98 Year \$540,000	1998-1999 Year \$810,000	1999-2000 Year \$1,080,000

As a requirement for receiving state funds, institutions of higher education will be required to demonstrate collaboration with school divisions. This prerequisite should promote cross training of individuals who can serve either as clinical faculty or mentor teachers.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E.M. (1985). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. Journal of Teacher Education, 29(1), 38-42.

Virginia Department of Education. Beginning Teacher Assistance Program: Information for the Prospective Teacher (Brochure) Richmond, VA: Author.

Virginia Department of Education. Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (Brochure).
Richmond, VA: Author.

Buckley, P. & Williamson, J. (1991). Clinical Faculty Models: A Study of Four State-Funded Projects in Virginia. (Unpublished report).

Cole, A. (1992). Teacher development in the work place: Rethinking the appropriation of professional relationships. Teachers College Record, 92(2), 365-381.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). The Current Status of Teaching and Teacher Development in the United States. Background paper prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Little, J.W. (1990). The mentoring phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. In C. B. Cazden (Ed.), Review of research in education, Vol.16. Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Magliaro, S., Niles, R. A., Wildman, T., Walker, D. & Maddex, J.S. (1994, April). Mentor Programs: Challenges and Chances for Professional Development in the '90's. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Virginia Department of Education, (1992). Mentor Teacher Project: Project Evaluation. Richmond, VA: Author.

Virginia Department of Education. The Colleague Teacher Project (Brochure).
Richmond, VA: Author.

Wildman, T.M., McLaughlin, R.A., Niles, J.A., and Magliaro, S.G. (1988). The Colleague Teacher Project: Project Report. (Unpublished report).

APPENDICES

House Joint Resolution 629

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA -- 1995 SESSION

ENROLLED

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 629

Requesting the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia to develop a plan for strengthening teacher education and induction.

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 4, 1995

Agreed to by the Senate, February 21, 1995

WHEREAS, the Interim Report of the Governor's Commission on Champion Schools recognizes the importance of increasing classroom experience for teacher candidate and the need for teacher mentor programs and support networks to keep talented people in the teaching profession; and

WHEREAS, from 1985 through 1990, the Virginia Department of Education sponsored several initiatives for the involvement of classroom teachers as clinical supervisors of teacher trainees and as mentors for new teachers; and

WHEREAS, formal evaluation by the Department of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia of pilot programs using teachers as clinical faculty in teacher preparation validated the effectiveness of this model; and

WHEREAS, formal evaluation of the colleague teacher model for mentoring new teachers indicated a sharp reduction in the loss of beginning teachers and an increase in their effectiveness; and

WHEREAS, experience and research indicate that service as clinical faculty or as a mentor/colleague teacher promotes continuing professional growth for experienced teachers; and

WHEREAS, many teacher education institutions in Virginia have increased the hours of classroom experience for students preparing for teacher licensure; and

WHEREAS, many school divisions and teacher education institutions have begun to collaborate for more effective preservice education and induction of teachers; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia develop a plan for strengthening teacher education and induction by training and supporting experienced teachers as clinical supervisors for trainees and mentors for beginning teachers. The plan should include, but not be limited to (i) criteria for clinical faculty and colleague/mentor teachers, (ii) training and support needed by clinical faculty and colleague/mentor teachers, (iii) appropriate compensation for teachers who serve as clinical faculty or colleague/mentor teachers, and (iv) dedicated funding for collaboration between school divisions and higher education for improving teacher preparation and induction.

The Department of Education shall provide staff support for the development of the plan. All agencies of the Commonwealth shall provide assistance to the Board and the Council, upon request.

The Board and the Council shall complete their work in time to submit their findings and recommendations to the Governor and the 1996 Session of the General Assembly as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for the processing of legislative documents.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

The Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education consists of representatives from the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV); the director of the State Council of Higher Education; the Superintendent of Public Instruction; the Virginia Teacher of the Year; and a representative from the following organizations: the Virginia Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (VACTE); the Association of Teacher Educators in Virginia (ATE-VA); the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL); the Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia (CICV); the Virginia Education Association (VEA); the Virginia School Boards Association (VSBA), and the Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS). Participants include:

Ad Hoc Committee Members

- Senator James P. Jones, President
Board of Education and Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee
P. O. Box 2009
Bristol, VA 24203
Telephone Number: 703-466-4800
Fax Number: 703-466-8672
- Mr. Alan L. Wurtzel, Member
Board of Education
2134 R. Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008
Telephone Number: 202-265-3232
Fax Number: 202-265-3019
- Mrs. Mary T. Jones, Member
State Council of Higher Education in Virginia
107 Hillside Drive
Abingdon, VA 24210
Telephone Number: 703-628-3272

- Mr. Donald N. Patten, Member
State Council of Higher Education in Virginia
12350 Jefferson Avenue, Suite 360
Newport News, VA 23602
Telephone Number: 804-249-1881
Fax Number: 804-249-3242

- Dr. A. Jerry Benson, President-Elect
Virginia Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
James Madison University
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
Telephone Number: 703-568-6572
Fax Number: 703-568-3342

- Dr. Sylvia Auton
Association of Teacher Educators in Virginia
Fairfax County Public Schools
7423 Camp Alger Avenue
Falls Church, VA 22042
Telephone Number: 703-698-0400
Fax Number: 703-698-7997

- Mr. Gary Blumenstein, Teacher Education Committee Chair
Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure
132 Red Oak Trail
Chesapeake, VA 23320
Telephone Number: 804-547-2152

- Dr. Robert B. Lambeth, Jr., President
Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia
P. O. Box 1005
Bedford, VA 24523
Telephone Number: 703-586-0606
Fax Number: 703-586-2630

- Mr. Nolan T. Yelich, President
Virginia School Boards Association
11th Street at Capital Square
Richmond, Virginia 23219
Telephone Number: 804-786-2332
Fax Number: 804-786-5855

- Mrs. Cheri W. James
Virginia Education Association
 Richmond City Public Schools
 5122 Tiffanywood Court
 Richmond, VA 23223-2713
 Telephone Number: 804-328-1254
 Fax Number: 804-780-4565

- Mrs. Cheryl B. Henig
1995 Virginia Teacher of the Year
 Hanover County Public Schools
 Stonewall Jackson Middle School
 8021 Lee Davis Road
 Mechanicsville, VA 23111
 Telephone Number: 804-730-3307
 Fax Number: 804-730-3231

- Dr. William C. Boshier, Jr.
Superintendent of Public Instruction
 Virginia Department of Education
 P. O. Box 2120
 Richmond, VA 23218-2120
 Telephone Number: 804-225-2024
 Fax Number: 804-786-5389

- Dr. Gordon K. Davies
Director, State Council of Higher Education in Virginia
 James Monroe Building
 101 N. 14th Street
 Richmond, VA 23219
 Telephone Number: 804-225-2602
 Fax Number: 804-225-2604

- Dr. Deanna W. Gordon
 Roanoke County Division Superintendent
Virginia Association of School Superintendents
 526 College Avenue
 Salem, VA 24153
 Telephone Number: 703-562-3704
 Fax Number: 703-562-3993

Staff Resource Members

- **Dr. Thomas A. Elliott, Ad Hoc Committee Coordinator**
Division Chief for Compliance
Virginia Department of Education
P. O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218-2120
Telephone Number: 804-371-2522
Fax Number: 804-225-2831

- **Dr. Margaret A. Miller**
Associate Director for Academic Affairs
Council of Higher Education
101 N. 14th Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone Number: 804-225-2627
Fax Number: 804-225-2604

- **Dr. Gene M. Pavlidis**
Academic Affairs Coordinator
Council of Higher Education
101 N. 14th Street
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone Number: 804-225-2635
Fax Number: 804-225-2604

- **Ms. Patty Pitts**
Manager for Professional Licensure
Virginia Department of Education
P. O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218-2120
Telephone Number: 804-371-2522
Fax Number: 804-225-2831

- **Ms. Jo Smith Read, Specialist**
Special Education Personnel Development
Virginia Department of Education
P. O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218-2120
Telephone Number: 804-225-2096
Fax Number: 804-225-2831

