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MENTORS' VIEW OF
THE OBSERVATION PROCESS IN
OREGON'S BEGINNING TEACHER SUPPORT PROGRAM

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Mentor teacher programs have the potential to improve the quality of instruction provided by new teachers and to create a new professional opportunity for experienced teachers. In order to achieve these goals, mentors must be willing and able to provide instructional assistance including observation of their proteges in the classroom. Evaluation of existing mentor programs indicates that generally mentors are willing to provide information and moral support, but some are less successful with the coaching aspect of their role. So that mentors can be provided with workable contexts and the training necessary to assume this coaching role, research was needed which discovers the quantity and types of observations being done by mentors and what factors most affect their ability to complete observations.

Background of the Problem

During the 1980's mentor teacher programs were instituted across the nation in response to the
profession's need for formalized induction programs for beginning teachers and continued professional development opportunities for experienced teachers (Huffman and Leak, 1986). The traditional induction through "trial by fire" caused needless anxiety, promoted bad professional practices such as teaching in isolation, and resulted in high attrition rates (Clewett, 1988; Schlechty and Vance, 1983). More important, if beginning teachers had problems adjusting to the teaching situation, it could not help but affect their teaching performance, and the students in their classrooms were the ones who ultimately lost. Mentoring offered an alternative for capable teachers who were leaving the profession due to burnout or the lack of career ladder opportunities in teaching.

Oregon joined this national trend in 1986 when the legislature approved funding for the Oregon Beginning Teacher Support Program (BTSP). House Bill 2020 (1987) stipulated that district programs must provide at least 90 hours of direct contact between mentor teachers and beginning teachers including classroom observation and other assistance with classroom teaching. (See Appendix A.) During the program's pilot year, the mentor role was defined as that of a service provider, support provider, and assistance provider.
Statement of the Problem

The instructional assistance component is the heart and hope of the teacher induction movement. It can empower teachers to take responsibility for the professional growth of their new colleagues. It can counter the social norms of teaching in isolation by offering a model where teachers work together to lead staff development activities in their school (Ward, 1985). It can improve teaching performance if meaningful types of assistance are offered (Huling-Austin, 1986).

The most meaningful type of assistance accessible to mentors is the observation process. In studying effective induction systems, Schlechty (1985) found that occupations with the most effective induction systems relied on intensive clinical supervision, demonstration, coaching, and constant corrective feedback by real practitioners in real situations. Classroom observation encourages self-evaluation and reflection about teaching strategies as a way to identify alternatives for the classroom. Such activities promote adult cognitive development in both the mentor and the protege (Hegler and Dudley, 1987).
However, mentors in Oregon as well as other states have been reluctant to assume the role of classroom observer. In California where the law permits mentors to be released from the classroom for as much as 40 percent of their time, surveys show that mentors spent only an average of 23 hours a month mentoring and only a third of this time was spent interacting with other teachers (Barnett, Kirkpatrick, Little, 1986). In Dr. Frank Brouillet’s 1987 report to the Washington Legislature, where surveys showed that fifty-six percent of the mentors either never or only once or twice observed their beginners teaching a lesson, the recommendation was made that beginners should invite their mentors to increase the number of observations conducted of the beginners’ classrooms.

Griffin (1985) set as a preliminary conclusion from the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) study that mentor program implementation problems included the training of experienced teachers to assume the role of peer teacher and the appropriate use of observation and data collection procedures.

Although the instructional assistance or coaching component was considered a crucial aspect of the Oregon induction program, during its first two
years it was considered by mentors as the role for which they were the least prepared (Clewett, 1988). Year end evaluations likewise indicated that this was considered a difficult dimension of their role (Crouse, 1989). As a result, two changes were implemented in 1989-1990: the addition of a requirement that all mentors conduct at least three classroom observations of their proteges, and an intensification in the clinical supervision training that mentors receive throughout the year. Additionally, the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) supported research on mentor observation.

**Importance of Study**

If mentoring is to be successful, the profession must not only be aware of, but also attempt to understand and resolve problems with instructional assistance. This has yet to be done. During the early 1980's mentoring was touted as a key to career and academic success and was quickly assimilated into educational settings without benefit of a clear conceptualization or sophisticated research (Zimpher and Rieger, 1988). A critical review of the literature
lead Merriam (1983) to conclude that most articles consist of testimonials or opinions as to the benefits of mentoring or "how to" articles on finding or being one. Griffin (1985) also found that available research on induction programs for new teachers had serious limitations. He urges that in order to understand the complex interactions in contexts such as schools, research should use "methodologies which blend and explain, that answer and provide needed detail, and that name and describe." (p. 44) He thus advocates a blend of qualitative and quantitative research methods.

The intent of this study was to research as Griffin suggested, to describe the extent and nature of the instructional assistance currently being provided by Oregon mentors through the clinical observation process and outline which needs and attitudes mentors perceive as being critical to their success. The study collected that information by means of a survey mailed to BTSP mentors in April of 1990. Oregon mentors who were involved in conducting classroom observations were asked to describe the observation activities they did and the barriers they faced in completion of those activities.
The Oregon Beginning Teacher Support Program (BTSP) was an especially appropriate site for this research because administration and training is done at the state level giving this program more consistancy of application than in most states (Crouse, 1989). The program is also free of the ambiguities and conflict raised by assessment issues (Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes, Paulissen, 1986). With a more accurately defined picture of what is and isn’t happening in the observation process, what problems are encountered, and how mentors feel about the process, administrators can begin to make supportive changes.
Objectives

The central goal of this research was to describe the activities and perceived needs and attitudes regarded by BTSP mentors as important in conducting classroom observations of proteges’ teaching skills during their year of involvement in the Oregon Beginning Teacher Support Program. The specific questions to be addressed in the study include the following:

1) What observation-related activities have mentors done during the 1989-1990 school year?

2) What are mentors’ attitudes regarding the effectiveness of the observational process and its potential for causing change?

3) Do the perceived observational needs and attitudes of elementary level classroom teachers differ significantly from those of secondary level classroom teachers?

4) Which observation-related factors are perceived by mentor teachers as being the most important to their success in conducting classroom observations?
5) What needs should be addressed through the Beginning Teacher Support Program (BTSP) training, requirements, or local district policies?

**Hypotheses**

1. There is no significant difference between elementary and secondary level mentors regarding:
   a. types and quantity of classroom observations performed,
   b. types of data collection tools used,
   c. confidence in the ability of the coaching/observation process to enhance communication and improve proteges’ teaching performance,
   d. the relative importance of contextual, attitudinal, and skill-related factors affecting their success with the observation process.

2. Mentors perceive no significant difference in the relative importance of various contextual, attitudinal, and skill-related factors affecting their success with the observation process.
Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1) that observations are an essential part of the mentor program,
2) that mentors are best able to ascertain those attitudes and needs which facilitate the observation process,
3) that attitudes are indicators of some important behaviors,
4) that this random sample represented the population of Oregon mentor teachers,
5) and that participants would respond honestly and reflectively to this survey given that it was sent out through the Oregon Department of Education which directly funds district mentor programs.

Definition of Terms

Several of the terms used in this study are open to generalized associations or multiple definitions. For purposes of coherence the following terms will be defined as follows.
**Beginning teacher:** a teacher who is employed by a public school district at least half-time as a classroom teacher and who has taught fewer than 90 consecutive days, or 180 days total as a certificated teacher in any public school. Beginning teachers who have been assigned a mentor in the Oregon Beginning Teacher Support Program are called proteges.

**Mentor teacher:** a teacher who is employed primarily as a classroom teacher by a school district, has taught successfully for three or more years as a certificated teacher, has demonstrated mastery of teaching skills and subject matter knowledge and has been chosen by his or her school district to participate as a mentor in the Oregon Beginning Teacher Support Program.

(eligibility as defined by House Bill 2020)

**Elementary level teacher:** a teacher who is primarily responsible for teaching in kindergarten through grade 6.

**Secondary level teacher:** a teacher who is primarily responsible for teaching in grades 7 through 12.
Clinical supervision:

"That phase of instructional supervision which draws its data from first-hand observation of actual teaching events and involves face-to-face interaction between supervisor and teacher in the analysis of teaching behaviors and activities for instructional improvement." (Goldhammer, Anderson, Krajewski, 1980). In Oregon's mentor program, clinical supervision involves mentor and protege analysis of teaching behaviors and is separate from evaluation.
Chapter II

THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides a brief overview of the history, rationale, and difficulties associated with the instructional assistance component of the mentor role in beginning teacher support programs. The review is divided into four sections. The first section describes the importance of mentor programs in orienting neophytes into the teaching profession and in providing professional development opportunities for experienced teachers; the second section provides a history of Oregon’s Beginning Teacher Support Program, specifically as relates to the development of its instructional assistance component; the third section provides the history and rationale for the use of clinical supervision as an observation model for instructional assistance; the fourth section outlines the observation-related issues and areas of difficulty which provide the focus of this study.
The Case for Mentor Programs

"There is something wrong with a profession, or even semi-profession, that provides no transition from theory to practice and that sanctions trial and error experimentation in the development of instructional skills." Such is the reaction of Marilyn Rauth (1986) as well as a host of her colleagues to the need for teacher induction. The answer for many states has been to institute mentor programs which provide two missing links in the education profession: assistance into the profession, and a professional growth opportunity for experienced teachers.

Surveys of beginning teachers from case studies, interviews, and reflections collected by Elizabeth Clewett in 1986 show that the problems beginning teachers face cross a wide gamut of instructional, managerial, and communicative issues, and vary greatly from one neophyte to another. Therefore, it is nearly impossible to predict which problems will occur, how severe they will be, and how long they will last. Because of beginners' inability to analyze the source
of their problems and their response to them, much of their frustration, according to Clewett, comes from not being able to untangle and identify their problems and apply appropriate solutions. Since difficulties are individualized and situation-specific, assistance needs to be available within the context in which the problems arise (Clewett, 1986).

In addition, Clewett (1986) found that beginners tend not to be proactive in soliciting the support they need to solve these problems because they are not sure who to ask, don’t want to appear incompetent, and are reluctant to stray from the traditional norms and structures in the school system which discourage collegial sharing.

Veenman (1984) did an international survey of literature from 1960 to 1985 on beginning teachers’ problems. Eighty-three studies revealed that their problems were centered on such diversified areas as: classroom discipline, relations with parents, individual learning needs, insufficient materials and supplies, inability to manage classroom tasks, dealing with problems of individual students, designing curriculum, and assessing student performance.
In her study of the induction efforts of Oregon school districts, Mary Cihak Jensen found that a lack of supervision also contributed to the problems of the beginner. In her study, school principals were frequently reluctant to monitor the performance of new teachers during the first months of the school year, preferring instead to let new teachers "try their wings" without fear of evaluation. Though this sentiment sprang from laudible motives, it lead to unproductive consequences. Unassisted, new teachers experienced difficulties, particularly in discipline and classroom management, that multiplied as the school year progressed. Without feedback, they repeated costly errors (Jensen, 1986).

Mentoring provides an alternative to what Sprinthall and Sprinthall call teaching as a "horizontal and repetitive experience" (1987. p. 66). Many good teachers face the same dilemma as John Reque, an example from their case study. John taught in ideal conditions but was facing burnout because as he said, "We do it over and over and over. New students keep it fresh--to a point. But moving up, however you define it, just can't be done for most of us" (Reque, as quoted in Sprinthall, 1987, p. 67). Sprinthall &
Sprinthall based their work on cognitive developmental psychology and developmental models which suggest that adults can develop or that developmental growth can be restarted. Their adult development studies (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980; Oja & Sprinthall, 1978; Sprinthall & Bernier, 1978) which focused on teachers in Minnesota, demonstrated that when teachers were "placed in slightly more complex roles with appropriate reflection, balance and continuity, some developmental stage movement was evident. The teachers learned new skills, and their ability to process experience was improved" (Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987). In their work with mentor teachers in North Carolina, Sprinthall and Sprinthall concluded that "supervision of beginning teachers represents a major opportunity for teacher revitalization" (Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987).

A majority of mentors in the North Carolina project listed as the most significant aspect that it forced them to reexamine and refine their own skills, and that it showed them the necessity of educators communicating with each other about educational practices (Hawke, 1986).

Experienced teachers appreciate mentoring as an opportunity to share skills and knowledge that are
intangible, not included in teacher education programs, and that would be lost if not rediscovered by beginning teachers (Krupp, 1987). Through collegial observation, the program provides a way for teachers to share ideas and experiences.

**History of the Oregon Program**

The Oregon Legislature adopted House Bill 2020 which provided funds for public school districts in the state to establish Beginning Teacher Support Programs (BTSP). This legislation required the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) to oversee the enactment of induction assistance programs on a pilot basis in the 1987-88 school year, followed by full-scale implementation in 1988-1989. The method of providing support to first-year teachers was prescribed by law, requiring that experienced teachers serve as mentors to beginners. This system was viewed as a means to provide veteran teachers with professional development experiences directly related to classroom teaching while promoting beginners' adjustment to and success in the first teaching year.

The final House Bill 2020 which enacted the program: Section 17, (3) "A description of the content
and calendar of the proposed beginning teacher support program. The program must provide a minimum of 90 hours of direct contact between mentor teachers and beginning teachers, including observation of or assistance with classroom teaching, or both, during the school day." (1987, p. 6).

The observation component of the mentoring process was chosen as the focus of this research because of the importance attached to it by the enacting legislation, House Bill 2020, and because of the perceived lack of readiness indicated by mentors surveyed during the first two years of the program.

The original intent of the Oregon mentor program as proposed by the recommendations of the citizen advisory committees to the Joint Interim Committee on Education, was that "the essential ingredient in upgrading the induction process is the creation of a 'mentorship' by which a senior teacher would be assigned a formal responsibility for the induction of the beginning teacher. A mentor teacher should spend at least an hour a day with the beginning teacher, in observation, coaching, and discussion of all aspects of the teaching craft." (1986, p. 34).
In a pre-training self-assessment survey of 26 mentorship skills, participants rated themselves lowest in skill level on collegial observation activities. In a rank ordered mean item rating, "Gathers observational data on which to base suggestions for improvement" was rated twenty-second with a mean rating of 3.69 (on a 5 point scale) and "Asked to observe colleagues and suggest improvements" was rated twenty-fifth with a mean rating of 3.50. "Served as supervisor/coach" was ranked twenty-fourth with a mean rating of 3.64. Prospective mentors rated themselves lowest in those tasks related to peer observation (Clewett, 1987, p. 16).

All of the mean item ratings on indicators with respect to service as a supervisor or coach were below the median in rank, suggesting lesser feelings of preparedness for direct observation of and assistance with classroom instruction than other dimensions of the mentor role. Of the five items rated lowest by the group, three included functions related to supervision or coaching, specifically skills in observation and data collection, and experience in a formal supervisory role. "The expected importance of this dimension of the mentor role in improving beginners' instructional
performance, coupled with mentors' relatively lower self-assessment of supervisory and coaching skills, suggests that considerable attention in program evaluation should be devoted to the frequency, focus, and quality of mentors' interaction with their proteges as regards the delivery of classroom instruction" (Clewett, 1987, p. 16).

In the post-training self-assessment survey, the role concerned with providing assistance with classroom instruction, termed supervision/coaching, was again rated lowest. The mentor group perceived themselves as less prepared to assume this role prior to training, and was no more ready following attendance at a training session focused exclusively on supervision/consultation techniques (p. 23).

In the next year's evaluation of the 1988 August training, the same trend emerged. Across all training sites preparedness to assume the coaching function was rated lowest by participants in the training workshops.

At the end of the March 1988-1989 training, a majority of participants (362 out of 566 participants responding) indicated that they had not used the observation strategy at all, with many commenting that this approach was inappropriate to the more casual and
informal interaction between team members (Clewett, 1989).

In response to this data, two changes were made in the BTSP program. The training related to mentor/protege observation was revamped to incorporate a more informal process and the amount of training was increased. It also became a requirement of districts to insure that each mentor do three classroom observations of their protege during the year.

The Observation Model

Mentor observation presents a unique situation. It doesn't fit observation-for-supervision models, since it is non-evaluative, nor peer observation models, which do not recognize the non-equal relationship, the assumption of greater expertise on the part of the mentor. Therefore, an examination of Oregon's mentor observation process requires a prior understanding of its roots in clinical supervision and of the alterations which make the process appropriate for mentoring.

The observational model finally selected for Oregon is a revised version of the clinical supervision process. The use of this model for helping beginning
teachers has considerable support (Driscoll, Peterson, and Kauchak, 1985; Odell, 1987; and Stroble and Cooper, 1988) who stated that "For support staff, expertise in the usual skills of clinical supervision--observation, data collection and analysis and communication--are necessary to focus their feedback on formative, developmental concerns." (p. 231). This clinical model was restructured by Rex Crouse and Shirley Gidley based on the collaborative observation research of Richard Strong and Kit Marshall. (See Appendix B.)

As Morris L. Cogan, the originator of clinical supervision, points out, the job of accomplishing significant improvements in classroom teaching is overwhelmingly difficult. Cogan believes that the lack of clinical supervision explains why many potentially useful instructional innovations have failed to become established practice in schools. Teachers trying to develop new classroom competencies need continuing classroom support of trained colleagues to be successful. Cogan states, "Without such specialized help the major and minor failures that a teacher almost always experiences in attempts to change established behavior will ultimately tend to press him back into familiar and 'safer' modes of teaching" (1973, xi).
For beginning teachers that means relying on those styles of teaching observed during their elementary and secondary school years as models of "what teachers are and what they do in class" (Cogan, 1973, p. 15).

Cogan sees clinical supervision as a young and immature science, being at the stage of natural history where it is appropriate for practitioners to collect and analyze data which "may contribute to the formation of theory, but theory building should perhaps wait until systematic practice and the data of supervision are both mature enough to engender and support promising theoretical formulations and related research" (Cogan, 1973, p. 18). The rationale for clinical supervision was envisioned as early as 1925 when William James in Talks to Teachers proposed that "Psychology is a science, and teaching is an art; and sciences never generate arts directly out of themselves. An intermediate inventive mind must make the application, by using its originality" (quoted in Cogan, 1973, p. 18). Cogan sees the supervisor in the role offered by James as "an intermediate, inventive, trained professional committed to working with the teacher to help him make his own original application
of the science available to him, in his own style" (Cogan, 1973, p. 18).

Clinical supervision was originally developed in the Harvard-Newton Summer Program. Cogan used a systematic analysis of teaching episodes to build a training mechanism for inexperienced principals, supervisors, and teachers in leadership positions. The Harvard-Lexington Summer Program, which was partially modeled after the Harvard-Newton program, introduced experienced teachers and administrators to cooperative teaching. In this program the trainees spent two weeks planning curriculum, two weeks teaching that curriculum and the last two weeks observing the teaching of fellow trainees.

Cogan's observation cycle was further refined by Robert Goldhammer, then a faculty member of the 1963 Harvard-Lexington program. Goldhammer published his clinical supervision model in 1969.

Goldhammer's model was particularly appropriate for the mentor program because it was intended to increase teachers' skills for self-supervision and for peer assistance in the skill development of professional colleagues. Its focus is on evaluation of instructional technique for personal improvement rather
than supervisory performance evaluation. It is based on methods which privilege inquiry, analysis, examination, and evaluation which are self-initiated and self-regulated by the teacher participants (Goldhammer, 1969). In clinical supervision, the responsibility for initiating the process and establishing goals and methods rests with the supervisor. In the mentor model, however, the process is directed by the protege and responds to her readiness and perceived needs.

Goldhammer's basic model consists of five stages: preobservational conference, observation, analysis and strategy, supervision conference, and post-conference analysis. The preobservation conference establishes communication and sets the guidelines under which the observation will take place. Goldhammer sees it as a time when the supervisor tries to understand the teacher's frame of reference for the lesson to be observed, and as a rehearsal of the instructional behavior predicted by the lesson. The second stage is the classroom observation. Goldhammer recommends that the observer write down verbatim what he hears and sees as comprehensively as possible. During this stage the observer can be of direct assistance to the teacher by
recording specific data that the teacher has requested in the preconference. During this process the observer is also modeling observational techniques for the teacher who may then use these techniques in observing other teachers or in self-analysis. This process helps teachers test the validity of their perceptions as to what is happening in their classroom. In the third step, Analysis and Strategy, the observer finds patterns, decides which issues to present, and sets goals for the postconference. Along with offering direct assistance through either information or theory, the postconference also presents an opportunity for the teacher’s work to be acknowledged by another professional, for training the teacher in techniques for self-supervision, and to decide what direction future supervision should take. In the postconference analysis the process is reviewed and evaluated by the observer (Goldhammer, 1969).

The current Oregon mentor model consists of three stages: preconference, observation, and postconference. It combines most of the analysis and strategy within the postobservation conference. This model differs from Goldhammer’s clinical supervision in that the
protege initiates the preconference and decides, in collaboration with the mentor, what aspect of the teaching/learning process will be observed and discussed. During this stage the mentor and protege negotiate the objectives of the observation, the data collection techniques to be used, when the observation will occur, and where the mentor will view the classroom during the observation. They also review the lesson plan and materials to be used in the learning activity. The goal is to set the stage for success. If all is not going as planned, a predetermined signal from either party terminates the observation.

The protege also takes responsibility for analyzing the collected data and identifying problems and concerns. Both the mentor and protege brainstorm alternatives, possibilities, and choices from which the protege determines a future course of action (Crouse, 1989).
Identified Problems

There is wide-spread research-based support for mentor programs and collegial observation in some form is considered an integral and, according to some research, an essential part of those programs (Grant, Zeichner, 1981, Howey, 1988 & Bowers, Eberhart, 1988). Researchers have also evaluated the success and problems associated with the implementation of these collegial observation models. Major barriers to collegial evaluation identified by the Stanford Collegial Evaluation Program include: teacher attitudes, lack of criteria validity and reliability, problems with administrator involvement, lack of teacher candor, and insufficient released time for observation (Roper & Hoffman, 1986).

From available literature, a list of potential barriers to observation has been created which will serve as the basis for selecting survey items. These significant factors affecting the observation process have been categorized into areas of:

-the environmental context in which the mentoring occurs: availability of release time and administrative/staff support, (survey questions 72-77)
importance of similarity in mentor/protege pairings regarding gender, age, job assignment, and teaching philosophy, (survey questions 78-83)
-protege attitude towards the process, desire to learn new skills, and ability to self-assess areas for improvement,
(survey questions 84-89)
-mentor attitude, belief in the benefit of the process and perceived coaching ability, (survey questions 90-95).

School Environment

One factor affecting the sustained involvement in collegial support is the degree to which mentors see their actions as significant in the general decision-making and instructional improvement efforts in the school. The school culture must generate an environment where teachers perceive that they have the power to affect change. The mentor program cannot function as a closed system but must connect with a larger teacher-lead professional growth effort in the school (Kit Marshall, personal communication, December, 1989).
"The work of mentor teachers is often conducted after school and erratically, with little time and attention given to the necessary support needed on a continuing basis for professional development. Teachers need opportunities for release time to work with one another, but in the context of a reduced load initially rather than asking teachers to separate themselves from already assigned responsibilities," according to Zimpher and Reiger (1988, p. 179). Participants in the 1986 International Conference on Mentoring agreed that it is difficult to provide time within the school day for coaching, peer observation, and feedback, but recommended release time and the judicious use of well trained substitutes (Lambert and Lambert). In the Oregon program each protege is financially supported by the State Department with a grant to the district of $3,000. It is recommended that individual districts use these funds to budget, among other things, release time for mentor/protege teams. In 1987-1988 a small portion of funds budgeted for this purpose was left unused and was returned to the Department (Clewett, 1988). Questions which remain unanswered are whether sufficient funds are being budgeted for release time, whether the release time is
being used for observation, and, if not, why not? Are teachers (mentors and proteges) reluctant to leave their classrooms? Who covers their classrooms during observations? How insurmountable a problem is it that some districts cannot hire substitutes for one-half day?

Similarity in Mentor/protege Pairings

Ward (1986) suggests that mentor teachers be assigned to novice teachers for a minimum of one school year and that proximity and like placement are needed to give teachers an opportunity to interact with each other in the regular course of the day. In the Oregon program some mentors are located in buildings as far as 50 miles away from their proteges. In many instances mentors are supporting beginning teachers in very different subject areas. There are many cases which require one of these two solutions: small schools which have only one teacher per assignment, and specialty areas such as special education, foreign language or music. How detrimental are distance and dissimilar subject matter assignments to the observation process? Which of the two solutions is less detrimental?
Of what significance is it that many beginning teachers are older than their assigned mentors? Ryan (1986) describes a mentor as an experienced older teacher. He suggests that mentors close in age to new teachers may have greater empathy for what is happening to the novice. Levinson (1978) notes that traditionally persons serving as mentors are older than their proteges by half a generation or 8 to 15 years. That finding was support by Fagin and Walter's study in 1983 which found that of those teachers who reported having a formal or informal mentor, mentors tended to be about 11 years older in age and experience (Coughlin, 1986). Klopf and Harrison (1981) recommend that mentor teachers be somewhat older than the first-year teacher. In their review of selection criteria for mentors, Zimpher and Rieger (1988) find no evidence that one age category is more appropriate or more effective than another age.

In the same study, Zimpher and Rieger found no evidence of significance in same or different gender placement. They cite Kram (1983) and Hunt and Michael (1983) who suggest that male-female mentoring relationships may pose special complexity but do not caution against such pairings. In Fagan and Walter's
1983 study of mentoring among teachers, teachers reported that mentors tended to be of the same sex as those they had mentored (Coughlin, 1986).

**Protege Attitude**

What factors must be present for proteges to accept this collegial coaching? Little (1985) studied conferences of teacher advisors with teachers and identified six principles of advising: common language, focus, hard evidence, interaction, predictability, and reciprocity. Instructional coaches must be able to use the technical language, model the practice, and teach the language to teachers. Do mentors in the Oregon program receive enough training in communication, observation and conferencing skills prior to their in-class work with novices? How important is it that first-year teachers also be trained in the observational model?

"Another aspect of the problem in the education of teachers is the fact that they rarely accept the professional necessity for constant improvement" (Cogan, 1973 p. 79) One reason for this, Cogan believes, is that many teachers graduate feeling inadequately prepared and therefore perceive
observation as designed to discover their gross incompetencies. Teacher effort is then directed toward hiding weaknesses rather than participating in a collegial effort to refine skills. Even those teachers who feel successful in their classroom teaching may view the observer as someone whose role requires that they discover or invent incompetencies. Without adequate pre-observation preparation, teachers, whether confident or insecure in their teaching ability, may view supervision as a threat (Cogan, 1973). "A conflict is generated when the teacher's conviction about his professional competence collides with his conviction that in-class supervision implies incompetence. This conflict must be resolved before he can participate freely in clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973, p. 80).

There is also research regarding problems with the roles and general functions of mentors which raise questions related to the observation activity.

One potential problem associated with the mentor program is in the ambiguity or misunderstanding of the mentor's role in the observation process. Is their observational role to assist or assess? In many states such as Virginia, Oklahoma, Florida, North Carolina,
and the Toledo program in Ohio, the role expectations for mentor teachers include formative and summative evaluation with these assessments being used in retention and tenure decisions. This mix of expectations can cause confusion to mentor and novice alike and erode the beginner's trust (Stroble and Cooper, 1988). In Oregon the mentor's role is clearly non-evaluative. Data collected during observations and mentor/protege conversations are to be kept confidential and are not to be shared with colleagues or administrators (Crouse, 1989). The question remains, are proteges convinced? Are they reluctant to open their doors to observation because of insecurity about who will know what happened in their room and what will they think?

**Mentor Attitude and Expertise**

In her description of the Turning Point Interaction observation model for mentors, Karen Olsen stresses that mentors must have knowledge and expertise regarding: the curriculum, instructional strategies, learning theory and how these three aspects interact with each other so that they can take a holistic view of the mentee's classroom, and analyze what actions
would have the most pay-off for the mentee and the students. In her example, if a mentee requests assistance with her discipline program, and upon observing the classroom the mentor realizes that the problem lies not with classroom management, but with the fact that the curriculum is boring, the mentor must be prepared to adjust her perspective. Otherwise the interaction is a waste of time for both the mentee and the mentor (Olsen, 1988, p. 90).

Zimpher and Rieger (1988) indicate that often the factors which constrain mentor/protege relationships are largely personal. Individual defensiveness in critiquing teaching practice seems to get in the way of the kind of professional objectivity necessary to observe and give feedback about teaching. They acknowledge the essential interpersonal abilities of mentors and recommend a focus on the practice of teaching as distinct from the teacher. Bird (1985) points out that mentors need to be knowledgeable in the basic strategies, procedures and skills of teaching and knowledgeable in observing, describing and analyzing teaching so that they focus on "practices and their consequences, rather than persons and their competence" (p. 25).
Elementary and Secondary Level Mentor Needs

One goal of this research is to compare the types and quantity of observations conducted by elementary and secondary level teachers as well as their attitudes and needs regarding the observation process. Elementary and secondary level mentor teachers currently receive the same training in collegial coaching at BTSP workshop sessions and there are like expectations for both levels. This may be unrealistic. Studies of internships in independent schools show significant differences in the intensity with which elementary and secondary programs attempt to develop instructional skill. There is a stronger commitment to create professional and supportive environments in elementary schools. In high schools mentors felt more uncomfortable with the role of expert or authority about teaching and were less likely to reflect on teaching behavior or attempt to articulate a pedagogical theory (Powell, 1988).

In a study of the extent to which working conditions impacted the self-perceived reality shock of beginning teachers, Marso and Pigge (1987) found that beginning elementary teachers experienced less reality shock than the secondary teachers. Elementary
teachers, but not secondary teachers, reported a significantly higher on-the-job than prior-to-employment expectation rating for help from other teachers.
Summary

Current research shows that mentors and beginning teachers benefit from the mentoring experience. It also shows that the most promising and difficult aspect of the mentoring role is that of observation for instructional assistance. What research now needs to discover is precisely what observation activities are being done by elementary and secondary level mentors and what factors most significantly affect their success in completing those observation activities.
Chapter III

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to investigate the observation activities and comparative perceptions of classroom observation needs and attitudes among BTSP mentors. In this study descriptive data was collected through a self-report, questionnaire survey. This chapter includes a description of the sample population, a discussion of the formation and content of the survey, and a description of the procedures used to analyze the data.

Sample Population

The population for this study included all mentor teachers involved in the 1989-1990 Oregon BTSP who were trained directly by the State Department of Education training cadre. This limitation insured that all teachers included in the study had the same training in observational process and data collection techniques. To be included as a mentor in the Oregon BTSP a teacher must have current Oregon teaching certification, be employed primarily as a classroom teacher, have at least three years of successful teaching experience and
have demonstrated mastery of teaching skills and subject matter knowledge. Districts establish their own process for mentor selection. It is recommended by the Oregon Department of Education that this process include the direct participation of classroom teachers. For study purposes, Oregon mentor teachers were considered a homogeneous population.

For descriptive research a sample of 10% of the population is considered minimum (Gay, 1987). Gay recommends that if it is at all possible to use more subjects, the researcher should do so. According to Borg and Gall (1989) the general rule is to use the largest sample possible since the larger the sample, the more likely are its mean and standard deviation to be representative of the population mean and standard deviation (p. 233). The population for this study was 562 mentors. A random sample of 225 (40% of the total population) was drawn using commercial computer software programmed to draw random numbers (Bolding, 1989). This insured randomness as each mentor had an equal chance of being selected and the selection of one mentor did not interfere with the selection of other mentors (Courtney, 1988). Each qualified mentor was assigned a consecutive number from zero to 562. The
computer-produced list of random numbers was then matched with the numbered list of mentor teachers to determine the random sample. The sample represented 225 mentors from 97 school districts of various size and geographic location throughout the state of Oregon.
**Procedure**

Survey questions designed specifically for this study were included in a general end-of-year survey used by the Oregon Department of Education to evaluate effectiveness and satisfaction of 1989-1990 BTSP participants. (See Appendix C).

Surveys were mailed from the State Department of Education, Division of Curriculum and School Improvement directly to district mentor teachers on April 16, 1990. Names were omitted from the surveys to insure individual confidentiality in outcome reporting. Each survey was, however, given an identification number so that a follow-up letter could be sent for each non-returned survey and to insure the accuracy of survey identification as representing elementary or secondary level mentors.

A total of 225 surveys were mailed to district mentor teachers. By the final deadline, 203 surveys were returned for a 90 percent return rate.
The Instrument

This study used a survey-type instrument designed for mailing. The survey asked respondents to describe how the observational process was managed in their site-specific context and judge needs and attitudes which are necessary to mentor teachers involved in the 1989-1990 BTSP program. One of the dependent variables for the study was a Likert-type scale value which was judgmentally assigned by each of the subjects included in the sample. The equal-appearing interval scale encompassed five (5) importance levels which reflected the perceived needs of mentor teachers in conducting classroom observation of proteges. The scale consisted of values based upon the following descriptions:

1 - extremely unimportant
2 - of little importance
3 - of some importance
4 - very important
5 - extremely important

The second dependent variable requested numerical counts of nominal scale data and partially close-ended questions designed to illustrate how observations were being managed, which teaching skills were being observed, and which data collection tools were being used in this process. Gillman (1978) advises that
researchers should not expect with this type of question to obtain a sufficient number of additional responses to warrant their inclusion in the planned analysis. The partially closed option may, however, yield useful information by indicating that there was not a significant number of respondents needing additional categories.

The instrument was developed according to the DELPHI method of validation as described by Courtney (1988). The method for establishing content validity for the instrument was to apply the DELPHI procedure to a list of factors which are considered to be inherent to the observational role. This preliminary list of survey items was developed through an initial review of literature covering perceived needs in the area of mentor/protege interaction, plus a review of current research on the process and application of the clinical supervision model. The actual validation involved six panel members (see Appendix D) who were chosen on the basis of the following criteria:

1) Not less than three years involvement in the mentor program or teacher education.
2) Not less than three years of experience in conducting teacher observations as part of staff development responsibilities or teacher education.

The initial stage of the DELPHI process collected responses from each member of the panel to indicate whether there was ambiguity or redundancy within the listing of potential items in the survey instrument. Panel members indicated their opinion of the item listings by marking one of the following response categories:

- retain
- reject
- retain with the following modification(s)

The second questionnaire asked the panel members to rate each item which was retained or retained with modification according to its level of importance using a five-point Likert type scale. Consensus was considered established when the responses of the panel were the same 80% of the time. In this study, group
consensus was met on the second round. Items were considered as being appropriate for inclusion in the instrument if the importance level mean was at or above the 3.5 level on the scale. (See Appendix E for Delphi survey.)

Survey

After completion the survey was pretested by using Dillman's Total Design Method (TDM) pretest procedures (1978). The survey was submitted to three groups of people: colleagues, potential users, and people drawn from the population to be surveyed. These people responded to the questionnaire and questions about the questionnaire to determine:

Is each of the questions measuring what it is intended to measure?
Are all the words understood?
Are questions interpreted similarly by all respondents?
Does each close-ended question have an answer that applies to each respondent?
Does the questionnaire create a positive impression, one that motivates people to answer it?
Are questions answered correctly?
Does any aspect of the questionnaire suggest bias on the part of the researcher?" (Dillman, 1978, p. 156).

The instrument was field tested on a small representative sample of ten (10) mentors prior to its implementation for data collection in the study.
Method of Analysis

The purpose and research intent of this study was to describe the activities and perceived needs and attitudes of BTSP mentors regarding the observational process. Important to the local district guidelines and state training curriculum are the amount and types of observations actually conducted and the levels of importance attached to training and management factors deemed essential by mentors in the field. This study used six sections of the BTSP survey to answer two hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1**

Mentors perceive no significant difference in the relative importance of various contextual, attitudinal, and skill-related factors affecting their success with the observation process.

The section of the survey designed to test this hypothesis used a five-point Likert-type scale which asked mentors to assign a score reflecting their judgment as to the importance of various factors in contributing to their success in conducting classroom observations. Items were clustered into categories of mentor/protege context, similarity of mentor/protege pairings, protege attitude, and mentor attitude. The
intent of data analysis was to determine if mentors perceived a significant difference in the relative importance of different factors. A one-way analysis of variance (F-ratio) was calculated to determine if there was a significant difference between the 24 survey items at a significance level of .05. In order to determine where significant differences occurred, Scheffe tests were used to compare each item mean to all other item means. The Scheffe test involves calculation of an F ratio for each mean comparison.

Mentors were also asked to select which of these factors they considered first, second and third most important to their success with the observation process. Scores for each group were counted and factors were ranked by two processes: a ranking of factors considered "most important" and a ranking of factors with combined, weighted scores for first, second, and third most important ratings.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between elementary and secondary level mentors regarding:

a. quantity and types of classroom observations performed,
b. types of data collection tools used,

c. confidence in the ability of the observation process to enhance communication and improve proteges' teaching performance,

d. the relative importance of contextual, attitudinal, and skill-related factors affecting mentor success with the observation process.

Hypothesis 2, Section A

In order to compare the quantity of classroom observations performed, mentors were asked to document their observation activities in two ways. First, mentors were asked to describe the number of observations performed and the number of observations which included a pre and post observation conference according to the following scale:

- A none
- B 1 to 3 times
- C 4 to 6 times
- D 7 to 9 times
- E 10 or more times

Second, in order to document both the quantity and types of observation activities completed, mentors were asked to mark on categorized lists those teacher and student behaviors they had observed. An "other" category was available for observed behaviors not included on the lists. Numerical scores for each observed behavior were tallied and a comparison of
responses from elementary and secondary level mentors was calculated using chi square tests.

Hypothesis 2, Section B

In order to document the types of data collection tools used, mentors were asked to mark on a pre-determined list each type of data collection tool they had used during their classroom observations. An "other" category was available for types of data collection tools not included on the list. Numerical scores for each data collection tool were tallied and a comparison of responses from elementary and secondary level mentors was done using a chi square test.

Hypothesis 2, Section C

The purpose of this section was to determine the level of confidence that elementary and secondary level mentors had in the observation process. Mentors were asked to rate as "Greatly," "Somewhat," or "Not at all" the extent to which they believed the observation process improved proteges' teaching performance and enhanced mentor/protege communication. Scores were tallied and compared for elementary and secondary level mentors using a chi square test.
Hypothesis 2, Section D

The purpose of the first section on the survey was to describe the proteges' working environment so that a comparison could be made between elementary and secondary level school environments. Environmental factors deemed important to this study were administrative and staff support, standards for student achievement, and general friendliness of school atmosphere. Mentors were asked to rate their agreement or disagreement with 8 context-related items on a five-point Likert-type scale. Responses were counted to determine the frequency of response to each item. A chi square test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the two groups of mentors.

In order to compare elementary and secondary level mentors' perceptions as to the relative importance of various contextual, attitudinal, and skill-related factors which affect their success with the observation process, mentors were asked to rate the importance of twenty-four factors on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Mentors rated each factor from "Not important" to "Very important." Comparisons of mean scores from elementary
and secondary level mentors were calculated using a one-factor analysis of variance, 1 degree of freedom, with an assigned alpha level of .05.

**Levels of Significance**

The level of significance determines how large the difference between the means must be in order to be considered significantly different. The choice of significance level must be made prior to execution of the study (Gay, 1987). According to Gay, for most studies a significance level of .05 is reasonable. The decision to retain or reject the null hypothesis in this study will be made at the .05 significance level.
Reliability

As specified by B.J. Winer in *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design*, a two-way analysis of variance was used to estimate the reliability of internal consistency measurement for the Likert-type items used in the survey. The formula used is as follows:

Whereas \( R \) equals the reliability of mean importance ratings as judged by a random sample of 24 mentors:

\[
R_k = \frac{MS \text{ (between people)} - MS \text{ (within people)}}{MS \text{ (between people)}}
\]

\[
R = \frac{16.177 - .859}{16.177} = .947
\]

The reliability coefficient for the interval scale data was .947. According to Gay, "a coefficient over .90 would be acceptable for any test" (1987, p. 14).
Summary

The aim of the study was to describe the quantity and types of classroom observations currently being conducted by elementary and secondary level mentor teachers involved in the BTSP and their perceptions as to which factors are most important to success in completing the observation process. Data was collected through a mailed, self-assessment survey of a random sample of the Oregon mentor population. Data was analyzed using frequency counts, chi square tests, F-tests, and Scheffe tests. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the responses of the two groups and between responses to various factors.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of data is presented in two sections. The first section discusses differences mentors found in the relative importance of twenty-four factors impacting their ability to provide instructional assistance for their proteges through the observation process. The second section compares the quantity and types of observations conducted by elementary and secondary level mentors and compares their perceptions of the importance of various observation-related factors.

Section I: Factor Comparison

The null hypothesis that mentors perceive no significant difference in the relative importance of various contextual, attitudinal, and skill-related factors affecting their success with the observation process was tested using a one-way analysis of variance. Eleven surveys were deleted because of missing values. The F-test was applied to the twenty-four factors at the .05 significance level to determine if real differences existed. With 192 degrees of freedom between subjects and 4,439 degrees
of freedom within subjects, the F-test value for all 24 factors was 2.97. This score was significantly more than the critical value of F at the .05 level so the null hypothesis was rejected. The analysis of variance test compares individual means with other means but does not identify the source of variance. Therefore, the Scheffe test was used to determine sources of difference. Results are listed in Table 1.

Table 1
Relative Importance of Factors Affecting Instructional Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Items Significantly More Important</th>
<th>Items Significantly Less Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. Availability of Release Time</td>
<td>78, 80, 84, 86, 87</td>
<td>79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88, 92, 93, 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Preparation Time Different From Protege</td>
<td>75, 76, 77, 78, 80</td>
<td>79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81, 84, 86, 87, 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89, 92, 93, 94, 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Positive Attitude of School Faculty</td>
<td>75, 76, 78, 80, 81</td>
<td>79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84, 86, 87, 88, 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93, 94, 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Positive Admin. Attitude Toward Observation</td>
<td>73, 74, 79, 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Positive Admin. Attitude Toward Teacher-Led Staff Development</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73, 74, 79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>More Important</td>
<td>Less Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Confidentiality of Observation Data</td>
<td>78, 93</td>
<td>73, 79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Mentor/Protege Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>72, 73, 74, 76, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79, 81, 82, 83, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89, 90, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Mentor/Protege Age Difference</td>
<td>72, 73, 74, 75, 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77, 78, 80, 81, 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84, 85, 86, 87, 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89, 90, 91, 92, 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94, 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Teaching in Same Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>72, 73, 74, 79, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83, 85, 89, 90, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Teaching the Same Content</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73, 74, 79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Similar Educational Philosophy</td>
<td>78, 80, 84, 86, 88</td>
<td>79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92, 93, 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Mentor/Protege of the Same Gender</td>
<td>72, 73, 74, 75, 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77, 78, 80, 81, 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84, 85, 86, 87, 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89, 90, 91, 92, 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94, 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Protege Willingness to Be Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td>72, 73, 74, 79, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Protege Ability to Identify Areas for Observation</td>
<td>78, 80, 92, 93, 94</td>
<td>79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Protege Belief Observation is Non-Evaluative</td>
<td></td>
<td>72, 73, 74, 79, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Protege Willingness to Try New Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>72, 73, 74, 79, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>More Important</td>
<td>Less Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Protege Belief</td>
<td>72,73,74,79,82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Improves Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Protege Need for Assistance</td>
<td>78,80,93</td>
<td>73,79,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Mentor Confidence Using Process</td>
<td>78,80,93</td>
<td>79,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Mentor Knowledge of Collection Tools</td>
<td>78,80,92,93,94</td>
<td>79,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Mentor Knowledge of Teaching Techniques</td>
<td>72,73,74,79,82</td>
<td>83,85,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Mentor Ability to Give Non-Threatening Feedback</td>
<td>72,73,74,77,79</td>
<td>82,83,85,89,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Mentor Belief</td>
<td>72,73,74,79,82</td>
<td>83,85,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Can Improve Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Mentor Desire to Learn Coaching Skills</td>
<td>73,75,79,83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows the relative differences between these factor means using a bar graph. Figure 2 also graphs the differences between the means of instructional assistance factors with the addition of error bars or confidence intervals which depict one standard deviation above and below the mean for each factor. With normally distributed sets of scores, it
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Figure 1
Ownership of Release Time -
Preparation Time Different From Protege -
Attitude of School Faculty -
Administrative Attitude Toward Observation -
Admin. Attitude Toward Teacher-led Staff Development -
Confidentiality of Observation Data -
Mentor/Protege Trust -
Mentor/Protege Age Difference -
Teaching in the Same Building -
Teaching in the Same Content -
Similar Educational Philosophy -
Mentor/Protege of the Same Gender -
Protege Willingness to Be Observed -
Protege Ability to Identify Area of Need -
Protege Belief Observation is Non-evaluative -
Protege Willingness to Try New Ideas -
Protege Belief Observation Improves Teaching -
Protege Need for Assistance -
Mentor Confidence Using Process -
Mentor Knowledge of Collection Tools -
Mentor Knowledge of Teaching Techniques -
Mentor Ability to Give Non-threatening Feedback -
Mentor Desire to Learn Coaching Skills -

Figure 2
could be expected that sample means would fall within this range 95% of the time (Gay, 1987).

Mentors were asked to select which of 24 factors they considered first, second, and third most important to their success with the observation process. Factors were ranked using two methods. In the first method, factors were ranked according to the number of times a factor was selected as being "most important." In the second method, factors were ranked according to the number of times a factor was selected as first, second or third most important. In the second method, ratings were weighted with a "most important" rating assigned 3 points, a "second most important" rating assigned 2 points, and a "third most important" rating assigned 1 point. The results were identical for both ranking systems. The results for all factors are shown in Table 2. Mentors most frequently cited the following:

1) Trust between you and your protege.
2) The availability of release time with someone covering your class while you observe and coach your protege.
3) Teaching in the same building as your protege.
4) Your protege’s willingness to have you observe him/her.
5) Teaching in the same content area or grade level as your protege.
Table 2
Factors Considered Important to Coaching Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Mentors</th>
<th>Weighted Sum of 1st, 2nd &amp; 3rd Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trust between mentor and protege</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Availability of release time</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teaching in same building as protege</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protege’s willingness to be observed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teaching the same content</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mentor ability to give non-threatening feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Protege’s belief that observation can improve teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Protege’s belief that observation is non-evaluative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Preparation time different from protege</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mentor knowledge of teaching techniques</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Protege’s perceived need for assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Similar educational philosophy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mentor belief that observation can improve teaching.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mentor knowledge of collection tools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Confidentiality of observation data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Protege ability of identify areas of need</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Administrative attitude toward teacher-led staff development activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Protege willingness to try new ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Administrative attitude toward collegial observation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Mentor desire to learn coaching skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mentor confidence using process</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Attitude of school faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Mentor/protege of same gender</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Mentor/protege age difference</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three of the top five factors dealt with context issues administered at the district level: access to release time and the logistics of the mentor/protege pairings. As in previous years (Gabriel, 1989 and Faddis, 1989), mentors cite the importance of teaching in the same building as their protege and the importance of similar teaching assignments. One mentor summarized the views of many saying,

"My ability to work with my protege was greatly enhanced by being in the same school and working at the same grade level."

In order to determine which factors had been omitted from the survey list and whether those omitted factors were important to a large percentage of mentors, respondents were asked "What other factors increased your ability to observe and coach your protege?" and "What other factors hindered your ability to observe and coach your protege?" (All responses are included in Appendix F.)

Friendship with their protege was the only additional factor mentioned by more than one mentor. Ten other mentors made similar comments to these two who said:

"We liked each other and felt comfortable being together. We shared the same interests."
"The fact that we became such good friends made our professional, working relationship great. We could talk about and share any problems and concerns."

Most mentors used the open-ended section of the survey to add information about previously listed factors. These personal comments provided insights about context, attitude, and skill-related issues.

**Context**

**Time**

Ninty-seven mentors commented about the time required for observations. Fifty-nine mentors voiced concern that a regular classroom teaching schedule is already a full-time commitment. Mentors felt a need to "be in our classrooms, on the job." Added to the strain of teaching duties, mentors mentioned district and building time commitments to attend meetings for standardization/accreditation visits, middle school transition, textbook adoption, curriculum building, and the time and energy drains of a strike.
Additional duties, both of the protege and the mentor, were listed by fourteen mentors as reducing the amount of time available for observations. As one mentor illustrated,

"Additional duties taken on while mentoring my protege such as a student teacher, ESD workshop on computers, yearbook duties, etc. all took time away from the mentoring process. I would recommend that the mentor and protege not assume any additional duties during that first year."

However, three mentors who had coached sports with their proteges found this time a benefit to mentoring. It also helped if teams attended a class together or did school duties such as hall duty or bus duty together.

Other mentors wrote about the difficulties they experienced trying to get substitutes to cover their classes. Difficulties included having no release time, not being able to get a substitute to cover just one class period, and the lack of qualified substitutes in small districts or in specialty areas such as music.

Many mentors who found solutions did so through administrative and staff support. Nine mentors listed that other teachers gave up preparation time to cover their classes and thirteen mentioned having administrators who were willing to cover their classes.
One drawback to having administrative coverage was brought up by four elementary mentors whose administrators were very willing to provide class coverage but were often caught up in unexpected problems causing them to be late or cancel. Other proposed solutions were video-taping, having a student teacher, or team-teaching with both teachers' students in the same room.

**Pairings**

Three pairing factors: close classroom proximity, similar jobs, and a prior acquaintance were mentioned most often (by fifty-six mentors) as helping build the trusting relationship necessary for instructional coaching to occur. In addition, fifteen mentors mentioned that teaching in a different building or on opposite ends of a building was a hindrance, and nineteen mentors listed teaching in different grade levels or content areas as a hindrance. Total, these three pairing factors were mentioned by nearly a third of the mentors surveyed.

Those mentors who were not in the same building as their proteges nor taught the same content found
coaching especially difficult. As one said,

"Being in a separate building and being in a different grade level was a tremendous hinderance. One or the other, though not ideal, would be more workable, but with both differences, we had many difficulties. If I could choose only one, I would choose same grade level, different building."

Several mentors found it beneficial to have known their proteges prior to mentoring.

"We had previously worked together (she did a practicum in my classroom the previous year). Therefore, we had already established a friendship and were quite familiar with each other's teaching."

Mentors knew their proteges previously either as friends, student teachers, or building substitute teachers.

Administrative/staff Support

Forty-seven mentors cited administrative support as affecting their ability to observe and coach. Twenty-one praised their administrators' flexibility, willingness to obtain class coverage, or willingness to cover classes themselves. Fourteen felt that their project directors or principals had hindered their efforts either by not wanting teachers to be out of their classrooms, not providing funding for
substitutes, or not having the mentor/protege teams ready to start at the beginning of the year. Ten mentors remarked that their staffs had helped through class coverage or moral support. Four reported that staff jealousy had been a problem.

**Attitude**

A third of the mentors commented about either their attitude or their protege’s attitude affecting the observation process. Thirty-six listed a positive protege attitude as one of the reasons for their success. They had proteges who were receptive and willing to try new ideas and who saw coaching as a way to become a good teacher.

"My protege’s openness about areas of struggle and her desire to grow and improve facilitated optimum use of observation and coaching time."

My protege’s desire to improve her teaching skills forced us to arrange the time."

Thirty-eight mentors listed protege attitude as a hindrance. They were matched with proteges who felt threatened by observation or, despite the efforts of the mentors, continued to see it as evaluation. Some proteges were simply not willing to put in the time. Seven mentors listed that either they, or their
proteges, or both, believed that the proteges’ skills were good already so coaching wasn’t necessary.

"My protege’s independence and self-confidence sometimes interfered. She is very self-assured and wants to be able to do it on her own. She’s a very good first year teacher and I don’t think she needed an extreme amount of coaching."

Twelve mentors attributed mentoring success to their own positive attitudes: a concern that students have good, qualified teachers, and a willingness to help. One mentor listed,

"Interest in working with another professional and the belief that observing and coaching my protege was/is a two way learning process."

Six mentors made remarks which reflected attitudes detrimental to the observation process either seeing it as an unnecessary remedial activity or admitting that they didn’t want to leave their own classrooms.

**Skill**

Thirty-nine mentors mentioned a skill-related factor as contributing to their success. Twenty-five felt the BTSP workshops had been helpful especially in teaching them to focus their observations on just one area in the
pre-conference (8 mentors) and in providing an opportunity to talk with other mentors (7 elementary mentors).

"Agreeing beforehand what areas I'd be observing and coaching in order to improve his classroom. Keeping the idea that I'm only looking for one area to observe, and that the process is to help, not evaluate the protege."

Eight mentors had previous training or experience with ITIP, TESA, clinical supervision, peer coaching, or supervising student teachers which helped them provide instructional assistance. Five mentors found a lack of skill to be a problem, most notably the inability of their proteges to identify areas for observation.

Section II: Elementary/Secondary Comparison

The null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference between elementary and secondary level mentors regarding:

a. the quantity and types of classroom observations performed,

b. types of data collection tools used,

c. confidence in the ability of the observation process to enhance communication and improve proteges' teaching performance,
d. the relative importance of contextual, attitudinal, and skill-related factors affecting mentor success with the observation process.

Quantity and Types of Classroom Observations

Elementary and secondary level mentors were asked to indicate how many times they had observed and gathered data for their protege while he/she was teaching. The majority of mentors (57.71%) reported that they had observed their proteges between 1 and 3 times. About a quarter of the mentors (25.87%) had observed their proteges between 4 and 6 times, and 12.44% had observed their proteges more than 7 times. A Chi Square test showed no significant difference (at .05, 4 degrees of freedom, p = .0147) between elementary and secondary level responses.

Most mentors (89%) indicated that these observations included a goal-setting conference and a post-observation conference. A Chi Square test indicated that there was no significance difference (at .05, 4 degrees of freedom, p = .3793) between elementary and secondary level responses.
Tables 3 and 4 show the types of teacher and student behaviors mentors documented during observations. Total, mentors assisted with 1,407 teaching factors, or an average of 6.9 teaching skills per mentor/protege pair. Based on Chi-Square scores, there was not a significant difference in the amount of instructional assistance provided by elementary and secondary level teachers, nor was there was a significant difference in the types of assistance provided with the exception of managing classroom procedures, time on task, and pupil/pupil interaction, all of which were observed more often by secondary level teachers.

Table 3
Teacher Behaviors Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary Mentors</th>
<th>Secondary Mentors</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Procedure</td>
<td>30 (24%)</td>
<td>31 (40%)</td>
<td>61 (30%)</td>
<td>5.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning Skills</td>
<td>61 (49%)</td>
<td>40 (51%)</td>
<td>101 (50%)</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracting Habits</td>
<td>46 (37%)</td>
<td>29 (37%)</td>
<td>75 (37%)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Movement</td>
<td>57 (45%)</td>
<td>43 (55%)</td>
<td>100 (49%)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>51 (41%)</td>
<td>26 (33%)</td>
<td>77 (38%)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping Strategies</td>
<td>43 (34%)</td>
<td>30 (38%)</td>
<td>73 (36%)</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>80 (64%)</td>
<td>48 (62%)</td>
<td>128 (63%)</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>91 (73%)</td>
<td>59 (76%)</td>
<td>150 (74%)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Tech</td>
<td>87 (70%)</td>
<td>53 (68%)</td>
<td>140 (69%)</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05, 1 degree of freedom, tabular value 3.84
Table 4
Student Behaviors Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary Mentors</th>
<th>Secondary Mentors</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time on Task</td>
<td>76 (61%)</td>
<td>59 (76%)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Movement</td>
<td>41 (33%)</td>
<td>27 (35%)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Involvement</td>
<td>66 (53%)</td>
<td>32 (42%)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Interaction</td>
<td>50 (40%)</td>
<td>43 (55%)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Response</td>
<td>66 (53%)</td>
<td>42 (55%)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 299 203 502

Combined Totals 845 562 1407

*Significant at .05, 1 degree of freedom, tabular value 3.84

Previous research has indicated that the school environment has strong indirect effects on the quantity and quality of interactions between beginning and mentor teachers (Gabriel, 1989). In this evaluation, data derived from a comparison of the school environment and the instructional assistance provided by elementary and secondary level teachers questions that conclusion.

The Chi-Square scores in Table 5 indicate that elementary level teachers scored half of these items significantly higher than secondary level teachers. Though significant differences existed in the elementary and secondary level school environments, these differences did not impact the quantity or types of instructional assistance provided.
Table 5
School Environment Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers and administrators work together on school concerns.</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>p=.0561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers feel supported by administrators.</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>p=.1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New teachers receive help from experienced teachers.</td>
<td>10.53*</td>
<td>p=.0145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New teachers discuss their problems with the principal.</td>
<td>15.47*</td>
<td>p=.0038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is a feeling of warmth and friendliness in the school atmosphere.</td>
<td>19.55*</td>
<td>p=.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers care for each other in this school.</td>
<td>11.77*</td>
<td>p=.0082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is ongoing staff development based on established needs.</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>p=.6533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There are challenging and attainable standards for student achievement.</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>p=.1298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05, 4 degrees of freedom, tabular value 9.49

Types of Data Collection Tools Used

Table 6 shows the types of data collection tools mentors used to document what was happening in their proteges’ classrooms. Tallies of actions, behaviors, or responses were used most often, by 71% of both elementary and secondary teachers. There was no
significant difference between elementary and secondary responses except for use of a student seating chart which was used more frequently by secondary level teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools Used by Mentors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim (teacher dialogue)</td>
<td>33 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected verbatim</td>
<td>51 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating chart</td>
<td>41 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallies of behaviors or responses</td>
<td>89 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05, 1 degree of freedom, tabular value 3.84

Confidence in the Observation Process

Elementary and secondary level mentors were asked to rate the extent to which they felt participation in the observation/coaching process improved their proteges' teaching performance by marking "greatly," "somewhat," or "not at all." Percentage results are shown in Table 7. When counts were compared using a Chi Square test, two degrees of freedom, the resulting score was .746 which was not significant at the .05 level.
Table 7
Observation Impact on Protege Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary Mentors</th>
<th>Secondary Mentors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly</td>
<td>23 (19.33%)</td>
<td>15 (19.48%)</td>
<td>38 (19.39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>89 (74.79%)</td>
<td>55 (71.43%)</td>
<td>144 (73.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>7 (5.88%)</td>
<td>7 (9.09%)</td>
<td>14 (7.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>119 (100%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
<td>196 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary and secondary level mentors were also asked to rate the degree to which they felt the observation process enhanced their communication with their proteges by marking "greatly," "somewhat," or "not at all." Percentage results are shown in Table 8. When results were compared using a Chi Square test, two degrees of freedom, the resulting score was .75 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table 8
Observation Impact on Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary Mentor</th>
<th>Secondary Mentor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly</td>
<td>43 (35.54%)</td>
<td>32 (41.56%)</td>
<td>75 (37.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>65 (53.72%)</td>
<td>38 (49.35%)</td>
<td>103 (52.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>13 (10.74%)</td>
<td>7 (.909%)</td>
<td>20 (10.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>121 (100%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
<td>198 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation-related Factors

When elementary and secondary level mentor responses were compared for observation-related factors using a one-factor analysis of variance, 1 degree of freedom between groups, 193-198 degrees of freedom within groups, a significant difference at the .05 level was found for only three of twenty-four factors. Those three factors were: "Having an educational philosophy similar to that of your protege," and "Your confidence in knowing enough teaching techniques to offer suggestions or alternatives," and "Being of the same gender as your protege." These three factors were rated significantly higher by elementary level teachers. Analysis of variance results for all factors are shown in Table 9.
Table 9
Elementary/Secondary Level Factor Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>F Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. Availability of Release Time with Class Coverage.</td>
<td>3.94 3.58</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Preparation Time Different From Protege</td>
<td>3.43 3.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Positive Attitude of School Faculty Toward Collegial Observation</td>
<td>3.58 3.68</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Positive Administrative Attitude Toward Collegial Observation</td>
<td>4.32 4.09</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Positive Administrative Attitude Toward Teacher-directed Staff Development</td>
<td>4.26 4.05</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Administrative Respect for Confidentiality of Data</td>
<td>4.24 3.95</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Trust Between Mentor and Protege</td>
<td>4.82 4.67</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Mentor/Protege Age Differences</td>
<td>1.58 1.38</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Teaching in the Same Building as Protege</td>
<td>4.73 4.55</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Teaching the Same Content as Protege</td>
<td>4.30 4.05</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Mentor/Protege Having Similar Educational Phil.</td>
<td>4.00 3.45</td>
<td>13.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Mentor/Protege Being the Same Gender</td>
<td>2.08 1.68</td>
<td>5.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Protege’s Willingness to Be Observed</td>
<td>4.40 4.20</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9  
(continued)  
Elementary/Secondary Level Factor Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th>F Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Ability of Protege to Identify Areas for Observation</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Protege’s Belief That the Observation is Non-evaluative</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Willingness of Protege to Try New Ideas</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Protege’s Belief That Observation Can Improve Teaching</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Protege’s Perceived Need for Assistance</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Mentor Confidence in Using Observation Process</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Mentor Knowledge of Data Collection Tools</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Mentor Knowledge of Teaching Techniques</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Mentor Ability to Give Non-threatening Feedback</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Mentor Belief That Observation Can Improve Teaching</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Mentor Desire to Develop Coaching Skills</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05, degrees of freedom = 1, 193-198 (depending on number of responses) tabular value 3.89.
Chapter V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Mentoring benefits both the experienced teacher and the protege by giving the neophyte counsel and guidance and by giving the mentor a new developmentally important role (Schmidt and Wolfe, 1980). From its initial period of success within the public school system, mentoring appears to be an appropriate way to bring beginning teachers into their profession. It responds to charges that new teachers are inadequately prepared to assume full teaching duties without continued assistance and to the reality of a high attrition rate among beginning teachers. It provides career ladder opportunities needed to revive and keep good, experienced teachers in the profession.

If, however, mentors in the public schools are going to assume a role larger than just being someone to answer questions and provide a sympathetic shoulder; if they are truly expected to provide instructional assistance and coaching, more research must be done to determine how that instructional assistance is being provided and what contextual and training needs mentors have. The intent of this research was to describe the
instructional assistance currently being provided through the observation process in Oregon's Beginning Teacher Support Program and identify what can be done at both the district and state levels to support the efforts of Oregon's mentors. The major objectives, procedures, and findings of the study are summarized in the following section.

**Objective 1**

What observation-related activities have mentors done during the 1989-1990 school year?

Research on current mentor programs indicates that in Oregon and elsewhere observation for instructional assistance is considered a difficult aspect of the mentor role (Clewett, 1987, Barnett, Kirkpatrick, and Little, 1986). In Oregon, efforts have been made through revision of training and program requirements to increase the number of observation activities undertaken by mentors. In order to know more specifically the amount and types of observations being done in Oregon, mentors in this study were asked to identify the types of data collection tools they had used and what teacher and student behaviors they had arranged with their proteges to observe. Along with
the collection of this data, the research looked at differences in the observational activities of elementary and secondary level mentors to determine whether BTSP training should be differentiated to meet diverse needs of these two groups. For statistical testing, the null hypothesis stated that there is no significant difference between elementary and secondary level mentors regarding the types and quantity of classroom observations performed and the types of data collection tools used. Chi Square tests were used to compare elementary and secondary responses.

Findings

1. There were no significant differences in the numbers or types of observations conducted by elementary and secondary level mentors. Total, 124 elementary level mentors observed for 845 student and teacher behaviors, or 6.8 per mentor/protege pair; 77 secondary level mentors observed for 562 student and teacher behaviors, or 7 per mentor/protege pair. The only significant differences in the types of behaviors observed occurred with classroom procedures, time on task, and pupil/pupil interaction, all of which were observed more often by secondary level mentors.
2. The types of teacher behaviors observed most often by both groups of mentors were teacher/student interaction patterns, instructional techniques, and reinforcement strategies. The student behavior of most interest to proteges was time on task.

3. There was no significant difference in the types of data collection tools used by elementary and secondary level mentors except in the use of a student seating chart which was used more frequently by secondary level mentors.

4. The data collection tool used most frequently by both sets of mentors was a tally of behaviors and responses. Verbatim, which is a recording of all teacher dialogue, was used least often.

5. When given the space and opportunity to describe other observation activities, few mentors indicated having observed other types of teacher or student behaviors or having used other types of data collection tools. Three secondary level mentors had observed proteges individualizing instruction, and four elementary mentors had observed conferences with parents, parent helpers, or aides. Thirteen mentors reported having made "wide angle" or general
observational notes, and three reported having used video tape as a data collection tool.

**Objective 2**

What are mentors' attitudes regarding the effectiveness of the observational process and its potential for causing change?

Research on mentoring has shown that successful mentors, like successful teachers, have a sense of efficacy. They believe they are both responsible and able to cause change (Marshal, 1985). In an effort to measure the sense of efficacy among Oregon mentors, both elementary and secondary level mentors were asked to rate the extent to which they believed the process improved communication with their proteges and improved their proteges' teaching. The null hypothesis which statistically tested this question stated that there is no significant difference between elementary and secondary level mentors regarding their confidence in the ability of the coaching/observation process to enhance communication or to improve proteges' teaching performance. Chi Square tests were used to test for significant differences.
Findings

1. No significant differences were found in the extent to which elementary and secondary level mentors believed in the ability of the observation/coaching process to improve their proteges' teaching. Most (73%) of the mentors felt that the process could "somewhat" impact their proteges' teaching skills. Only seven percent believed that the process would improve teaching "not at all."

2. Both elementary and secondary level mentors had a strong belief in the ability of the observation/coaching process to enhance communication with their proteges. Thirty-eight percent of the mentors sampled felt that the process "greatly" enhanced communication and fifty-two percent felt that it "somewhat" enhanced communication. There was no significant difference between elementary and secondary level responses.

Objective 3

Do the perceived observational needs and attitudes of elementary level classroom teachers differ
significantly from those of secondary level classroom teachers?

Research literature has reported differences in support needs of beginning teachers, school environments, and confidence in assuming an expert role between elementary and secondary level mentors (Powell, 1988, Marso and Pigge, 1987). Previous BTSP evaluations have indicated that the school environment has strong indirect effects on the quantity and quality of interactions between beginner and mentor teacher (Gabriel, 1989). Research has not been done which ties those environmental differences to factors affecting mentors' ability to provide instructional assistance. This research was designed to compare the perceptions of elementary and secondary level mentors toward various context, attitude, and skill-related factors affecting their success with the observation process.

The twenty-four observation-related factors used in the research instrument were identified initially through a literature search and subsequently through the work of a panel of experts within the DELPHI process. Mentors were asked to rate the importance of each factor from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating "not important" and 5 indicating "very
important." Responses were compared using one factor analysis of variance.

Findings

1. At the .05 significance level, differences were found for three factors:
   - having an educational philosophy similar to that of your protege,
   - your confidence in knowing enough teaching techniques to offer suggestions or alternatives,
   - being of the same gender as your protege.

   These three factors were considered more important by elementary level mentors.

2. The relative importance of twenty factors was perceived similarly by elementary and secondary level mentors. It is interesting that the response to "having a preparation time different from protege," was rated almost identically (F value of .01) by both groups even though elementary level teachers are less likely to have a scheduled preparation time. The two other factors which received nearly identical ratings,
"mentor confidence in using the observation process," and "mentor belief that observation can improve teaching," relate to the issue of mentor efficacy.

Objective 4

Which observation-related factors are perceived by mentor teachers as being the most important to their success in conducting classroom observations?

Twenty-four potentially important factors were identified through a review of previous research and refined by a panel of experts using the DELPHI process. The null hypothesis used to test this research question stated that mentors perceive no significant difference in the relative importance of various contextual, attitudinal, and skill-related factors affecting their success with the observation process. Mentors in this study were asked to indicate the importance of these factors two ways. First, mentors were asked to rate from 1 to 5 each factor's importance on a Likert-type scale with 1 indicating "not important" and 5 indicating "very important." Analysis of variance was used to test for significant difference and a Scheffe test was used to identify the sources of variance.
Second, mentors were asked to rank which factors they felt were first, second, and third most important to their success in conducting observations for instructional assistance. In addition, mentors were asked to describe other factors which had either enhanced or hindered the process.

Findings

1. Sampled mentors did perceive significant differences in the relative importance of various factors. When rated on a 1 to 5 scale, those factors rated higher than 4.5 were trust between mentor and protege, teaching in the same building, and mentor ability to give non-threatening feedback. Those factors considered least important with ratings below 2.0 were differences in the age and gender of mentor and protege partners.

2. When mentors were asked to rank the factors they considered most important to observation success, the top six factors in order of importance were:
   - trust between you and your protege,
- the availability of release time with someone covering your class while you observe and coach your protege,
- teaching in the same building as your protege,
- your protege's willingness to have you observe him/her,
- teaching in the same content area or grade level as your protege,
- mentor ability to give non-threatening feedback.

Least important were age and gender differences between mentor and protege.

3. The only additional factor mentioned more than once which increased mentors' ability to provide instructional assistance was the friendship that developed within some teams.

Objective 5

What needs should be addressed through either the BTSP training and guidelines or district policies?

Training

1. The implications for BTSP training support most current practices. Since their observation activities
and perceptions regarding the process are similar, there appears to be little need to separate elementary and secondary level teachers for training in the instructional assistance role. Mentors in this study mentioned the benefits of talking with other mentors in similar situations, so it seems appropriate to continue forming job-alike groups for those sharing sessions.

2. Proteges are enlisting the help of their mentors to observe predictable teacher and student behavior patterns. Mentors are either finding the data collection tools currently taught by the BTSP adequate in recording the requested information or else are tailoring their observations to use familiar tools. Because beginning teachers typically have difficulty self-diagnosing and selecting appropriate areas for assistance, mentor trainers might consider providing proteges with a list of the types of behaviors mentors have observed in previous years. The disadvantages of offering such a list are that it short-cuts the reflection process and appears to limit the possibilities. The reality is, however, that teams left to their own creativity are not identifying widely diverse skill areas and some report that their
difficulty identifying areas to observe is derailing the process.

3. Considering the overwhelming importance attached to a trusting relationship by mentors, the ODE should continue workshop sessions on communication and trust building. ODE should consider more activities to strengthen the trust aspect of the relationship in mid-year as the mentor's role shifts from that of information provider to instructional coach. It might be prudent to consider the responses of those mentors who listed friendship as a factor which increased their ability to observe and coach their proteges. As one mentor said,

"The relationship we built was the biggest factor in our ability to work well together."

Mentors might be advised that time spent together in social contexts helps build the personal relationship necessary to professional assistance.

4. Designers of ODE training might find ways to address comments such as these which suggest that some mentors see the observation process as remedial:

"No perceived need for assistance on either part."
"My protege has done very well in her first year of teaching. Thus, I stayed out of her way and let her have as much uninterrupted teaching experience as possible."

Participants need to believe that the program can help even highly competent proteges increase skills or learn new techniques. They need to perceive observation as continued professional growth. Mentors ranked "protege's willingness to have you observe him/her," as the fourth most important component in coaching success. Therefore, training time should be devoted to helping proteges understand the benefits of refining skills and learning new techniques. Proteges should be reminded that continued professional growth is the responsibility of all teachers.

Reluctance to tackle instructional issues might be supported by mentors' inexperience and discomfort seeing themselves as teachers of adults as well as teachers of adolescents. Workshop time spent on adult learning styles would help mentors feel more confident in this new role.

5. New participants should be provided a list of the creative ways mentors have found to obtain class coverage such as using administrators or other teachers. They should also be made aware of effective
ways to use half-day substitutes. Mentors face diverse restrictions due to various district sizes and policies so they need to be aware of all possible options and individually select what will work in their district.

Mentor Selection

1. The perfect mentor/protege match is not always possible, but project directors should keep in mind the importance of classroom proximity and similarity in job assignment. Several mentors mentioned that teaching across the hall or next door to their protege was a tremendous asset to mentoring. Elementary level mentors talked about the benefits of teaching similar grade levels not only to help with planning, but also to collaborate about helping individual students.

"We shared students within the three first grades. This allowed us to talk about individual students--how I saw them in my classes and she in hers--we could talk about strategies for meeting their needs. We could talk about quality of work, behavior, etc. It made the coaching process very easy."

2. Keep in mind that mentors must not only be master teachers, but also people who are interested in helping neophytes into the profession and developing their own
skills at the same time. One mentor attributed his/her success to:

"Interest in working with another professional and the belief that observing and coaching my protege was/is a two-way learning process."

3. Encourage teachers interested in mentoring to attend peer coaching or clinical supervision workshops. While keeping in mind that the mentor observation model is uniquely different, mentors who have had training in other observation models found that background training helpful.

4. Mentor teachers are often highly motivated people who typically volunteer for a variety of activities. Mentors need to be made aware of the time commitment involved in mentoring early enough that they have a chance to cut back on other obligations. The only way that extra-curricular duties such as coaching aren't a detriment to the mentoring process is if both the mentor and the protege are involved together.

Administrative Support

1. It is difficult for teachers to leave their classrooms. Principals can facilitate leaves by granting release time, helping mentors locate
substitutes, or offering to cover classes themselves. Principals who agree to provide class coverage need to be aware of the planning and preparation that goes into an observation and follow through with that commitment.

2. It is detrimental for mentor/protege teams to be formed after the school year starts, especially if this causes mentors to miss the August workshop which outlines the mentor role. It is helpful for mentors and proteges to begin meeting before the school year starts to form a relationship without the time commitment and stress of a teaching assignment. This is an important time for the mentor to orient the protege to the building, find supplies, and begin lesson planning. With this in mind, district program administrators should identify potential mentors in the late spring and hire new teachers as early as possible during the summer.

3. District project directors need to have their budgets in place prior to the beginning of the school year and make participating principals aware of monies available for release time for mentor/protege observation.
Recommendations for Further Research

In view of the findings of this study and in order that mentors continually be provided useful training and conducive contexts within which to work, the following suggestions are offered:

1. Similar studies, using techniques analogous to those of this study, should be done with additional populations to verify the findings of this research and to measure growth as mentors and school systems become more comfortable with the status of teachers as instructional coaches.

2. Investigate possible relationships between factors which enhance mentors' ability to provide instructional assistance to proteges and supervising teachers' ability to provide instructional assistance to student teachers. From shared research and communication between Oregon teacher education institutions and the ODE mentor program, administrators can determine ways to make the mentoring process a logical extension of the practicum experience. Oregon teacher education institutions can benefit from the experience of the mentor program in training and supporting public school
teachers in their role as providers of instructional assistance.

3. Compare the observation-related needs of mentor teachers in large and small districts specifically in relation to acquiring class coverage and mentor/protege pairings.

4. This study specifically excluded those school districts which provided their own mentor training. Another study should be done which includes those districts or which compares the quantity and types of observations conducted by mentors who received BTSP training with those who received in-district training.

5. This study touched lightly on differences between elementary and secondary teaching contexts. Research would explore the nature of this variance and its impact on collegiality would support a variety of instructional assistance efforts.
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HOUSE BILL 2020
CHAPTER

AN ACT

Relating to school improvement; appropriating money; and declaring an emergency.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. As used in this Act:
(1) “Administrator” includes all persons whose duties require administrative certificates.
(2) “Educational goals” means a set of goals for educational performance, as formulated by site committees and local communities, and adopted by district school boards, according to provisions of this Act, to encourage greater accountability between schools and the community, and better to assess the effectiveness of educational programs, including the professional growth and career opportunity programs, described in this Act.
(3) “Index of teaching and learning conditions” means the system for the collection and analysis of relevant educational data by schools, districts and the state for the purpose of assessing the educational effectiveness of schools and programs.
(4) “School Improvement and Professional Development program” means a formal plan submitted by a school district and approved by the Department of Education according to criteria specified in this Act.
(5) “School district” means a school district, an education service district or any legally constituted combination of such entities that submits an application under section 4 of this Act.
(6) “Site committee” means a body composed of teachers, administrators and others, constituted under section 8 of this Act, for the purpose of designing, sponsoring and administering local professional growth and career opportunity programs.
(7) “Teacher” means all certificated employees in the public schools or employed by an education service district who have direct responsibility for instruction, coordination of educational programs or supervision of teachers, and who are compensated for their services from public funds. “Teacher” does not include a school nurse as defined in ORS 342.455 or a person whose duties require an administrative certificate.

SECTION 2. (1) Further initiatives to promote educational excellence in the public schools are of vital importance in increasing student learning and strengthening Oregon’s economy.
(2) The state should encourage and assist local school districts in their efforts to establish school goals through a process that involves educators and members of the community and to develop effective tools to measure progress against those goals that will increase the public accountability of educational programs.
(3) New career opportunities for professional development are desirable to recognize and reward those teachers who have demonstrated mastery of teaching skills, knowledge of their subject matter and other appropriate indicators of professional growth.

(4) The establishment of site committees for the school district and for individual schools is desirable to encourage new initiatives in school-based management and the assessment of educational progress, to provide new and expanded career opportunities for teachers and to facilitate efforts to restructure the school workplace to provide educators with greater responsibility while increasing their accountability.

SECTION 3. Oregon hereby establishes a School Improvement and Professional Development program to encourage the following:

(1) The development of educational goals for individual schools and school districts;
(2) The assessment of the educational progress of school programs and students;
(3) The expansion of professional growth and career opportunities for Oregon teachers; and
(4) The restructuring of the school workplace to provide teachers with responsibilities and authority commensurate with their status as professionals.

SECTION 4. (1) The School Improvement and Professional Development program shall be administered by the Department of Education according to rules established pursuant to this Act by the department.

(2) A school district or an education service district, or a combination of such entities, may submit an application to the Department of Education to receive a School Improvement and Professional Development grant.

(3) The Department of Education shall be responsible for evaluating district proposals according to rules and criteria established under section 6 of this Act.

(4) Grants under this program shall be effective for one calendar year and are renewable.

SECTION 5. (1) The State Board of Education shall appoint a School Improvement and Professional Development advisory committee to propose rules for the submission and approval of grants under this Act.

(2) The advisory committee shall include teachers, administrators, school board members, education school faculty and other citizens as considered appropriate by the board.

(3) The deadline for applications submitted by districts under this Act shall be April 1 preceding the school year for which they are proposed. The Department of Education shall review all applications and shall approve or reject them no later than June 1 of the school year for which they are proposed.

(4) Distribution of grants-in-aid moneys through the School Improvement and Professional Development program shall begin in the 1988-1989 school year. Districts that qualify for grants under this Act shall receive $1,000 per year for every full-time equivalent teacher deemed eligible for this program.

(5) Subject to ORS 291.232 to 291.260, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall distribute grants-in-aid to eligible school districts so that at least three-quarters of the allocation due to each eligible district is received no later than February 1 of each fiscal year and the remainder prior to June 30 of each fiscal year. If underpayments or overpayments result, adjustments shall be made in the following year.

SECTION 6. (1) The advisory committee appointed under section 5 of this Act shall make its recommendations no later than November 1, 1987.

(2) After public review of the recommendations of the advisory committee made under subsection (1) of section 5 of this Act, the State Board of Education shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this Act no later than February 1, 1988. Such rules shall be published and distributed to all school districts.

(3) In awarding grants, the Department of Education shall work to insure a representation of school districts of different sizes and in different geographical locations.

(4) A preliminary report on the success of programs under this Act shall be made to the Sixty-fifth Legislative Assembly.
SECTION 7. (1) An eligible grant application must be submitted by a school district according to rules prescribed by the State Board of Education. The rules shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) The school district in its application shall certify that its proposal has been approved by the school board and is consistent with existing district policies, rules and contracts bargained under ORS 243.650 to 243.782.
(b) The administration of grant programs under this Act shall be consistent with existing district policies, rules and contracts bargained under ORS 243.650 to 243.782.

(2) Nothing in this section is intended to make grants under this Act subject to collective bargaining.

SECTION 8. (1) To the extent practicable, the establishment of school goals, the development and use of indexes of teaching and learning conditions and the administration of grants-in-aid for the professional development of teachers shall be delegated to site committees that are established at the school building level.

(2) A building site committee established under this Act shall be composed of teachers, administrators and representatives of the community at-large as considered appropriate by other members of the committee.

(3) Teachers, administrators and any designated representatives of the district school board who serve on a building site committee shall be selected by the direct election of peers, through a process described in a district's grant application, under the following conditions:

(a) A majority of a building site committee shall be active classroom teachers.
(b) The principal of a school or the principal's designee shall be a member of a building site committee.

(4) The duties of a building site committee under this Act shall include the development of a plan to improve the professional growth and career opportunities of a school's faculty and the improvement of its instructional program.

(5) A district may establish a district site committee to assist in the administration of grants under this Act. Such district site committees shall be composed of teachers, administrators and at least one member appointed by the school board. Classroom teachers shall comprise one-half of such committees and shall be appointed by the certified or recognized bargaining unit, if any, for teachers in the district.

SECTION 9. To be eligible for funding, a district's application shall include the following:

(1) A description of a process to formulate and adopt district and individual school building educational goals so that such goals reflect input from a wide range of citizens in the community.

(2) A description of how the district will formulate and use indexes of teaching and learning conditions to measure progress according to those goals. The indexes of teaching and learning conditions may include, but are not limited to, such indicators as:

(a) Class size and teaching loads;
(b) A profile of the teaching and administrative personnel, including such characteristics as years of experience, rate of turnover and absenteeism;
(c) The frequency and nature of teacher misassignments;
(d) The socioeconomic status of the community;
(e) The ability and willingness of a school district to provide financial support for the schools;
(f) Measures of student progress as measured on school district or state assessments, or both;
(g) Attendance and drop out rates;
(h) Student conduct and disciplinary actions;
(i) Measures of student success in vocational, college and other post-secondary programs; and
(j) Student expectations and attitudes toward learning.

(3) A description of how the proposed program will address the identified needs for professional growth and career opportunities of teachers in the district.
(4) Certification by the school district that no more than 50 percent of the moneys received through this Act shall be used to replace expenditures for existing programs for professional growth and career opportunities.

(5) A description of how the district will evaluate the effectiveness of its School Improvement and Professional Development grant, using educational goals and an index of teaching and learning conditions.

SECTION 10. (1) To be eligible for funding, a district proposal shall define and provide a process by which eligible teachers are selected by a site committee to receive additional professional growth and career opportunities which may include, but are not limited to, service as a mentor teacher, supervision and instruction of student teachers, either in the classroom or as an adjunct faculty member at a school of education, curriculum development, service on a site committee, reimbursement for academic course work, opportunities for research in a teacher's field or fields, programs to encourage peer observation and assistance programs, additional sabbaticals and other programs designed to encourage professional growth.

(2) All teachers in good standing shall be eligible for advanced professional growth and career opportunities, according to criteria established by site committees. Those criteria shall include demonstration of the following:
   (a) Mastery of teaching skills and subject matter knowledge;
   (b) A commitment to personal and professional growth as a teacher;
   (c) Active collaboration on professional matters with other faculty; and
   (d) Active involvement in school and community affairs.

(3) In applying for such opportunities, teachers shall describe how such opportunities will further the goals of the schools in which the teachers are employed.

(4) Administrators may be eligible for additional professional growth and career opportunities, provided that their proposals are directly linked to enhancing their role as instructional leaders within their schools.

(5) Grants for professional growth and career opportunities may be given for a period of time not to exceed one year.

(6) A teacher approved for a professional growth and career opportunity shall be given the choice of receiving additional release time or additional compensation in exchange for assuming additional responsibilities. However, release time shall not be used if to do so increases the work load of other teachers regularly employed by the school district.

SECTION 11. (1) The Department of Education shall be responsible for conducting a comprehensive evaluation of all district programs under this Act and reporting to the Legislative Assembly.

(2) The evaluations shall include an assessment of the performance of district programs as measured against those requirements outlined in section 9 of this Act.

SECTION 12. A progress report shall be made to the Legislative Assembly by the Department of Education at the time of convening the Sixty-fifth Legislative Assembly and to subsequent Legislative Assemblies.

SECTION 13. To administer this Act, the Department of Education shall dedicate a portion of its funds, not to exceed 10 percent of the total appropriated under this Act, to provide for the establishment of professional development centers to:

(1) Assist school districts, teachers, site committee members and others to formulate goals and indexes of teaching and learning conditions;

(2) Provide additional professional growth and career opportunities for teachers; and

(3) Carry out other purposes of this Act.

SECTION 14. As used in this Act:

(1) "Beginning teacher" means a teacher who:

(a) Possesses a basic teaching certificate issued by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission;

(b) Is employed at least half time, primarily as a classroom teacher, by a school district; and
(c) Has taught fewer than 90 consecutive days, or 180 days total, as a certificated teacher in any public school.

(2) "District" means a school district or an education service district, or any legally constituted combination of such districts.

(3) "Formal assistance" means a program provided by a mentor teacher to a beginning teacher that includes, but is not limited to, direct classroom observation and consultation; assistance in instructional planning and preparation; support in implementation and delivery of classroom instruction; and other assistance intended to enhance the professional performance and development of the beginning teacher.

(4) "Mentor teacher" means a teacher who:
   (a) Possesses a basic or standard teaching personnel service or administrative certificate issued by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission;
   (b) Is employed at the time of selection under contract primarily as a classroom teacher by a school district in this state;
   (c) Has successfully taught for three or more years as a certificated teacher in any public school;
   (d) Has been selected and trained as described in section 20 of this Act; and
   (e) Has demonstrated mastery of teaching skills and subject matter knowledge.

(5) "Teacher" means a certificated employe of a common or union high school district or an employe of an education service district who has direct responsibility for instruction, coordination of educational programs or supervision of teachers and who is compensated for services from public funds. "Teacher" does not include a school nurse as defined in ORS 342.455 or a person whose duties require an administrative certificate.

SECTION 15. The Legislative Assembly finds that:

(1) The quality of teaching in the public schools is of vital importance to the future of this state;

(2) This state has a special interest in insuring that the induction of beginning teachers into their profession is conducive to their professional growth and development; and

(3) The formal assignment of mentor teachers who have demonstrated mastery of teaching skills and subject matter knowledge should substantially improve the induction and professional growth of beginning teachers in this state, as well as provide mentor teachers with additional and valuable opportunities to enhance their own professional growth.

SECTION 16. (1) The State Board of Education shall establish a beginning teacher support program to provide eligible beginning teachers in this state with continued and sustained support from a formally assigned mentor teacher during the first full year of teaching.

(2) After the 1987-1988 school year, any district is eligible to participate in the beginning teacher support program.

(3) Two or more districts may operate jointly a beginning teacher support program if they meet all the requirements of this Act.

(4) Educational consortia established for approved teacher education programs pursuant to rules of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission are eligible to operate a beginning teacher support program to serve beginning teachers in a participating school district if:
   (a) All moneys received as grants-in-aid for the beginning teacher support program are administered by the participating school district to provide direct services to beginning teachers; and
   (b) All other requirements of this Act are met.

(5) To the extent practicable, school districts may coordinate with institutions of higher education in the design, implementation and evaluation of mentorship programs.

SECTION 17. Each district that wishes to participate in the beginning teacher support program shall submit a formal application to the Department of Education no later than September 15 of each school year, according to rules of the state board. By that date, districts shall inform the department of:

(1) The names of all eligible beginning teachers employed by the district and a description of their teaching assignments and extracurricular duties;
(2) The names of mentor teachers selected by a district and a description of their teaching assignments and the indorsement area in which they are certified to teach;

(3) A description of the content and calendar of the proposed beginning teacher support program. The program must provide a minimum of 90 hours of direct contact between mentor teachers and beginning teachers, including observation of or assistance with classroom teaching, or both, during the school day;

(4) A description of the amount and nature of each eligible beginning teacher’s classroom and extracurricular duties and assurance that these duties are not unreasonable for a beginning teacher; and

(5) A certification that no eligible beginning teacher is or may be misassigned outside the teacher’s indorsement area, except as provided for by rules of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

SECTION 18. (1) Subject to ORS 291.232 to 291.260, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall distribute grants-in-aid to eligible districts to offset the costs of beginning teacher support programs. A qualifying district shall receive annually $3,000 for each full-time equivalent beginning teacher approved for support.

(2) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall distribute at least three-fourths of the allocation due to each eligible district no later than February 1 of each fiscal year and the remainder prior to June 30 of each fiscal year. If underpayments or overpayments result, adjustments shall be made in the following year.

(3) If the funds are insufficient for all eligible proposals, the department shall award grants on a competitive basis taking into consideration school district size and geographic location.

(4) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of section 17 of this Act, if a participating district hires a beginning teacher after its program has been approved, the district shall be eligible to receive, for each beginning teacher in addition to those named in the application, a per teacher grant-in-aid that is prorated to the remaining length of the school year, if all other requirements of this Act are met.

(5) The State Board of Education may adopt such rules as it considers appropriate for the distribution of grants-in-aid under this section.

SECTION 19. After consulting with representatives of teachers, administrators, school boards, schools of education, Teaching Research Division of the State System of Higher Education and such others as it considers appropriate, the Department of Education shall develop or approve workshops to provide training for mentor teachers and beginning teachers in programs eligible for grants-in-aid under this Act.

SECTION 20. The selection, nature and extent of duties of mentor teachers shall be determined by the school district. The following guidelines shall apply:

(1) No teacher shall be designated as a mentor teacher unless willing to perform in that role;

(2) No mentor teacher shall participate in the evaluation of beginning teachers for purposes of actions taken under ORS 342.805 to 342.955;

(3) Each mentor teacher shall complete successfully a training workshop provided or approved by the Department of Education prior to participating in the beginning teacher support program;

(4) The stipend received for each beginning teacher may be used by the district to compensate teachers who act as mentor teachers in addition to their regular duties or to compensate other individuals assigned duties to provide release time for teachers acting as mentor teachers; and

(5) If a mentor teacher receives additional release time to support a beginning teacher, it is expected that the total workload of other teachers regularly employed by the school district should not increase in any substantial manner.

SECTION 21. The Department of Education shall be responsible for the regular and ongoing evaluation of programs under this Act and may contract for such evaluation. The evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, assessments of the following:

(1) A survey and follow-up of all eligible mentor teachers and beginning teachers and appropriate district officials, to assess satisfaction with and the effectiveness of the beginning teacher support program;
(2) The amount and quality of the contact time between mentor teachers and beginning teachers;
(3) The effectiveness of workshops and other training required under this Act; and
(4) The effectiveness of the mentor program in enhancing the professional development and re-
tention of new teachers in the district.
(5) The desirability of extending this assistance program to students participating in graduate level teacher preparation programs similar to those which have been proposed by the Department of Higher Education.
(6) The desirability of extending this assistance program to all probationary teachers.

SECTION 22. A district that is determined by the Department of Education to be in violation of one or more of the requirements of this Act may be required to refund all grants-in-aid moneys distributed under this Act. The amount of penalty shall be determined by the State Board of Edu-
cation.

SECTION 23. Commencing in the 1987-1988 school year, a limited number of districts shall be selected for a pilot program, based on diversity of size and geographic location.

SECTION 24. There is hereby created an Oregon Teacher Corps program to encourage the entry of certain qualified persons into the teaching profession through the use of forgivable student loans for those who complete three years of successful teaching in a public school in this state.

SECTION 25. (1) The State Scholarship Commission shall administer the Oregon Teacher Corps program insofar as practicable in the same manner as the loan program under ORS 348.050 is admin-
istered and make rules for the selection of qualified applicants.
(2) Eligibility for the Oregon Teacher Corps is limited to those prospective teachers whom the State Scholarship Commission determines to have graduated, or currently rank, in the top 20 per-
cent of their high school or college class. The commission shall assess each applicant's potential for teaching through such means as essays written by the applicant, letters of recommendations from teachers and others, descriptions of relevant teaching experiences, and other appropriate measures. Allowance shall be given for those applicants whom the commission determines to be in at least one of the following categories:
   (a) Members of minorities as defined in ORS 279.059;
   (b) Prospective teachers in scarce indorsement areas, as defined by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission; or
   (c) Prospective teachers who agree to teach in remote and difficult to serve school districts in this state.
(3) Recipients of loans under this Act shall be enrolled at least half time in an approved teacher education program at an Oregon institution of higher education.

SECTION 26. (1) Upon approval of the loan application of an eligible student by the State Scholarship Commission, the commission may loan an amount from the Oregon Teacher Corps Ac-
count to the student in compliance with this section. The loan shall be evidenced by a written ob-
ligation but no additional security shall be required. Notwithstanding any provision in this section, the commission may require cosigners on the loans.
(2) Loans granted under this section to eligible students by the commission shall:
   (a) Not exceed $2,000 in a single academic year to an undergraduate student enrolled in a teacher education program leading to a basic certificate.
   (b) Not exceed $4,000 in a single academic year to a graduate student leading to a basic certif-
icate.
   (c) Not exceed $8,000 for all loans made to a student under this section.
(3) Borrowers are required to pay at least seven percent interest per annum on the unpaid bal-
cance from the date of the loan as provided in subsection (4) of this section.
(4)(a) Repayment of the principal and accruing and deferred interest on loans shall be com-
enced not later than 12 months after the student's completion of the teacher education program or other termination of the student's education. Repayment of loans under section 25 of this Act shall be delayed for the period of time the student is teaching at least half time in a public school in this state but becomes payable under the usual terms if the student ceases teaching before com-
pleting three full years. Repayment of loans shall be delayed up to three years upon application of the borrower showing inability to locate suitable employment.

(b) Repayment shall be completed in a maximum of 120 months from the time repayment is commenced. However, nothing in this section is intended to prevent repayment without penalty at an earlier date than provided in this section or to prohibit the commission from extending the repayment period to a date other than permitted by this subsection.

(5) An eligible student who receives a loan under this section, preparing to be an elementary or secondary school teacher in this state, is not required to repay a loan made under this section if the student completes at least three years of equivalent full-time teaching in a public elementary or secondary school within the five-year period following completion of the teacher education program in this state.

SECTION 27. (1) There is established in the State Treasury separate from the General Fund an account to be known as the Oregon Teacher Corps Account into which shall be deposited all repayments of loans with interest to the State Scholarship Commission pursuant to section 26 of this Act. Any interest accruing to the account shall be credited thereto.

(2) Amounts in the account established under subsection (1) of this section are continuously appropriated to the State Scholarship Commission for the purposes of this Act.

SECTION 28. All programs in this Act are subject to the availability of funds appropriated therefor.

SECTION 29. This Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this Act takes effect on its passage.
APPENDIX B
MENTOR HANDBOOK SECTION
PROVIDING INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANCE
The outline of the mentor role sketched the critical function that service providers perform in modeling sound teaching practices and coaching beginners' development of effective teaching skills. Examples of ways that mentors provide instructional assistance include:

**Modeling effective instructional practices by:**

- Previewing long-range curriculum outlines and unit and lesson plans.
- Helping specify criteria for pupil performance, prepare student assignments, assess student progress, and record pupil achievement.
- Assisting in identification of individual academic needs, organizing and grouping pupils for learning activities and individualizing instruction.
- Helping prepare for parent contacts and conferences and role-playing these events.
- Modeling specific lessons or strategies that the beginner is uncomfortable doing the first time (e.g., discussion groups, laboratory experiments)

**Coaching the protege's development of effective teaching skills by observing and providing feedback about:**

- Organizing paperwork and managing time.
- Using instructional materials and media.
- Motivating and managing students.
- Teaching methods, strategies and techniques.
- Individual student's classroom behavior and performance.
- Organizing pupils for learning activities, working with small groups and individualizing lessons.
- Monitoring student progress and providing reinforcement.
- Using good judgment in deviating from planned lessons and activities.
- Sequencing and pacing lessons.
- Increasing pupil participation and reducing teacher talk.
- Improving questioning techniques and responses to student answers.
- Moving away from textbook teaching.
- Dealing with interruptions and distractions.
- Communicating effectively with students.
Whatever approach is used in modeling, the value of the exchange resides in consistently following these general principles of the instructional assistance process:

- The decision to use modeling techniques is a collaborative one, based on the potential for demonstration, simulation or role-play to address the beginner's specific needs or concerns about teaching.

- Mentor and protege agree on appropriate forms of feedback to be used in instructional assistance activities prior to initiating this or other types of teaching exchanges.

- The modeling activity is preceded by a goal-setting conference, in which mentor and protege identify the purpose of the activity, agree on suitable ways to collect objective information during the observation and review the lesson plan and material to be taught.

- Observation of the demonstration or simulation, or enactment of role-play activity, is followed by a de-briefing discussion in which team members collaborate in analysis of objective information collected during the exchange and its application to the beginner's work.

**Coaching**

Coaching is a strategy used to provide direct and immediate feedback about the protege's design or delivery of instruction, motivation and management of pupils in the classroom and assessment of students' academic performance during learning activities. In the strictest sense of the words, coaching entails the provision of direct assistance in the classroom to promote the transfer of knowledge and skills to the teaching setting. In the Oregon BTSP, the coaching concept is conceptualized somewhat more broadly to include all activities in which the mentor observes or works with the protege in his or her classroom, gathers information about some aspect of the teaching-learning process and uses that information to provide useful feedback about the beginner's instructional effectiveness. Based on the same general principles that guide modeling activities, the Oregon BTSP Assisting Instruction Model (AIM) is a coaching strategy that involves:

- **Negotiating an agreement in the pre-observation, goal-setting conference.**

Prior to the observation, mentor and protege collaborate in defining the purpose of the teaching exchange and methods for collecting objective information. This discussion focuses on specifying, clarifying, focusing, and limiting the objectives of the observation, and data collection techniques to be used. The possible targets of observation are many and varied and can be related to teacher behavior (e.g., using a variety of instructional strategies, sequencing and pacing of instruction, transitioning between learning activities, extending instruction beyond the textbook, dealing with interruptions) or pupil behavior (e.g., at-task behavior during seatwork or learning activities, patterns of student participation in discussion). Accordingly, the techniques used to gather objective information about these targets of observation also differ depending on the purpose of the teaching exchange. The mentor's role in the goal-setting conference is to suggest alternative targets and techniques of data collection in response to the protege's request for specific information about the teaching-learning process.

The negotiated agreement that results from this discussion must be reciprocal. That is, both mentor and protege must be comfortable with what is to be observed and the observation tools to be used. The mentor must commit to assuring that he
or she knows exactly how to respond to the protege's request for information, whereas the protege must commit to participating fully in analysis of that information and experimenting with new strategies or skills that are suggested by the results of the observation.

The goal-setting conference concludes with review of the lesson plan and materials to be used in learning activities and a mutual decision as to where the mentor will view the classroom during the observation. The latter is particularly important, inasmuch as the observer should have unobstructed vision of the entire classroom yet be inconspicuous so as to avoid influencing the teaching-learning process.

• Observing targeted aspects of the teaching-learning process and collecting objective information as agreed in the goal-setting conference.

Having negotiated both the purposes and data collection techniques to be used in the observation during the team's goal-setting conference, the mentor focuses on these targets and uses the selected observational protocols while observing the lesson(s). Unless agreed to in the pre-observation conference, the mentor should avoid prolonged discussion with students before or during learning activities and be seated and ready to observe before the lesson begins. Except in team-teaching situations, mentors should not directly participate in the delivery of instruction during the observation period. And the mentor's observations of both protege and pupils should be kept in strictest confidence, which precludes sharing information about classroom activity with colleagues or discussing student behavior or performance with them later.

• De-briefing the observation.

The de-briefing discussion between mentor and protege following the observation is a three-stage process that focuses first on analysis of information about the teaching activity and its outcomes. The protege assumes primary responsibility for the direction of this analysis by sorting, grouping and classifying data supplied by the mentor into three categories—plus, minus and interesting. The mentor, in turn, supports the protege's analysis by identifying any overlooked data in each category and validating the beginner's findings. This approach emphasizes the importance of seeking and verifying the positive aspects and effects of instruction, as well as identifying areas for improvement.

The second stage of the de-briefing session entails a review of the classified data by mentor and protege to actively search for alternatives, possibilities and choices. This is the beginning of their collaborative discussion of explanations for and solutions to problems, concerns and assistance needs that may have surfaced as the information was sorted. No limits are placed on the ideas generated in this brainstorming activity, and mentor and protege actively participate in the process to learn from one another.

In the third and final stage of the de-briefing discussion, the protege identifies the implications of the results of the observation for subsequent design and delivery of instruction—aims, goals and objectives for improvement. These might include a decision to continue what appears to be a successful strategy or technique, to request future observations and additional information about a specific concerns, or to explore other promising techniques and develop new skills in the area of interest. The team can then incorporate these decisions in its year-long action plan and adjust their schedule of instructional assistance activities accordingly.
The success of the AIModel depends on following this structure with respect to the conduct of the observation and feedback process and also on using effective forms of feedback as described in the "Collegial Support" section of this handbook. This coaching model is also grounded in the following general principles of mentor-protege interaction focused on instruction:

- Observation of and feedback about teaching can be uncomfortable, even threatening, unless participants in the collaborative process have developed a trust relationship based on honest disclosure, open communication, confidentiality, and mutual respect. Coaching activities should not be initiated until mentor and protege have developed a responsive partnership, discussed the process of teaching exchange, engaged in casual and informal instructional assistance activities and understand the function of observation and feedback in their year-long action plan.

- Coaching is but one effective strategy to use in promoting the protege's teaching effectiveness and is best used in combination with casual contacts, informal interactions and other formal instructional assistance activities (team consultation and modeling).

- Both mentor and protege are active learners in collaborative observation of and consultation about the teaching-learning process. This posture is maintained by entering each goal-setting session, observation and de-briefing discussion mindful that all transactions between teachers and learners are unique and special.

- Coaching is most effective when focused positively on identification of teaching strategies and teacher behaviors that create a classroom climate conducive to teaching and learning and foster pupil progress and achievement.

Several sessions of the ODE mentor training workshops are devoted to these approaches to providing instructional assistance and also to topics related to effective teaching—curriculum design, pupil motivation and management, pupil assessment, grouping and organizing students for instruction. In August, primary attention is paid to assisting the protege establish a classroom climate conducive to teaching and learning through motivational and management techniques. The October session focuses on introduction of AIM concepts and skills, and experimenting with coaching strategies and techniques. In both October and February, problem-solving discussions are planned in which mentors and proteges can share their experiences in providing instructional assistance and suggest useful approaches to increasing the productivity of team interaction about teaching. Finally, in February, focused workshop sessions will address specific instructional assistance topics of concern to both mentors and their proteges. Additional materials will be distributed in these training sessions to increase mentor's effectiveness as providers of instructional assistance.

In the meantime, mentors may want to add to this section of the handbook other resources of potential utility in helping their proteges with the design and delivery of instruction, including:

- Sample unit or lesson outlines in the protege's curricular area and where prescribed, the district's lesson planning form.

- Sample grading or record keeping systems.
• A sample parent conference folder.

• An outline of the contents of information kept in student records for the district.

• Materials used in school- or district-adopted instructional strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, writing across the curriculum) that all staff are expected to use.
APPENDIX C
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS
AND SURVEY
April 16, 1990

TO: Mentor Teachers Participating in the Beginning Teacher Support Program

RE: Evaluation of the Beginning Teacher Support Program

The Beginning Teacher Support Program has enjoyed another successful year and we credit you for making that happen. Because of your dedication, enthusiasm, and expertise, a new generation of teachers is starting their careers with a great deal of support.

When House Bill 2020 was enacted by the 1987 Legislative Assembly, the Department of Education was given the responsibility for evaluation of the statewide Beginning Teacher Support Program. A major component of the evaluation of this year's program is the enclosed survey of participating mentor teachers.

It is crucial that we get your response because this year only a small number of mentors will be surveyed. Your name was drawn in a random sample of all mentors in the state. We ask that you respond to the enclosed survey and mail it to the Department of Education by Friday, May 4, using the enclosed business reply envelope.

Your answers to the survey questions will be strictly confidential. Your name is needed only for follow-up purposes and for the matching of related data. In no way will your answers be identified with you as an individual or shared with others in your school or district. This is an evaluation of the statewide program—not of individual teachers, school, or districts.

Please call Rex Crouse, Personnel Development Specialist, (503) 373-1287, if you have any questions or concerns about the survey. Thank you very much for your assistance and for all your efforts this year.

Redacted for Privacy

Wayne R. Neuburger
Acting Associate Superintendent
Division of School Improvement
(503) 378-8992
Survey of Mentor Teachers
Participating in Oregon's Beginning Teacher Support Program, 1989-90

Directions: Please write your last name and your protege's last name in the boxes at the top left corner of the enclosed answer sheet and fill in the corresponding circles. Indicate the grade you teach in the column labeled "grade or educ." If you teach at more than one grade, fill in the highest grade. Indicate your answers to the survey questions (except the fill-in items on pages 7 through 9) by darkening the appropriate circle using a number 2 pencil. Completely erase any stray marks or responses that you wish to change. Any explanatory comments may be written on the survey instrument itself.

Your answers will be kept completely confidential. In no way will they be identified with you as an individual or shared with others in your school or district. Please respond carefully and honestly.

Part 1: Description of the School in Which Your Protege Works
For questions 1 through 8, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement as it applies to the school in which your protege works.

1. Teachers and administrators work together on areas which are causing problems and concerns in the school. A B C D E
2. Teachers in this school generally feel supported by administrators. A B C D E
3. New teachers receive help from experienced teachers. A B C D E
4. New teachers discuss their problems with the principal. A B C D E
5. There is a feeling of warmth and friendliness in the atmosphere of this school. A B C D E
6. Teachers care for each other in this school. A B C D E
7. There is an ongoing program of staff development based on established needs. A B C D E
8. Standards for student achievement are set so they are both challenging and attainable, and are maintained consistently. A B C D E

Form 581-3299 (4/90)
Part 2: Your Protege’s Development as a Teacher

We are interested in your assessment of your protege’s teaching skills as they have developed over this school year. Please rate his or her skill with respect to the dimensions of teaching listed below at two points in time: (1) at the beginning of the school year (i.e., the first month of teaching), and (2) at the present time. Use the following scale: A = Extremely skillful, B = Very skillful, C = Moderately skillful, D = Minimally skillful, and E = Not at all skillful. Again, we emphasize that this information will be confidential.

(Note: The item number immediately precedes the response choices.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom discipline</th>
<th>Beginning of School Year</th>
<th>Present Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom discipline</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating students</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with individual learning differences</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing students' work</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning instructional units and lessons</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining needed materials and supplies</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with problems of individual students</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with parents</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3: Support Provided to Mentor Teacher

Questions 25 to 29: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the support you have received to perform your role as a mentor teacher?

25. I have been provided with sufficient training in mentorship skills.
26. My principal provides me with support and encouragement in my role as a mentor.
27. Other teachers in my school provide me with support and encouragement in my role as a mentor.
28. Other teachers are willing to help my protege.
29. I feel some resentment from other teachers in my school because of my role.
### Part 4: Relationship With Your Protege

For each dimension of teaching listed below, please respond to two questions: **How much assistance have you felt your protege needed this year?** and **How much assistance did you provide?**

(Note: The item number immediately precedes the response choices.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Assistance Needed</th>
<th>Amount of Assistance Provided by Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Slight Amount</td>
<td>A Slight Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Moderate Amount</td>
<td>A Moderate Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Great Amount</td>
<td>A Great Amount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Classroom discipline        | 30. A B C D                           |
| Motivating students         | 31. A B C D                           |
| Dealing with individual learning differences | 32. A B C D |
| Assessing students' work    | 33. A B C D                           |
| Planning instructional units and lessons | 34. A B C D |
| Obtaining needed materials and supplies | 35. A B C D |
| Dealing with problems of individual students | 36. A B C D |
| Relations with parents      | 37. A B C D                           |

46. **How many times have you observed and gathered data for your protege while he/she is teaching?**

   - None
   - 1 to 3 times
   - 4 to 6 times
   - 7 to 9 times
   - 10 or more times

47. **How many of these observations included both a goal-setting conference and a post-observation conference?**

   - None
   - 1 to 3 times
   - 4 to 6 times
   - 7 to 9 times
   - 10 or more times

48. **How many times during this school year did your protege observe your teaching?**

   - None
   - 1 to 3 times
   - 4 to 6 times
   - 7 to 9 times
   - 10 or more times

49. **How many times during this school year did your protege observe other teachers (aside from you) in your school or other schools?**

   - None
   - 1 to 3 times
   - 4 to 6 times
   - 7 to 9 times
   - 10 or more times
50. How many times during this school year did you attend conferences, workshops or classes together with your protege?

A None  
B 1 to 3 times  
C 4 to 6 times  
D 7 to 9 times  
E 10 or more times

51. How many times during this school year was a substitute hired to allow you to observe or meet with your protege? (Include training and conferences you attended with your protege.)

A None  
B 1 to 3 times  
C 4 to 6 times  
D 7 to 9 times  
E 10 or more times

52. Approximately what percentage of the time was your preparation period used to observe or meet with your protege?

A 0 percent  
B 10 percent  
C 20 percent  
D 30 percent  
E 40 percent or more

53. Over the school year, how has the frequency of meetings with your protege changed? (Include formal and informal meetings.)

A Increased greatly  
B Increased moderately  
C No significant change  
D Decreased moderately  
E Decreased greatly

54. How frequently on the average did you meet with your protege during the first half of the school year?

A Daily  
B 2 to 3 times per week  
C Once per week  
D Once every two weeks  
E Less than once every two weeks

55. How frequently on the average did you meet with your protege during the second half of the school year?

A Daily  
B 2 to 3 times per week  
C Once per week  
D Once every two weeks  
E Less than once every two weeks

56. Over the school year, how has the amount of time spent with your protege changed? (Include all contact time – formal and informal.)

A Increased greatly  
B Increased moderately  
C No significant change  
D Decreased moderately  
E Decreased greatly

57. Approximately how many hours per week on the average did you spend with your protege during the first half of the school year?

A 1/2 hour per week  
B 1 hour per week  
C 1 1/2 hours per week  
D 2 hours per week  
E 2 1/2 or more hours per week

58. Approximately how many hours per week on the average have you spent with your protege during the second half of the school year?

A 1/2 hour per week  
B 1 hour per week  
C 1 1/2 hours per week  
D 2 hours per week  
E 2 1/2 or more hours per week

59. To what extent did other teachers or administrators provide your protege with the support and assistance he/she needed as a new teacher?

A To a very great extent  
B To a large extent  
C To a moderate extent  
D To a slight extent  
E Not at all
Questions 60 through 71: Please rate your own performance on the aspects of mentorship skill listed below. Use the scale: A = Excellent, B = Very Good, C = Good, D = Adequate, and E = Poor.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Orienting your protege to the teaching setting</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Becoming familiar with your protege's particular classroom</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Assisting your protege in finding the instructional resources he/she needs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Providing information that increases your protege's subject area knowledge</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Observing your protege's teaching performance and offering feedback</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Providing helpful suggestions to improve your protege's teaching</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Providing helpful suggestions to improve your protege's classroom management</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Modeling or demonstrating useful ways to improve your protege's teaching</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Helping your protege with individual student problems</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Counseling your protege about professional concerns</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Counseling your protege about personal concerns</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Establishing a positive working relationship with your protege</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 5: Instructional Assistance

To what extent did you find each of these factors important in being able to observe and coach your protege?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>The availability of release time with someone covering your class while you observe your protege.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Having a preparation period at a time different from your protege so you could use your prep time to do classroom observation.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>A positive attitude by the other members of your school faculty towards collegial observation.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>A positive attitude by administrators toward collegial observation.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>A positive attitude by administrators toward most types of teacher-directed staff development activities.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Your administrator's respect for the confidentiality of the mentor-protege observation data.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Trust between you and your protege.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Differences in age between you and your protege.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Teaching in the same building as your protege.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Teaching the same content area (for middle/high school) or grade level (for elementary) as your protege.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Having an educational philosophy similar to that of your protege.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Being of the same gender as your protege.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Your protege's willingness to have you observe him/her.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>The ability of your protege to identify areas for observation/coaching</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Your protege's belief that the observation/coaching process is non-evaluative.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>The willingness of your protege to try new ideas.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Your protege's belief that the observation/coaching process can improve teaching.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Your protege's perceived need for assistance to improve instruction.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Your confidence in using the observation/coaching process as presented in the training.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Your knowledge of enough appropriate data collection tools to gather the data your protege requested.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Your confidence in knowing enough teaching techniques to offer suggestions or alternatives.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Your ability to give feedback in a non-threatening, informal way.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Your belief that the observation/coaching process can improve teaching.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Your desire to develop the new skills required by the coaching role.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 6: Open-ended Comments on Instructional Assistance

Please respond to this part of the survey in the space provided below each question. Tear off and return pages 7 through 9 with your answer sheet.

A. Which of the factors listed in Part 5 (items 72 to 95) are the most important in being able to observe and coach your protege? Put the number of the item on the appropriate line below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>Second most important</th>
<th>Third most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. What other factors increased your ability to observe and coach your protege?

C. What other factors hindered your ability to observe and coach your protege?
D. To what extent do you feel participation in the observation/coaching process improved your protege's teaching performance?
   ____ Greatly
   ____ Somewhat
   ____ Not at all

E. To what extent do you feel that the observation process enhanced communication between you and your protege?
   ____ Greatly
   ____ Somewhat
   ____ Not at all

F. Mark each type of teacher behavior that you observed for.
   ____ Managing classroom procedures such as taking attendance or lunch counts
   ____ Questioning skills
   ____ Distracting verbal or nonverbal habits
   ____ Teacher movement patterns
   ____ Transitions
   ____ Grouping strategies
   ____ Verbal or nonverbal reinforcement
   ____ Pupil/teacher interaction patterns
   ____ Use of instructional skills or techniques
   ____ Other (please describe)
G. Mark each type of student behavior that you observed for.

- Time on task
- Student movement patterns
- Student involvement in small group work
- Pupil/pupil interaction
- Pupil response patterns (asking questions or volunteering during discussions)
- Other (please describe)

H. Mark each type of data collection tool that you used.

- Verbatim (recording teacher dialogue)
- Selected verbatim (recording selected parts of teacher dialogue)
- Student seating chart
- Tallies of actions, behaviors, or responses
- Other (please describe)

Your time is greatly appreciated. Thank you very much for completing this survey.

Please return pages 7 through 9 of this survey, along with the scannable answer sheet, using the business reply envelope provided. No postage is necessary.
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APPENDIX E

DELPHI LETTERS AND SURVEY
February 6, 1990

Joyce Reinke
Director of Personnel Development
Oregon Department of Education
Salem, Oregon

Dear Joyce:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a member of the DELPHI panel which is developing a survey for use with mentors in Oregon's Beginning Teacher Support Program. As you know, this survey will be used as the data collection instrument in a descriptive study to determine the needs of mentors conducting classroom observations of their proteges. Along with this letter you will find a page giving some background of the program and outlining the specific research questions to be answered by this study.

The purpose of the DELPHI process is to create a valid instrument which will generate the data necessary to answer the research questions. The preliminary list of survey items was developed through an initial review of literature covering perceived needs of mentor/protege interaction, plus a review of current research on the process and application of the clinical supervision model.

In this first round of the DELPHI process, your task is to react to each item to determine whether or not the wording is appropriate and if there is redundancy within the listing of potential items. You are asked to react to each item according to the following scale:

Retain
Reject
Retain with the following modification(s)

You are also encouraged to contribute new items for the questionnaire where needed.

The second and third (if necessary) rounds utilize a six point scale to determine the importance of each item which was retained or retained through modification in the initial phase. I will continue correspondence with each panel member until group consensus is met. Consensus is considered established when the response of panel members as a group are in agreement 80% of the time. Items will be considered as being appropriate for inclusion in the interview guide when the importance mean is rated at or above 3.5 on the scale.

If possible, please return this first round questionnaire to me by February 16th. I do understand how busy your schedule must be this time of the year, and I do appreciate your time and effort on behalf of this project. Please call if you have any questions. I can be reached at Oregon State University, 737-3244, or at home, 757-1353.

Thank you.
February 20, 1990

Joyce Reinke
Director of Personnel Dev.
700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem, OR 97310-0290

Dear Joyce:

Thank you for responding to the first DELPHI questionnaire. Your responses were extremely helpful in formulating this second draft. From your suggestions I was able to make significant changes, and I feel this survey is much stronger.

The major task now is to rate the importance of each item. A five point scale follows each item on the draft. Please mark the scale under each item in terms of importance of inclusion in the survey. Items marked 1 are considered of little or no importance, and items marked 5 are of the highest importance. Items will be considered as being appropriate for inclusion in the survey when the importance mean is rated at or above 3.5 by all panel members. Again, I welcome all suggestions regarding wording, items that might be left out or added, or order of items.

If possible, please return this second round of questions by March 6th. Depending of the degree of consensus, this may be the last round necessary.

Thank you for the time and expertise you have lent to this study. Please call if you have any questions. I can be reached at Oregon State University, 737-2644 or at home, 757-1353.

Redacted for Privacy

Karen Hamlin
Sample Survey Questions

Elementary ________  
(K-5)  
Secondary ________  
(6-12)  
Other ________

1. How many times have you been able to observe your protege teach so far this year?  

Retain ✓  
Reject  
Retain with the following modification ____________________________

2. To what extent do you feel participation in the observation process improved your protege's teaching performance?  

_____ greatly  
_____ somewhat  
_____ not at all

Retain ✓  
Reject  
Retain with the following modification ____________________________

3. What types of teacher skills or classroom environment factors did you observe for? Mark each.  

_____ time on task  
_____ questioning skills  
_____ distracting verbal or nonverbal habits  
_____ student movement patterns  
_____ transitions  
_____ small group work  
_____ pupil/pupil interaction  
_____ pupil/teacher interaction
classroom management techniques

other (Please describe.)

Put an X by items to be retained.
Cross out items to be rejected.
Write modifications above the appropriate item.
Add additional items below:

5. What types of data collection techniques did you use? Mark each.

selected teacher verbatim for:

- X questioning skills
- X classroom management directives
- X assignment directions
- X transitions

student seating chart for:

- X student reinforcement
- X student/student interaction
- X student/teacher interaction
- X teacher movement
- X student time on task
counts of:

- reinforcers
- verbal mannerisms
- non-verbal mannerisms
- disciplinary remarks

- other (Please describe.)

Put an X by items to be retained.
Cross out items to be rejected.
Write modifications above the appropriate items.
Add items below each category or establish new categories.

To what extent did you find each of these factors important to your ability to conduct classroom observations of your proteges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not important</th>
<th>very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2   3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5   6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Your protege's willingness to have you observe him/her. 1 2 3 4 5 6
Retain X
Reject
Retain with the following modification__________________________

2. Release time with a substitute to cover your class while you observed your protege. 1 2 3 4 5 6
Retain X
Reject
Retain with the following modification__________________________

3. Having a preparation period at a different time than your protege so you could do classroom observations at that time. 1 2 3 4 5 6
Retain X
Reject
Retain with the following modification_________________________
4. The ability of your protege identify skill areas for observation.  

Retain  
Reject  
Retain with the following modification

5. A positive attitude by the other members of your school faculty towards collegial observation.  

Retain  
Reject  
Retain with the following modification

6. A positive attitude by administrators toward teacher-directed staff development activities.  

Retain  
Reject  
Retain with the following modification

7. Your confidence in using data collection tools.  

Retain  
Reject  
Retain with the following modification

8. Your knowledge of enough appropriate data collection tools to be able to observe those teaching skills which your protege requested.  

Retain  
Reject  
Retain with the following modification

9. Your confidence in using the observation process as presented in the training.  

Retain  
Reject  
Retain with the following modification
10. Your administrator's respect for the confidentiality of the mentor-protege observation data. 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Retain √
   Reject ______
   Retain with the following modification __________________________________________

11. Trust between you and your protege. 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Retain ______
   Reject X
   Retain with the following modification __________________________________________

12. Your protege's belief that the observational process is non-evaluative. 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Retain X
   Reject ______
   Retain with the following modification __________________________________________

13. Teaching in the same building as your protege. 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Retain X
   Reject ______
   Retain with the following modification __________________________________________

14. Teaching the same content area as your protege. 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Retain X
   Reject ______
   Retain with the following modification __________________________________________

15. Being older than your protege. 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Retain ______
   Reject X
   Retain with the following modification __________________________________________

16. Being about the same age as your protege. 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Retain ______
   Reject X
   Retain with the following modification __________________________________________
17. Being of the same gender as your protege.  
Retain _____  
Reject □  
Retain with the following modification ____________________________

17. The willingness of your protege to try new ideas.  
Retain □  
Reject _____  
Retain with the following modification ____________________________

18. Your belief that the observation process can potentially help your protege be a better teacher.  
Retain □  
Reject _____  
Retain with the following modification ____________________________

19. Your protege's belief that the observation process can help him/her become a better teacher.  
Retain □  
Reject _____  
Retain with the following modification ____________________________

20. Which of the above factors would be the most important to your ability to do protege observations? (Put the number of the item on the appropriate line.)

_____ most important  
_____ second most important  
_____ third most important  

Retain □  
Reject _____  
Retain with the following modification ____________________________
21. What other factors not listed above were barriers to your conducting classroom observations?

Retain X
Reject
Retain with the following modification__________________________

Add additional items below:

Thank you for evaluating these survey items. I will be looking forward to your feedback.
APPENDIX F
MENTOR RESPONSES
MENTOR RESPONSES: SECONDARY

WHAT OTHER FACTORS INCREASED YOUR ABILITY TO OBSERVE AND COACH YOUR PROTEGE?

CONTEXT

School

Cooperativer teachers.

Input from other faculty members, good and bad.

Conducive atmosphere in building.

Individual meetings after school. Observing programs in other schools.

The staff development program in school made observation seem to be the normal procedure. Other teachers were being video-taped, along with myself and the protege.

Collegial awareness of the program.

Time

Having a prep period at a time which allowed me to observe her teaching our common subject. Substitutes were provided.

Time to attend conferences. Our combined desire to work with students during lunch time. Team teaching opportunities.

The willingness of another teacher to cover one or two classes was very helpful.

His school starting time is one hour earlier than mine, so it was easy to get over to observe his first period class.

(Ability to get release time during the day.)

Our staff development program at our school provided sub time; other teachers gave up prep time that allowed us to do this.
The willingness of another teacher to cover one or two classes was very helpful.

My team members willingness to take my class while I did observations.

Administrators

Administrative support for release time to do observing.

Positive attitude by administrators toward collegial observation.

Administrators letting me know areas that needed work.

Giving up my prep time to observe. Willingness of my principal to cover my class.

Administration is very supportive.

The understanding of administration to let me observe during my prep period. The ability to be granted every request to be allowed to attend workshops.

Administrator’s willingness to allow me to report late in the morning.

Support from administrators

Job similarity

Similar subject matter and students in common

Extra-curricular activities coached together.

Teaching together - we had the exact same schedule.

In the same teaching field and involved in coaching.

It was real important that an agriculture instructor and FFA advisor be the mentor because there are so many other things involved other than teaching in the classroom to be successful.

Same subject matter

Several units of team teaching—or same content teaching.

Team teaching during our block classes.
Proximity

Room next to one I use regularly.

My protege and I shared the same room together and had the opportunity to spend a great deal of time together talking, informal observing, etc. We were very fortunate with our teaching situations.

Teaching in the same building

Being in the same building. Being in the same discipline.

Because we practically shared a room (there was just an accordion partition between us) we performed daily observations on each other and spoke briefly every day.

We teach in the same lab.

Closeness of teaching areas; co-use of equipment

Sharing same office and building

Personal

Rapport between my protege and myself

Similar interests

We shared similar interests

We get along very well.

The proximity to my protege and her need for assistance with individual problems provided the opening for observations and coaching. She was working through a great deal of personal problems and by providing support in that area, I was able to finally gain her confidence and assist with some classroom management areas. Rex was very helpful to me with some individual counseling.

Pairings

She helped choose her mentor. She had substituted in the building the previous year.
ATTITUDE

Protege

My protege's sincere desire to improve and enrich his teaching skills during his first year helped a great deal.

His trust and belief that the process was non-evaluative.

Willingness of my protege to be open and honest.

Willingness of protege to try new ideas.

Willingness (eagerness) of protege

Desire of protege to grow.

His willingness to have me observe.

His wanting input and to grow.

Protege's strong desire to be great at what he does.

Mentor

My protege had excellent classroom management from early on so my role seemed most effective in the "supportive" role beyond the classroom. We spent many hours discussing how to deal with students in our "informal" meetings and it was in that arena that I felt she most benefitted from my years of experience.

Mentor's sensitivity to needs of first-year teacher.

Competence of protege made it easy (almost unnecessary) to observe and coach.

A willingness to really help.

Willingness to do it.

Concern for the students to have good, qualified teachers.

A sincerity to improve the profession and a deep personal concern for both the protege and their students. I care and I'm here to help.
We were eager to play the roles of mentor/protege. Our best time spent together was in late summer prior to our fall in-service. We established our rapport and learned each other’s teaching philosophies.

Interest in working with another professional and the belief that observing and coaching my protege was/is a two way learning process.

A high level of honesty. A willingness to spend a lot of time just listening, not giving advice. Support and building up her confidence.

My protege had always an "open door" policy and she was not at all threatened by my presence in her room. Our rooms were very close to each others. We also are both in the same department. We share many of the same interests and really consider each other good friends.

SKILLS

Agreeing beforehand what areas I’d be observing and coaching in order to improve his classroom. Keeping the idea that I’m only looking for one area to observe, and that the process is to help, not evaluate the protege.

My protege would focus my observation on a particular area.

Give feedback in a non-threatening and informal way.

Knowledge from the workshops

Knowledge of teaching techniques, knowledge of observation instruments.

Training sessions.

Suggestions from workshop #2 helped to organize and focus observations.

The training provided in the mentoring workshops was good. Perhaps some follow-up work at the district level immediately after the workshop would help internalize the practices.

My background and certification in his subject area even though I am not currently teaching in that area was a great help. His describing a problem was often enough to recognize it and suggest possible alternatives.
Mentor workshops/mentor guidebook
The pre-conference
I have had advanced ITIP and peer coaching, so it's easy.
Previous coursework in clinical observation-evaluation. Previous experience as a mentor.
WHAT OTHER FACTORS HINDERED YOUR ABILITY TO OBSERVE AND COACH YOUR PROTEGE?
CONTEXT
Proximity
Distance was the greatest problem. We were 50 miles apart.
My protege's room was on the opposite end of the school campus which hindered our communication.
It would have helped to have our classes next to each other.
Not being in the same building was a tremendous hindrance.
Being in a different building made the situation more difficult.
Being in different content areas and at difference ends of the building hindered me the most.
Job similarity
Coached volleyball together.
I was provided with sub time to work with my protege. We have a team organization at our school and we were on the same team. Therefore, we had a daily 40 minute meeting together. Social events together were delightful.
The fact that we were in different content areas. She was in music and I was in language arts which made me feel as though I was not adept in zeroing in on some content areas. I was able to help with non-content areas (discipline--etc.).
Different subject areas, I couldn't help on content.
Not teaching the same grade level, self-contained vs departmentalized language arts.

Time

Time, time, time! pressures of not enough time to do as many observations as we wanted.

My individual class schedule.

Lack of time. . hectic school year (accreditation/standardization visits, extracurricular demands, etc.)

Time limitations due to a full curriculum. We were getting ready for a state visit.

My schedule.

Finding time.

Just plain business in teaching 3 preps. She and I often were a school next door to each other until 5:30 p.m.

Sometimes extra duties, supervision, filling in other classes cut into the prep period we had hoped to use. Just time to do it.

Lack of release time.

Protege coached after school and at a different school part of the year. Protege taught only part time.

Lack of time in science teaching schedule.

Scheduling of time to do it.

I had no problems observing him, but his schedule made it difficult to observe me. However, he was able to observe others.

Lack of release time other than prep period to observe protege.

Heavy work load.

Increased demands on teachers during accreditation year.

Time
My time with my protege was hindered by the fact that I teach six classes a day, have three different preps and have a little over an hour to prepare per day. In addition, my protege coached football and umpired baseball games so our time after school was limited.

Having to work around the A.M. meetings scheduled in my own building.

Lack of time.

Time

Time as a small district. Everyone has 2-4 other duties.

Lack of time. Too many other responsibilities.

The first semester I had no preparation period, so direct observation was minimal.

Time constraints; busy schedules for us both

Lack of time in a day and little observation time

Regular teaching schedule

A very hectic schedule this year--including a strike.

Not having a common prep time. My protege coached after school all year so we had no time then. I have a lot of meetings before school. It was very difficult to get together. I could observe him but we had no time to talk about it.

It was helpful to have different prep periods for observation, but it hindered the time available for conference and discussion. My protege had a strenuous teaching assignment and I felt uncomfortable taking up her time when she needed considerable time for preparing lessons and grading papers.

Just the business of putting in so much time doing my job plus setting aside the time needed to coach and support her.

Other Duties

Additional duties taken on while mentoring my protege such as a student teacher, ESD workshop on computers, yearbook duties, etc all took time away from the mentoring process. I would recommend that the mentor
and protege not assume any additional duties during this first year.

Many times when we could have worked together I was off coaching at another school.

I feel that first year teachers should not be assigned any after school responsibilities. It greatly reduces the time available for pre-conferences and post-conferences.

Protege coached two sports making it difficult to meet after school.

We have the same prep period. We have different "extra-curricular" involvements and sometimes these interferred with our time together.

Substitutes

The shortage of substitutes during the "sick" months and my stress of other obligations in my field which required use of my prep time for things other than mentor work.

Not enough sub time

Not being able to drop in for only a few minutes. (Administration felt a half day sub was needed. 10 minutes or so would have been sufficient.

Staff

Non-support from fellow teachers

Teachers in the protege's discipline who expressed that they should have the mentorship. Quiet undermining of my confidence as a mentor and communication with protege as a result of being appointed mentor instead of a teacher in protege's discipline. Jealousy. Negative parking lot evaluations by in discipline teachers upon mentor instead of using positive avenue to help program.

Administration

The budget for the individual mentors and proteges wasn't finalized until December. My protege coached football. It was very difficult to find time to meet without release time. I felt the decision of how the funds would be spent was delayed due to lack of planning on the administration's part.
A demanding principal and district that sponges up every second of absorbable time--frequent meetings for district-wide concerns, obligations for/toward our middle school transition--even so everything went well.

Administrative support. (problem)

Department head expecting problems to be fixed immediately. He would tell me to do this and that instead of being active in working with her. Since I was there he wasn’t. His requests were often very unreasonable making my protege extremely uncomfortable and stressed.

Poor project director.

Not starting program until after school started.

ATTITUDE

My protege was very uncomfortable being observed as a result of a bad experience during her student teaching. I was not successful in helping her overcome her negative feelings regarding observations so my class visits were brief and very casual.

She was not always receptive to an observation. It seemed quite threatening to her, I’m sad to say.

No perceived need for assistance on either part.

My protege’s lack of self-confidence and fear that confidentiality would not be maintained were primary factors hindering observation and coaching. After she broke through her own beliefs and fears, she was able to accept the assistance. She now has plans to make many changes in style and content.

A heavy schedule of "accountability" observation by evaluators and feeling that "growth" observation was an extra burden to protege. Additionally this young lady came to the teaching profession with a skill level far above that of many (most) first year teachers. Ours became more of an enhancement relationship than a mentor‘protege relationship. There should be a track for this calibre new teacher in the BTSP format.

I placed the responsibility of setting up time to observe on my protege. I reminded him several times, but we never did do a formal observation. We share the same prep, which made it difficult to observe. We team-taught at least one class every day, which allowed
us to observe each other on an informal basis. Informal feedback was given.

Fear of being criticised.

My protege has done very well in her first year of teaching. Thus I stayed out of her way and let her have as much uninterrupted teaching experience as possible.

His lack of desire to have me observe.

Protege's defensive attitude

His unwillingness to try

He made several enemies among the staff and refused to understand what was going on. He would not let up or give up on an issue even when told to.

Difference in educational philosophy.

SKILLS

Protege's previous experience made for a stronger instructor than the mentor.

OTHER

Inability to observe locker room behavior

We are both in the same department. At the beginning of the year we had two handicapped boys which took constant monitoring on our part. We needed to be in our classrooms, on the job.

Not wanting to leave my own class.
MENTOR RESPONSES: ELEMENTARY

WHAT OTHER FACTORS INCREASED YOUR ABILITY TO OBSERVE AND COACH YOUR PROTEGE?

CONTEXT

Class Coverage

Ability to coordinate schedule with principal so he could cover one of the classes.

Our cooperative classified staff helped us tremendously.

Having a student teacher has freed me to do informal drop-in observations of protege.

Having someone in the building who could occasionally cover classes for a short period of time.

Time

Release time was most important.

Our schedules were different to enable observations.

The primary factor that assisted me in my ability to observe and coach my protege was the release time that I could take to observe.

We used video-tape machines several times. Taped our lessons and reviewed them at a later time when students were gone and we had planning time together.

We did a lot of team teaching. We were lucky enough to have only 19 students each, so we could work often in large groups.

She brought her class to my room for special projects or occasions and my class visited her room. I could observe without hiring a sub.

My prep time helped give me time for observations.

We both had somewhat flexible schedules so we could meet a few minutes here and there.

I teach mornings only. I used afternoon hours to observe. We used lunch hour to meet.
We both came to work early and stay late, giving us time to plan and share ideas.

Proximity

We have adjacent rooms with a shared interior door and spend every afternoon reviewing day's activities.

We shared a classroom and had daily contact during lunch time. I was able to share all my materials with her. We conducted parent conferences as a team.

Being in close proximity--classrooms across the hall.

We were assigned to the same building and grade level.

Rooms next to each other. Same grade level.

Classrooms just across the hall made it very easy to meet both informally and formally.

Rooms right next to each other.

We shared a room.

Protege in same building.

My protege teaches in the same open classroom. Because of this, our mentor/protege set up was idea.

Being next door.

He had many of my students from the two previous years. My knowledge of them as students and children helped me to analyze. Being across the hall from him made frequent visits possible on an informal basis.

Being in same building right next door and having the same lunch and recess times.

I taught next door to one of my proteges. We shared duties together. One of my proteges taught my P.E. class daily.

Release from morning and afternoon bus duty.

My ability to work with my protege was greatly enhanced by being in the same school and working at the same grade level. We shared an open-space classroom.

Rooms next to each other and teach same grade.
We were both intermediate teachers and our rooms were fairly close to one another.

The close proximity of her room to mine, also the unique situation under which we teach (K-3 school) helped us to develop a good relationship from the beginning.

We teach right across the hall from each other.

Teaching is the same building is essential. Both mentor and protege though not on the same curriculum, are specialists and teach on parallel schedules.

Her room was near mine and she could pop in with questions. What doesn’t show on reports is the number of times we met just for a few minutes.

Our rooms are adjoining therefore we were constantly in contact. This made it very easy for us to confer when necessary.

Similar Jobs

Although I taught first and she kindergarten we both had previous experience teaching kindergarten and we both believed in the developmental approach to teaching kindergarten.

We both had the same type of students requiring the same styles of teaching, worked for the same department, had the same supervisors, same schedules, and our resource rooms were almost exactly the same other than being in different schools.

Both of us in special services.

My protege and I taught not only in the same school but were teammates in a 5th/6th grade classroom. We were together every day and we planned our lessons together every week. We also became friends quickly and spent a lot of time laughing.

Same curriculum, I’m familiar with what she’s teaching.

Knowing the students.

Teaching similar grade levels.

We shared students within the three first grades, changing rooms for reading and math. This allowed us to talk about individual students, how I saw them in my
classes and she in hers. We could talk about strategies for meeting their needs, etc.

We did not have the same teaching assignment; I’m in the classroom and my protege is in music. My own music background and the fact that my husband is a music teacher were very significant factors.

Pairings

She was my student teacher.

Philosophy similar

Same teaching philosophies.

My protege did practicum teaching under my direction last year, so we had many opportunities to observe each other and discuss strategies.

She is an experienced substitute teacher and has raised six children, plus she has lived in our school area for some time. She had requested me as a teacher for her son prior to our program so I knew our philosophy was similar--that certainly helped.

My protege and I had previously worked together (she did a September Experience and Practicum II in my classroom the previous year). Therefore, we had already established a friendship and were quite familiar with each other’s teaching.

We were friends before we became involved in the program.

Our teaching assignments gave us many opportunities to work together informally and formally. We had had a unique headstart last year when my protege was a substitute. That let us begin this year with some knowledge of one another’s teaching styles, and an already established level of trust as a foundation.

We had a lot in common from the beginning (had known each other for several months) and felt comfortable with each other.

Administrative

Having a supportive administration and a staff that was willing to give input.

Cooperation from principal.
The administration was very supportive.

We had a very supportive supervisor.

Freedom from administration to go ahead on my own.

My principal's willingness to take my class so I could go to observe my protege also helped.

The willingness of my administrator to cover for me helped.

Administrative support for the mentor/protege concept.

I feel that my district is totally behind this program. This also helped with observations because they were more than willing to provide subs or cover my classes.

Our administration is very supportive.

Support from our principal.

I had both a superintendent and a principal that were very enthusiastic about the program.

Support of principal and faculty for mentor process.

Personal

We have a good working relationship and a high degree of respect for each other and our respective teaching style. We have respectfully shared ideas since Day 1.

I think the relationship we built was the biggest influence in our ability to work well together.

Trust and confidence that we built as a team.

Similar education philosophy.

Shared educational philosophy, sense of humor!

Similar moral beliefs.

Non-threatening relationship between us.

Friendship.

We liked each other and felt comfortable being together. We shared the same interests: karate.
We became such great friends. We felt comfortable discussing results of any observation problem discovered.

Our relationship is very non-threatening.

Getting to be friends.

Developing a good rapport with my protege.

Our ability to communicate. Our sense of humor.

The fact that we became such good friends. It made our professional, working relationship great. We could talk about and share any problem and concern. It's been a great year.

Confidence in each other.

ATTITUDE

Protege

The positive attitude of protege and her willingness to ask for help.

Her openness and willingness to try new ideas.

Willingness to improve teaching skills.

The determination and hard work of my protege despite administrative differences.

We are both open to new styles, new ideas, and each other's opinions.

Her belief it was non-evaluative and her willingness to try new ideas.

Same desire to improve, change, alter style and approach.

Because she had many years teaching in a private setting, I didn't know how much help she welcomed. I think I would have taken more initiative if it had been someone who had never taught before. If she asked me, I responded. I didn't want to push myself on her if she didn't need me. I was uncertain about this balance. I felt more comfortable having her observe me. I felt I could model some skills that might be helpful to her.

Willingness of protege to listen.
My protege’s willingness to let me share. He was an excellent protege and is a very good teacher.

My ability to give feedback in a non-threatening way and her willingness to receive feedback in a positive and constructive manner.

My protege’s desire to improve her teaching skills forced us to arrange the time.

The willingness of my protege to try new ideas.

Her willingness to let me come in at any time.

The protege’s desire and acceptance of the importance of it.

Desire for growth and to be the best teacher.

Protege’s willingness to seek guidance and be receptive to suggestions.

Level of competence achieved by protege (or perceived level.)

Willingness of protege to try new ideas.

Her willingness to work with me on this process. Her knowledge that I had little background in her area, and her cooperation and patience with me to help find out pertinent information that could help her.

She was very positive and open to learn.

My protege’s openness about areas of struggle, and her desire to grow and improve facilitated optimum use of observation and coaching time.

Willingness by protege to be observed. He did not seem to be threatened by me watching.

We both value teaching and believe we can make a difference in kid’s lives. We care about kids and strive to provide them with a positive learning environment.

She was very responsive to my suggestions and was eager to learn.
Mentor

I have had, from almost the beginning, a great deal of confidence and respect for her; I have learned from her also.

Her observation and feedback of my teaching.

SKILL

Practice, dialogue with other mentors at state workshops.

Being a good active listener and giving advice only upon request was beneficial. We were always straight-forward and honest with each other.

In-service training, opportunity to compare experiences with other mentors.

Informal meetings with other mentors and proteges.

Working with another mentor/protege pair. The other mentor and I shared ideas and suggestions of ways to observe and encouraged each other.

Ability at self-analysis, good self-esteem, tact.

Going to workshops together.

Mentor conferences, talking with other mentors about their strengths and weaknesses.

Classes and traveling to mentor workshop.

Having been interested in peer coaching and having taken clinical supervision on my administrator's certificate.

Experience as a supervisor of student teachers, experience in peer coaching and models of teaching, experience as a district curriculum trainer.

I feel that my ITIP classes I have taken increased my ability to observe and coach my protege. I was taught some very good observation techniques.

I have extensive training in peer observation and coaching. I could easily fulfill this in a non-threatening, positive manner.
I have been trained in T.E.S.A model of peer coaching. I found this to be very useful in our observations.

I have been involved in the U of O Resident Masters Program as a cooperative teacher. The "university" showed me several ways of collecting data.

Workshops
Information provided by the workshops was valuable.
Our training sessions were very helpful.
Good training by mentor program.
I appreciate the workshops and district training sessions for mentors. The dialogue between mentors was useful.
Ability to give feedback in a non-threatening manner.
pre-conference
The ability of both of us to identify areas for observation/coaching and setting a time to do it and following through with it.
OTHER
The requirement of the program to observe.
I became well-acquainted with her students.
Verbalizing my philosophy.
WHAT OTHER FACTORS HINDERED YOUR ABILITY TO OBSERVE AND COACH YOUR PROTEGE?

CONTEXT

Time
Not enough release time with someone covering my class.
Not enough release time to observe. No release time to conference between us.
No release time. Many times my prep period didn't fit with the time she wanted particular observations conducted.
No prep period in my schedule. No coverage of my class provided. Very difficult to beg someone often enough to adequately observe and help her.

Time, our breaks did not mesh, nor our lunches, and we have had many after school meetings, usually 3 a week getting ready for standardization, curriculum goals and setting, textbook adoption, regular weekly meetings and ad hoc committee meetings. Time before school just had to be used for class preparation. I would have greatly appreciated being at the same grade level.

This was a difficult year for our building due to additional meetings relating to contract negotiations and a strike.

Disproportionate amount of energy and time devoted to contract negotiation and strike activities and the aftermath.

Hectic schedule, other activities getting in the way.

Too busy with own responsibilities.

Taking the time away from my own class was difficult.

Lack of time to leave my own class. Various committee work took me away from my class for a considerable amount of time. Leaving for the additional time to observe my protege became difficult.

Time, maybe. That seems to be a problem in many areas. . . feelings that I’m taking time away from my own students when I’m in another classroom or at conferences, etc.

The many other demands for our time.

Lack of time due to numerous other responsibilities.

Lack of time.

Time (lack of)

Time

Time

Time (never enough)

Time and time management.
Finding the time to do observations.

Lack of prep time to observe.

Not enough prep time to observe.

Our schedules were very much the same so it was difficult to have a time to observe her. Our prep times were the same also and release time was not a frequent option.

We both teach special education. We were hindered by: huge caseloads and long referral lists that needed to be completed in a timely fashion. These needed to be done by us. Substitute teachers and release time couldn’t help us.

Lack of time due to involvement in other school activities. In a small school with a small staff, a few teachers seem to head all committees and assume all leadership roles.

Our district was involved in the Onward to Excellence program and by the time we spent hours in meetings for that, it was hard to get together for more meetings for mentors.

Common prep periods.

Same prep times.

Our prep periods and lunch periods were on different schedules so unless we arranged for a sub to cover my class, we couldn’t observe each other.

Just time and all we are working to accomplish this year.

Not having release time available.

Time, we were always busy, had groups of students and it was hard to free up time to observe at any length.
Finding time to be able to give the protege enough coaching, observing, and sharing time. Our team had to meet after school to get enough time in.

Lack of enough prep time to do observations. It was really a waste to hire a sub in order to observe 30 minutes, but none of our prep times are that long.

Our prep times coincided, making it somewhat difficult to arrange observation times until springtime when I had a student teacher.

Schedules, making my scheduled breaks or preps coincide with the areas she wanted to have observed.

Our instructional schedules have prohibited me observing at some times with certain classes. I would like to have observed my protege with at least one other class.

Daily pressure of teaching responsibilities.

All teachers have 50-60 hours of work each week. Mentoring adds more work.

With so many interruptions and programs that take kids out of the classroom, time to teach all the goals that we are responsible for and all the paperwork demanded of us in the form of lesson plans, tracking, and documentation, it is almost impossible to find the time to observe. If we happen to have a break, a phone call to a parent, filling out a form, or setting up a science activity may be all that gets done. We can’t count on a time everyday that is free. Once a week would even be a luxury.

It was hard to find time during the school day to meet (different preps, recess duty, bus duty, short lunch break, etc.)

My protege was only half time and her time at school was not during my prep time.

Protege was a half time teacher P.M. and all my prep time was in the A.M. In spring she coached so no after school time.

Meetings take me away before and after school.

She wasn’t at school much. She taught half day, she started the school year late and had a baby and was out several months.
Class Coverage

Finding an adequate substitute for me (music).

Trying to get "someone" to take my class without getting a substitute for the entire day.

Proximity

It was difficult to schedule time together because my protege: only worked half-time, taught in another subject area, taught half of her time in another building. This was not fair to either my protege or to myself. When protege and mentor are matched up there needs to be better planning.

Being in different buildings.

Being at another building was a big hindrance.

We didn’t teach in the same building. In fact our schools were 50 miles apart.

We were in different buildings in the same town.

Not being in the same building and not feeling welcome by the administrator in my protege’s building.

We were each in two buildings so release time was more difficult. Each meeting had to be planned ahead; there was no informal meeting in the halls or staff room.

Being in a different building and being in a different grade level was a tremendous hinderance. One or the other, though not ideal, would be more workable, but with both differences, we had many difficulties. If I could chose only one, I would choose same grade level, different building. Working out a time factor is manageable. Having similar content, being able to develop units together, and that sort of thing would have been very beneficial to us as a team. With different grade levels, we were much less specific, and had less to work with.

Similar Job

Being in separate buildings and having different content areas; I taught second grade and she was a media specialist.
I really feel that I would have been better able to help the new vocational teacher next door to me (whom I spent a great deal of time with anyway) than my protege who was in a different discipline than I. It would help to have mentor/protege closer in discipline.

Working at the same grade level really would be a plus, although not necessary.

Conflicting schedules, protege teaches in two towns. Lack of locations for her to observe in the art area. Art teachers are not a part of the staff of most schools in our area. We are fortunate!

My protege teaches music and I have a very limited music background.

We could have worked, planned and shared more if we were teaching at the same grade level. Lunch times were different. Most of our planning periods fell at the same time.

I felt I could have been more helpful if I taught the same grade as my protege. I was helpful in all areas except specific curriculum planning for her grade.

Not in the same field.

My protege was not directly teaching the same content area as I.

My protege was team teaching with another first grade teacher and she naturally discussed many of the things with her that she might otherwise have discussed with me.

I feel a primary teacher is better able to help another primary teacher. Their times available are more matched as are the curriculums. I feel I lacked ability to help with curriculum planning because I had not taught her level.

Lack of experience at her grade level.

Being out of my content area made a little bit of a problem.
Administration

Finding time to do more observations. Several times observations were changed due to other commitments by our principal. (He covered our classes during observations.)

Taking time from my classes. It was difficult for my principal to always be on time to take my class due to unexpected problems. He tried very hard.

Our principal who was very willing to cover our classes was very often caught up in his own responsibilities.

Administrator not very supportive of program. It was okay until we tried to go somewhere together.

Problems with us being gone from our classroom. No encouragement to attend professional conferences to improve teaching strategies, etc.

The smallness of our school and staff made it difficult to hire a substitute for observations. The fact that our principal is half-time and not always available made it difficult also; as well as his belief that our planning and preparation time should not be done during classroom time.

We ran out of money.

Late start.

Additional Duties

Protege has extra duty contract to coach, which cuts into meeting time.

I regret having accepted a student teacher winter term. I would not again take a student teacher while working with a protege. My student teacher’s presence made my protege less apt to spend long periods after school in my classroom during winter term.

My caseload as a special educator. My students don’t do well with changes. Substitutes really upset their day and the programs are interrupted. I also feel that programs should be in place as far as mentors go in the spring so we might know we will be called on and prepared for the extra responsibility.

I coach high school basketball November - March 10th.
I had several other responsibilities in the district that I had also been asked to do. They also were very time consuming.

Setting the day of the observation and being able to actually do it on that day.

School

In-staff jealousy.

Negative feelings from other staff members about release time to observe.

ATTITUDE

My protege never got over the feeling of not wanting to be observed. She would observe me but felt it was an evaluative process for me to observe her. We even observed specific students rather than teaching styles.

Protege had a degree in PE and taught PE for awhile. Then went back to school to get elementary certificate. She subbed for several years before getting a full time job. She did not need as much help as a beginning teacher.

I was never sure she really wanted me to. I felt my suggesting it would be misunderstood.

Self consciousness on both our parts.

My protege’s independence and self-confidence sometimes interferred. She is very self assured and wants to be able to do it on her own. She’s a very good first year teacher and I don’t think she needed an extreme amount of coaching.

My protege rarely took suggestions given to her. She continued all year long having the same problems regardless of how many suggestions were given.

My protege has not been a willing participant in the mentor program. She has resisted all aspects of the program which has made the year an extremely difficult one. She has never been willing to come up with observation needs nor has she ever been pleasant when we needed to meet for any reason. I have felt guilty most of the year, thinking that she was this way because I had not been a good mentor. Finally, in March, I decided that I do not have to accept the responsibility for her attitude concerning the program.
I still feel disappointed that I could not have been of more assistance to my protege even though I realize that she was not a willing participant.

I started out coaching a woman. It did not work out. I don't think she saw any need for me. Maybe she didn't like men either. I think she was divorced. I switched to ___ and things went much better. ___ would call me when he wanted to try out a new idea on someone before he implemented it in the classroom. We were hindered only by being in different buildings.

I think new teachers establishing themselves are especially reluctant to leave their classes unless it is for a specific purpose such as a workshop, conference or visitation.

Her feeling that my observing her would increase her work load and not necessarily improve her teaching.

My protege was not willing to work extra hours after the completion of the school day.

Protege reluctance to share problems.

Reluctance by the protege to leave their own class.

Release time was never used due to difficulty in getting good substitutes that you feel comfortable leaving your class with and prep periods are non-existent in elementary.

Protege not adequately preparing for my observation. Also, she grew up in this town and I commute. She was more personal with parents and had some lack of confidentiality which caused me to back off.

She didn’t need a great deal of coaching.

She felt threatened or that it was inconvenient. Too much of a bother.

We didn't develop a close personal relationship and I often felt that my advice wasn’t accepted freely.

Teaching at the same times hindered my ability to observe so I would need to observe during my prep time. Also, I needed to remind my protege of making observation times.
She seemed to feel a little threatened by my observations. I never was able to create a feeling that observations were non-evaluative.

Her willingness to have me come into her classroom. She kept putting me off. Also we both needed to identify areas for observation/coaching. This was difficult. A list of possibilities to choose from would have been helpful.

My protege was experiencing severe emotional problems. Many times she didn't feel like meeting at scheduled times. Other times she demanded meetings. She decided when our meetings would take place--no cooperation in setting the times. She would be so emotionally upset that she would go to other staff members and cry about her problems.

My protege will not be re-hired, a know-it-all who refused to asknowledge her need for help from me, the principal or others. I hope this does not skew your sampling.

My protege came to the teaching profession at a mature age. Since this is her second career, she is very confident and didn't want much assistance other than in procedures and finding materials.

SKILL

At first she was not clear on what my role was when I observed her. Once we discussed that it was non-evaluative and she could pick what she wanted to have me observe, she felt more comfortable.

My protege was hired after the school year had begun. We began our mentor relationship late. I missed the first workshop that would have helped me begin our relationship with good ideas and confidence.

Protege not being able to identify areas for observation/coaching.

My protege's needs required, I believe, the role of a master teacher/student teacher. Because of extenuating circumstances he was a classroom teacher for '89-'90 while completing his student teaching/ed block courses. His needs professionally were clearly more than my ability or time in this mentor/protege framework allowed for.
Completely different teaching styles were another concern on my part. He was in a portable rather than in the building. That is a lonely place to be and almost impossible to watch other good teachers in action.

Many of her students had been my students in kdgth. They were easily distracted by my presence.