DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 421 SP 030 650

AUTHOR Mager, Gerald M.; And Others
TITLE The New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program for 1986-1987. A Report to the State Education Department.
INSTITUTION Syracuse Univ., N.Y. School of Education.
PUB DATE Sep 87
NOTE 206p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Internship Programs; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Mentors; *Program Attitudes; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Prog

ABSTRACT

This report presents a comprehensive overview of the intents, activities, and results of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship (MT-I) Program. Part 1 provides an introduction and overview of the evaluation study; it includes information regarding the purpose of the study, the study design and analysis, and the issue of confidentiality. Part 2 focuses on the nature of the pilot mentor-intern projects--their goals, structures, and resources--and a variety of issues that are related to developing and sustaining a local project. The third part deals with the mentor-intern relationship specifically; it provides information on who the mentors and interns were, on how the matches between mentors and interns were made, how the relationships formed and grew, what the mentors and interns did together or individually, and other issues related to this central feature of the MT-I Program. Part 4 focuses on the impact the local projects have had on participants and other educators in the local setting, as well as on the school as an organization. The final part draws a set of conclusions from the three middle parts, and on that basis offers a set of recommendations regarding future policy, planning, and practice related to the work of the MT-I Program. (JD)

A Report
to the
State Education Department
on the
New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program
for
1986 - 1987

prepared by

Dr. Gerald M. Mager

with

Ann Bower

Carol Corwin

Mary Davis

Gary DeBolt

School of Education

Syracuse University

September, 1987

Contents

		page
Contents		i
List of Tables		iv
List of Figures		vi
Part One.	An Overview of the Evaluation Study	1
1.1	Introduction	1
	1.11 The uses of the report	2
	1.12 Organization of the report	4
1.2	Purposes of the Evaluation Study	5
1.3	Design and Analysis	8
	1.31 The study team	8
	1.32 The study questions	9
	1.33 Sources; plan for data collection and its relative success; analysis procedures	11
1.4	A Concern about Confidentiality	26
Part Two.	The Nature of the Pilot Projects	29
2.1	Scope of the Local Efforts	31
2.2	Valued Outcomes	33
2.3	Emphasis on the Mentor-Intern Relationship	36
2.4	Released Time Arrangements	38
2.5	Supportive Resources	43
	2.51 Workshops and consultants	43
	2.52 Printed and audio-visual materials	45
	2.53 Colleges and universities	45
	2.54 State Education Department and local networks	48
2.6	Emergent Roles, Governance, and Management	49
	2.61 Mentor selection committees	49
	2.62 Local project coordinators	51
	2.63 Other role players	54
	2.64 Intermix of roles in governance and management	55

2.7 Variance among the Projects 56

2.8 Stability of the Projects 62
2.81 Strategies for stability 64
2.82 Trust and cooperation 66

Part Three. The Nature of the Mentor-Intern Relationships 70

3.1 Selection of the Mentors 72
3.11 Selection criteria 73
3.12 Appointment of the mentors 75
3.13 Problems related to the selection of mentors 76

3.2 Selection of the Interns 77
3.21 Definition of intern 77
3.22 Voluntary and required participation 79
3.23 Intern hesitance 79

3.3 Demographic and Professional Background 81
3.31 Gender and age 81
3.32 Academic background and certification 81
3.33 Teaching histories and experiences 87
3.34 Current teaching positions 88

3.4 The Matching of Mentors and Interns 93
3.41 Information considered in matching decisions 94
3.42 The number of interns per mentor 98
3.43 Changes in the matches 101
3.44 The quality of the matches 101

3.5 The Workings of the Relationship 103
3.51 Motives and expectations 103
3.52 First meetings and first impressions 106
3.53 The developing relationships 112
3.54 The uses of time 116
3.55 Continuing the relationship 134

3.6 Problems Encountered by Interns and Mentors 136

Part Four. The Impact of the Projects 143

4.1 Impact on the Interns 144
4.11 Beginning Teacher View of Self data 150

4.2 Impact on the Mentors 160
4.3 Impact on the School Organizations 165

Part Five. Conclusions and Recommendations 171

5.1 Conclusions 172
5.11 Regarding intern teachers 172
5.12 Regarding mentor teachers 175
5.13 Regarding the mentor-intern relationship 177
5.14 Regarding the projects 180
5.15 Regarding problems and potentials 184
5.16 Regarding levels of understanding the experience of the first pilot year 187

5.2 Recommendations 188
5.21 For the State Education Department 188
5.22 For local projects 193
5.23 For interns and mentors 195

Appendix. The 1986-1987 Pilot Projects 197

List of Tables

		page
1.	Number of Mentors and Interns Sent WRI Forms by Month	15
2.	Number of WRI Forms Sent and Response Rate by Month	16
3.	Number of Focused Log Forms Sent and Response Rate by Month	18
4.	Interns and Mentors Distributed by Gender and Age	82
5.	Academic Backgrounds of the Interns	82
6.	Academic Backgrounds of the Mentors	84
7.	Certifications of the Interns and Mentors	86
8.	Teaching Histories and Experiences of the Mentors	87
9.	Current Teaching Positions of the Interns and Mentors	89
10.	Intern Comparison of Current Teaching Position to Preparation Experiences	91
11.	Intern Familiarity with Assigned School	92
12.	Mentor Comparison of Own Teaching Position to Intern Teaching Position	93
13.	Importance of a "Good" Match	95
14.	Importance of Selected Information in Making a Match	97
15.	Ratings of the Mentor-Intern Matches Made	102
16.	Beginning Months of the Mentor-Intern Work	106
17.	Activity Instances Distributed across Days of the Week	125
18.	Activity Instances Distributed across Time Blocks in the Day	125
19.	Forms of Activities	127
20.	Activity Participants	129
21.	Foci of Activities	131

22. Changes in Foci of Intern Activities across Several Months 133

23. Changes in Foci of Mentor Activities across Several Months 133

24. Mean Responses for Three Administrations of the BTVoS Questionnaire 151

25. Mean Responses on the BTVoS Questionnaire by Years of Experience 155

List of Figures

		page
1.	Intern A, Week of December 1, 1986	118
2.	Intern B, Week of December 15, 1986	119
3.	Mentor C, Week of December 15, 1986	120
4.	Intern A, Week of May 4, 1987	121
5.	Mentor D, Week of May 4, 1987	122

Part One. An Overview of the Evaluation Study

Introduction

The Mentor Teacher-Internship Program (MT-I Program) is a major development in the theory, policy, and practice of teacher education in New York State. To some, it is the embodiment of an idea, long-discussed as theoretically sound but seldom tried. To some, it is an extension of the state's responsibilities in regulating and supporting the conduct of education. To some, it is an event experienced personally, representing opportunity and challenge. To all it is an engagement with change from what has been, to what is, and what might become. The work of teacher education will be different as a result.

The first year, 1986-1987, has been characterized as a pilot year for the MT-I Program. Two dozen projects have been designed and implemented. It was important that the experiences of those educators across the state, whose ideas and efforts in a substantial way comprised the program, be recorded. From them could be learned much about the how-to's and where-fore's of turning sound ideas into manageable policies and effective projects. Recording their experiences--what they proposed, what they did, what effect they ascribed to their efforts--was an important aspect of the pilot year. Such an effort could turn

their experience into knowledge not yet available to theorists and practitioners of teacher education. Such knowledge, if shared, could inform planners and participants in other projects. Such knowledge, if well-grounded, could undergird the writing of policy. The potential benefits of recording the experiences were many. It was certain that the experiences of planners and participants ought not simply dissipate or be held only by the personal accounts of disparate educators.

Thus, in the pilot year, a commitment was made to systematically study the MT-I Program, as it was enacted in the 24 local projects. The commitment was made by the State Education Department, offering resources, counsel, and assistance; by a team of evaluators/researchers, bringing knowledge of design, data collection and analysis; and, importantly, by planners and participants in sites around the state, giving their time and sharing insights about their own experiences. The commitments made by these parties are some measure of the value attached to the MT-I Program. This present report will, hopefully, honor their commitment by describing and discussing well the first year of the MT-I Program.

The uses of the report. Because it is based on data collected across the many local projects, this report represents the MT-I Program from a statewide perspective. It would be proper to read the report as generally representative of the Program in its first year. For the same reason, it would be improper to suggest that the report reflects specifically any one

of the local projects.

The report is comprehensive. It addresses many aspects of the MT-I Program as it was conceived and implemented in this pilot year. As such, it allows the reader to consider matters in the larger context: a reader's knowledge of a particular local project can be placed into the perspective of the full range of projects; a particular practice or issue might be judged more significant or less, when viewed against this backdrop.

The report is descriptive. It attempts to display the similar and different parts of the many projects. Though the report will make available "what is known" and "what has been practiced" in the MT-I Program this year, it does not prescribe that knowledge or practice. Indeed, because of learning from the experience of the first year, future projects may be different.

Thus, this report brings a broad perspective to understanding the MT-I Program, addressing a variety of issues related to the pilot year experiences. It describes rather than prescribes the nature of work within the projects.

Given these qualities, this report has several uses:

- It can seed the thinking of State Education Department officials as they set policy and monitor practice related to the MT-I Program.
- It can stimulate local project planners to consider the experience of educators at other sites, as they proceed through

their second year of participation.

- It can present to first-time planners a systematic review of ideas, practices, and issues that they might address as their work proceeds.
- It can communicate to other interested, but less directly involved teachers, administrators, staff members and teacher educators about the MT-I Program--its goals, opportunities and problems.
- It can inform the public about the MT-I Program and its role in strengthening teaching in New York State.

Organization of the report. This report has the difficult challenge of presenting a very complex education undertaking through what is essentially a linear medium. Inevitably some of the interrelationships of facts and ideas will be lost or only loosely drawn. Without tripping over itself with references to what has already been stated and what is yet to come, the report will attempt to point to the relatedness of sections that are separately placed.

This report is organized into five parts. Part One provides an introduction and overview of the evaluation study; in this part will be found important information regarding the purposes of the study, the study design and analysis, and the issue of

confidentiality.

The three middle parts of this report will be organized around the three questions set for the statewide evaluation study. Thus, Part Two focuses on the nature of the pilot mentor-intern projects--their goals, structures, and resources--and a variety of issues that are related to developing and sustaining a local project. Part Three focuses on the mentor-intern relationship specifically; it provides information on who the mentors and interns were, on how the matches between mentors and interns were made and how the relationships formed and grew, what the mentors and interns did together or individually, and other issues related to this central feature of New York State's MT-I Program. Part Four focuses on the impact the local projects have had on participants and other educators in the local setting, as well as on the school as an organization.

Finally, Part Five of this report draws a set of conclusions from the three middle parts, and on that basis offers a set of recommendations regarding future policy, planning, and practice related to the work of the MT-I Program.

Purposes of the Evaluation Study

At the outset of the evaluation study effort, three purposes were given formally as part of the rationale for the conduct of the study. Those purposes were:

> A. Data collected for the evaluation/research study will document the events and progress of the particular pilot projects funded and of the overall state program.

This first purpose has largely been met; this report itself

represents the fulfillment of that purpose.

B. The data collection process of the evaluation/research study will, at least to some degree, serve as a means by which the State Education Department can influence the development and implementation of programs in particular local education agencies within the state.

This second purpose has also been fulfilled, though the degree to which the State Education Department has used this evaluation study to influence local projects has been minimal. Suggestions have been made that particular information or issues be pursued through the study; only in this manner has the Department displayed interests which might be seen as influencing local projects.

C. Data collected for the evaluation/research study will be used to inform future program planners of the nature of practices that have been judged successful.

This third purpose will be met if this report is clear, relevant, and usable, and if it is made available as has been anticipated.

In addition to the formal purposes of the evaluation study, it has become evident that this effort also has served several informal functions during the course of the year. From the start, though this has been called the statewide "evaluation" study, it has been made clear that the outcome of the effort would not be a series of judgments about the qualities of persons or projects. In that sense the term "evaluation" may have been somewhat a misnomer. Largely, however, it would seem participants across the state have accepted it as a documentation effort. Indeed, because the study has been an effort undertaken

publicly among the participants--with their knowledge and cooperation--it has garnered their commitment to this particular effort and to the larger MT-I Program. It has to some degree fostered a sense of exploration and opportunity to learn. Periodic feedback to participants at statewide meetings and through other contacts reinforced the notion that this was, indeed, a pilot year from which much could be learned, and it was important not to let the opportunity pass untaken. There has been a sense of "creating this state program together." The study thus served the function of encouraging local planners and participants to pioneer, to share their experiences, while assuring them of a moratorium on judgments.

Perhaps related to this function has been another fulfilled by the study. While participants and observers of the MT-I Program continue to depend heavily on their own experiences, they are aware of the statewide study and recognize that it may frame their experiences as distinctive. The study has thus generated a sense of the importance of grounding discussions of the MT-I Program in broad terms as well as personal experience. To some extent, the study has created a common ground on which to encounter other views.

Finally, it has been the case that for some individuals, the evaluation study team has served as a source of support or reassurance. Whether just listening to mentors, interns, or other participants, or helping them place their experiences in the context of what others were experiencing, or thinking with

them as they worked through particular issues, members of the study team undoubtedly have played a supportive role. This has been particularly evident in face-to-face contacts with individuals; it can be assumed that in the many written communications that have been exchanged with participants during the year, a similar sense of support has been felt.

Design and Analysis

To undertake the evaluation study, a comprehensive design was conceived as a guide by which the work could begin. A team of researchers was formed and communication with participants in the local projects was initiated. As the academic year and the study itself progressed, the research team made several modifications in the original design, chiefly to expand its scope. As responses were received from participants, appropriate analysis procedures were instituted and completed.

The study team. The study team consisted of five educators in the Division for the Study of Teaching, in the School of Education, at Syracuse University. The team was directed by Dr. Gerald M. Mager, an associate professor, whose fields of study include teacher career development. Dr. Mager has spent the last nine years in New York State, working in preservice and inservice teacher education programs and serving several professional associations. The four other team members are advanced students in the Teaching and Curriculum doctoral program at Syracuse University. The four bring additional years of experience in classroom teaching and with institutions of public education.

Ann Bower has 15 years of public school teaching experience, has conducted seminars in education and supervised students for the university. Carol Corwin spent 10 years teaching English and mathematics at the eighth grade level. Mary Davis has worked for several years in early childhood education, and more recently has been a supervisor of student teachers. Gary DeBolt has been a social studies teacher at the secondary level for 14 years. The knowledge and experience shared among the members of the team have enabled them to undertake the study with vision and sensitivity to the matters at hand.

The study questions. Three broad questions anchored the evaluation study design. Sets of subquestions illustrated each.

A. What is the nature of the various mentor-intern pilot programs?

   1. What are the purposes specified by the programs?

   2. What are the activity structures set to achieve the purposes?

   3. What are the outcome indicators valued by the programs?

B. What is the nature of the particular mentor-intern relationships established?

   1. Who are the mentors? What are their backgrounds and professional experiences? How were they selected and on what criteria? What preparation and support have they been given for their roles as mentors? What are their understandings of the purposes and structures of the mentor-intern program?

   2. Who are the interns? What are their backgrounds and professional experiences? What are their understandings of the purposes and structures of the mentor-intern program?

3. How does the relationship begin? How does it change? How is it brought to an end?

4. What events occur which chronicle the relationship, perhaps fostering or impeding the relationship?

5. What is the focus of issues addressed between the mentor and intern? For example, do they focus on personal development? curricular and instructional knowledge, skills and attitudes? organizational and community context concerns? philosophical concerns? other issues?

6. How does the mentor structure and use his/her released time? How does the intern structure and use his/her released time?

7. What activity structures do the mentor and intern design and use in the relationship? For example, do they engage in classroom observation and conferencing? review of curricular materials? team teaching of lessons? informal discussion of issues and problems? attendance at workshops? review of materials such as handbooks and policy manuals? sharing workloads such as planning lessons, preparing materials and exams, grading papers? other structures?

8. What complementary roles do the mentor and intern set for themselves in the relationship? For example, are they advisor and advisee? friend and friend? coach and player? guide and follower?

9. What structures within the school organizational context seem to promote or impede the development of the mentor-intern relationship and the achievement of its purposes?

C. What is the impact of the program on the intern, the mentor, and the school organization?

1. What is the short-term (within the first year of teaching) impact of the program on the intern's performance? Performance is defined as knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired and used in a particular education setting. For example, what effect has the program had

on the intern's performance in the classroom? in the school organization? in contact with colleague teachers? in contacts with parents and community? in other settings?

2. What is the short-term impact of the program on the intern's satisfaction? For example, what effect has the program had on the intern's satisfaction with the work of teaching? with self as a teacher? with schools as a teacher? with schools as a place of work?

3. What is the degree of congruence between intern's and mentor's perceptions of the short-term impact of the program?

4. What is the long-term (beyond the first year of teaching) impact on performance and satisfaction?

   a. Does the intern continue in the teaching career?

   b. Does the intern continue to acquire knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to successful performance in particular settings?

   c. Does the intern continue to be satisfied with teaching as a career?

5. What is the impact of program on the mentor?

   a. Does participation in the program have an effect on the performance or satisfaction of the mentor?

   b. Does participation in the program effect the mentor's view of teaching as a career?

6. What is the impact of the program on the school organization and larger local education agency?

Sources; plan for data collection and its relative success; analysis procedures. In order to address each of the questions, it was necessary to tap several sources of data. The sources included the written proposals funded for the 1986-1987 pilot

projects; the persons who functioned as the local project coordinators; the intern teachers' immediate principals and/or supervisors; other school personnel such as union leaders, fellow teachers, building and district administrators; and an assortment of written materials such as project guides, workshop handouts and articles, newspaper and newsletter clippings. The data collection also tapped a sample of beginning teachers across the state who are not part of any of the 24 local projects. Finally, and most importantly, the mentor teachers and intern teachers were called on time and again, using several different methods, to share their experiences and views.

All together 13 instruments were designed and employed for data collection purposes. Distribution of these instruments was spaced over an eight month period from November, when many of the local projects began their formal work, to June, when the program came to an official close for the year. The collection of data through paper-pencil forms was augmented through a series of visits to selected sites in January, March, and May.

Data collection through the paper-pencil instruments was begun when word was received from the State Education Department that the particular project had been approved and a list of participating mentors and interns was sent to the study team. Thus, 12 projects were contacted initially in late November, 1986, and the first instruments were mailed to participants. Other projects were approved and lists of participants were received in December, January, February, and March. Regarding

these latter projects, decisions were made by the study team about the nature, timing, and extent of involvement that would be requested of each: the earlier projects were asked to be fully involved; the later projects were selectively involved. This variation will be reflected in the numbers given in the descriptions below.

With one large project, it was the decision of the study director to work cooperatively with the local project evaluators so as to maximize the data collection opportunity and to avoid doubling the efforts needed of the local mentors and interns; data collected from this project site was less easily integrated into the overall data pool, and thus it is unevenly represented in the presentation of results in Parts Two, Three, and Four.

A second large project was not officially approved until late in the pilot year, a point too late for that project to be included in the data collection in any form other than the proposal review. Thus, that particular project is not directly represented in any of the other presentations of results.

The following describes each of the data collection instruments and its use, the relative success of each in generating responses, and the analysis procedure used with the data collected.

Proposal Review Guides (PRG). Two instruments allowed for a systematic review of the content of each local project proposal, noting essential features, unique features, and features held in common. Each of the 24 proposals was studied using the first

PRG. Analysis made note of: the nature of the project and the district; project objectives; plans for needs assessment; data collection; types of mentor-intern interactions, activities and training anticipated; research cited; and desired project outcomes. The role of the coordinator and use of consultants or outside evaluators were also noted. Analysis of the PRG data worked toward summaries, across the proposals, of content related to such matters as goals, resources, and emphasis on the mentor-intern relationship. This analysis was also able to view the project proposals wholistically, noting the variance within the group of 24.

A second PRG was developed to examine each proposal in its conformity to the Commissioner's Regulations regarding the MT-I Program. This instrument looked at each proposal's definition of intern and mentor; process and criteria for the selection of mentors; process and criteria for the selection of interns; description of training to be provided to mentors; functions of the district selection committee; and, project evaluation system. This second instrument also noted variance in the degree of specificity, which was observed first through application of the PRG.

Results of this analysis are presented chiefly in Part Two of this report, as it focuses on the nature of the pilot projects.

Weekly Records of Involvement. This instrument provided a record of participation by mentors and interns in the local

project on a weekly basis. The form consisted of a single page per week on which respondents could list for each day, the times, forms, participants, and focus of activities related to their involvements in the projects.

Each mentor and intern was provided with a set of forms for each month from the time their local project began formal operation. The numbers of mentors and interns sent WRI forms for the months December through June are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1
Numbers of Mentors and Interns Sent WRI Forms by Month

Participant Teachers	Month						
	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Interns	50	72	85	84	83	83	83
Mentors	46	54	63	61	61	60	60

For a given month, the participant teachers might have received four or five separate WRI forms. The total number of forms sent and the response rate, by month, is displayed in Table 2. The response rate varied from .83 to .20. The overall response rate was .56 for interns and .70 for mentors. This rate is judged to be acceptable given the amount of effort required for responding to the WRI, and given the span of time over which responses were requested.

Table 2
Number of WRI Forms Sent and Response Rate by Month

Participant Teachers	Month			
	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Interns	162 (.81)	288 (.73)	340 (.68)	420 (.61)
Mentors	148 (.82)	216 (.83)	250 (.78)	305 (.80)

continued	Apr	May	Jun
Interns	332 (.56)	332 (.49)	332 (.20)
Mentors	241 (.71)	240 (.64)	240 (.33)

Note. The whole number in each set is the number of forms mailed; the numbers in parentheses are the response rates.

Entries from the returned WRI forms were coded so that the data could be analyzed and summarized statistically. Most of the entries on the WRI forms needed simply to be translated into the coding system; largely handled in this fashion were the entries regarding the month, week and day, and starting and ending times of activities. Some of the entries were analyzed inductively to form coding categories; entries transformed into codes in this fashion were forms of activities, participants, and foci of activities. More detail regarding the coding categories are presented in Part Three of this report which focuses on the description of the mentor-intern relationships.

The responses received were separated into intern and mentor groups, and then divided by month. This process created 14 cells

of responses. From each of these cells, 40 WRI forms were selected randomly for coding and inclusion in the statistical data analysis.

Focused Logs. Four instruments were developed to provide the opportunity for more personal responses to particular matters regarding the mentor-intern relationship and project impact. The questions were largely open-ended, giving the teacher participants considerable latitude in their chosen response.

The Focused Logs consisted of one or two pages on which between three and six questions were asked; parallel forms were developed for mentors and interns. The focus of each of the logs was as follows:

> January Log on the first impressions formed by the mentors and interns of each other;
>
> March Log on the evolving relationship(s), and concerns the mentors and interns might have had in that regard;
>
> April Log on the qualities of the mentors-interns match; and
>
> May/June Log on the effects of the project.

The numbers of Focused Log forms sent to participant teachers, and the response rate, by month, are displayed in Table 3. The overall response rate was .63 for interns and .73 for mentors. This rate is judged to be acceptable.

Responses on the Focused Log forms were studied to understand the interns' and mentors' views regarding the particular focus of each log. Similarities and variances in the responses were noted, organized and summarized to display the participants' views. Results of this analysis are presented in

Table 3
Number of Focused Log Forms Sent and Response Rate by Month

Participant Teachers	Month			
	Jan	Mar	Apr	May/Jun
Interns	126 (.67)	126 (.65)	126 (.70)	126 (.51)
Mentors	95 (.82)	95 (.67)	95 (.79)	95 (.64)

Note. The whole number in each set represents the number of forms mailed; the numbers in parentheses are the response rates.

Part Three of this report in the description of the mentor-intern relationships, 1 Part Four which addresses the issue of the impact of the projects.

Demographic and Professional Background (D&PB) Questionnaire. This instrument provided information regarding the ·lected demographics: gender and year of birth; and a wider range of professional background characteristics: academic background, teaching certification, teaching history, and current teaching position. Parallel forms were developed for interns and mentors, each being two pages in length.

This instrument was mailed to participant teachers in January, or as the local project was formally begun thereafter. All together, 1 ,1 forms were mailed to interns, with a response rate of .69; 97 forms were mailed to mentors, with a response rate of .80.

Responses on the D&PB Questionnaire were coded in order to

be analyzed statistically. From these statistical summaries, profiles of the interns and mentors can be generated. The results of these analyses are presented chiefly in Part Three of this report, as it describes the mentor-intern relationships.

Beginning Teacher Views of Self (BTVoS) Questionnaire. This instrument was an attempt to provide a measure of the impact of the project on the intern teachers. The instrument asked the respondent to describe him/herself on a series of 28 items taken from the literature as "areas in which beginning teachers may cite changes in their views of themselves." Generally, the items addressed matters of planning and delivering instruction, classroom management, becoming part of the school as an organization and social system, and developing understandings of self as an adult and as a teacher.

Respondents reported their views by placing themselves on a seven-point continuum. Respondents were also asked to indicate, at the end of the BTVoS Questionnaire, how many years of teaching experience (not including student teaching or other preservice experiences) they actually had prior to their internship year.

The BTVoS Questionnaire was first mailed to interns in early March; at that time, 131 forms were mailed out, with a response rate of .66. The BTVoS Questionnaire was mailed to interns a second time in May; at that time 131 forms were mailed out, with a response rate of .59; an additional 36 response forms were received from one large project site, raising the total number of responses to 114. Two administrations of the BTVoS

Questionnaire made it possible to look for changes in the interns' views of self as the year progressed, although the two respondent groups can only be considered roughly equivalent. However, such changes as might be expected would likely be more detectable over a longer span within a school year. Nonetheless, it was decided that it would be a worthwhile effort to discover any change that could be measured.

In conjunction with the second mailing of the BTVoS Questionnaire to interns, a comparison group of beginning teachers was also surveyed. This comparison group was selected randomly from a statewide listing of teachers in their first-year of teaching. Teachers in all districts within the state were eligible for inclusion except those in the 24 project sites. Altogether, 178 forms were mailed out, with a response rate of .57. Administering the BTVoS Questionnaire to such a comparison group created the opportunity to note similarities and differences in patterns of responses between beginning teachers in a mentor-intern relationship formalized through one of the projects and those beginning teachers not involved as such.

Though no systematic steps have been taken, at this point, to validate the BTVoS Questionnaire, it would seem to have content validity. Before it was first administered to the interns, an early form of the questionnaire was piloted with a handful of beginning teachers; they suggested that the BTVoS Questionnaire had a good sampling of important matters. Their comments regarding wording and content were incorporated into the

final form. A few of the actual respondents to the BTVoS Questionnaire wrote such remarks as, "...not all of these statements apply to my situation"; however, they proceeded to respond to the questionnaire, and their responses seemed not to vary much from other respondents' views.

The reliability of the BTVoS Questionnaire was estimated by computing the Cronbach coefficient alpha, or, the interclass correlation on the 28 items of the questionnaire, for the May responses of the intern and comparison groups; the values of alpha obtained were 0.958 and 0.911 respectively.

The results of the analysis of the BTVoS Questionnaire are reported in Part Four of this report which focuses on the impact of the MT-I Program.

Local Project Coordinator (LPC) Questionnaire. Four instruments were developed to collect information from and the views of the person who served as the local project coordinator. Though no official designation of a person in such a role was required by the MT-I Program, it became evident that typically some one person (or set of persons) in each project site served such a role. Often that person was the designated contact person for the State Education Department.

As the statewide evaluation proceeded, it seemed useful to tap the experiences and perspectives of these persons, not only because they represented an efficient source of information regarding local project facts and events, but also, because of roles they played, they often were in a position to see the

project at a level unavailable to others directly involved at either local or state levels.

The four LPC Questionnaires varied in length from two to four pages, containing from three to four sets of questions each. The focus of each form in the series was as follows:

> LPC Questionnaire #1 on criteria for selection of the mentors, matching the mentors and interns, the role of the mentor selection committee, and project-level problems;
>
> LPC Questionnaire #2 on mentor training, resources used, involvement of higher education institutions, and parental responses to the project;
>
> LPC Questionnaire #3 on released time arrangements, project stability, and project "ownership"; and
>
> LPC Questionnaire #4 on the role of the local project coordinator, and the role of administrators and supervisors in the project.

The LPC Questionnaires were mailed toward the end of the pilot year, spacing the forms about three weeks apart. Mailing 23 LPC Questionnaires #1 generated 15 responses; #2 generated 19 responses; #3 generated 17 responses; and #4 generated 15 responses.

The responses were analyzed to identify facts and events descriptive of the local projects which could be usefully incorporated into the description of the larger MT-I Program. Views of the local project coordinators are summarized and incorporated where relevant in Parts Two, Three, and Four of this report.

Principal/Supervisor (P/S) Questionnaire. This instrument was developed to record the views of principals and/or

supervisors of the intern teachers regarding the local project. It was a two page questionnaire on which seven open-ended questions were asked. Particularly, it asked respondents to describe their role--actual and preferred--in regard to the project, to comment on the matter of mentoring versus evaluating new teachers, and to cite what effects of the local projects they had seen.

The P/S Questionnaire was distributed through the local project coordinator at each site. An estimate of the number of school buildings involved in each local project was made. Two forms for each building were mailed to the local project coordinator for distribution, with the request that if more forms were needed, they be duplicated and distributed. If too many forms were received, the extras were to be discarded. Local project coordinators returned postcards indicating exactly how many P/S Questionnaires were distributed locally following these instructions. From the postcard returns (15 returned out of 21 postcards expected), and the actual responses received, it can be reported that at least 94 P/S Questionnaires were distributed to principals and supervisors in local buildings. Fifty-eight (58) were returned, for a response rate of .62.

The data from these responses were studied to understand the experiences and perspectives of the principals and supervisors. They are summarized and reported chiefly in Part Four of this report regarding the impact of the MT-I Program.

Site visits. Five sites were selected at the start of the

evaluation study for a series of site visits. The purpose of the site visits was to gain a first-hand understanding of the work of the local projects: giving interns and mentors an opportunity to talk candidly and at length regarding their experiences and recommendations, and giving union leaders, district administrators, building principals, and occasionally other teachers the opportunity to do the same. Site visits also afforded the study team the opportunity to see local projects with the degree of complexity that arises from the mix of persons, roles, institutions, traditions, and values that are inevitably a part of any such effort. The many written response forms used did not readily offer this view.

The five sites were selected to represent a range of differences found among the 24 funded projects. Two were small scale projects with one or two interns; two were medium scale projects; one was a large scale project. Projects focused at the elementary and at the secondary levels were selected, as were regular and special classroom teachers, and urban, suburban, and semi-rural district sites. Projects that seemed to differ somewhat in their approach to the MT-I Program, as evident in the proposals, were included. One additional site was visited in May because of a particularly unique feature of that project.

Each of the five sites were visited three times, once in January, once in March, and once in May. Most often, two members of the evaluation team visited a site, although at times, particularly with the larger scale projects, three or four

members were present, and split into smaller groups for travel to particular buildings. Visits were all confined to the span of one school day, typically arriving some time after the start of classes and continuing as best could be scheduled, until all available participants had been interviewed or until the class day was over.

Interviews were conducted under a variety of conditions: often team members met with participants individually, but sometimes with two or more. Interviews were not tape-recorded; rather; notes were taken during or shortly after the sessions were completed. From each site visit, field notes were compiled as a record of the discussions held.

No interview schedule was developed for the site visits. Rather, interviews were conducted so as to allow participants to describe their experiences as they felt most appropriate. Questions intended to clarify or extend their descriptions were frequently asked. The different roles that participants played in the local projects were also a source of different questions raised in the interviews. Subsequent visits to the same sites allowed the study team members the opportunity to follow-up matters raised in earlier visits, and to note changes in the projects or changes in perspectives on the projects.

Data from the site visits is incorporated in Parts Two, Three, and Four of this report, as appropriate, for enhancing the results of other analyses.

A Concern about Confidentiality

During the course of the evaluation study, it was important that the information, interpretations and judgments conveyed to the study team members by participants be held confidential. The study team consciously worked to establish a high level of trust, so as to garner candid and forthright responses to their various inquiries. Demonstrating that all responses were regarded as confidential was an important step in building this trust. In this way, the interests of particular individuals, and of projects and schools, would be protected from inadvertent harm. And the study itself was most likely to gain access to those matters critical to the success of the MT-I Program. It is important that this report sustain the trust established.

In the data collection process, a number of steps were taken to assure that the participants' responses were held confidential. First, participants from whom regular responses would be expected were assigned code numbers known only to the study team; these code numbers were the only identifiers placed on response forms mailed out. Participants from whom less regular responses would be expected were not assigned code numbers, but were identified only through more general codes assigned to their local projects.

Second, all response forms were mailed directly to the participants (with the exception of the P/S Questionnaire, as described above), and in all cases, self-addressed, stamped envelopes were provided for direct return to the study team in

Syracuse. Thus, there was no opportunity for review of responses by any persons other than the evaluation team members.

In face-to-face interviews, participants were assured of the confidentiality of their comments, and statements made in one interview were not shared in subsequent interviews with other participants, even for purposes of confirmation or clarity. No tape-recordings were made. Field notes were held private, and collected in Syracuse for analysis.

Finally, though there has been extensive contact with the State Education Department during the course of the evaluation study, under no circumstances has any of the data collected been shared with personnel from those offices. Reports about the progress of the evaluation study and about preliminary results were made without specific references to persons or projects.

The present report is built on an analysis of the data collected. Descriptions and interpretations contained herein derive from responses, in one form or another, from the various participants. Once again, the matter of confidentiality has been considered as the report has been written. No individuals or individual projects have been identified in the following pages. Though this makes it impossible to honor them directly for their contributions, it also protects them from possible affront. In selected situations where individuals or projects might be more easily identified, steps have been taken to conceal their identities.

The readers of this report can also play a role in

sustaining the confidentiality of the participants. While the report should be read keenly, no purpose is served in trying to match circumstances and fix identities. Refraining from such pursuits prompted by curiosity will better serve the participants, and the MT-I Program generally.

Part Two. The Nature of the Pilot Projects

One level at which the MT-I Program might be understood in its first year is as a collection of projects enacted by a relatively limited number of local school districts and BOCES. At this level, the MT-I Program has elements similar to many other locally enacted programs. The projects were funded on the basis of a competitive review of proposals submitted; the proposals contained statements of goals, means by which those goals might be attained, and resources used in the process. Individuals knowledgeable about and responsible for project implementation were designated as role players in the projects. Attempts to garner the understanding and support of diverse local groups were made. Formal and informal influence on the organizations of which they were a part was exerted. As the projects developed, adaptive changes in the proposed plans were made, and matters which were not anticipated in the proposals were addressed. It is useful to view the MT-I Program, as least initially, from this perspective, since it was at this level that projects were first conceived, and at this level that many of the persons involved functioned.

Two important qualifiers should first be understood before the description proceeds. First, 1986-1987 was designated as a pilot year for the MT-I Program. This designation was necessary

because no models of using mentoring for new teacher induction, as found in the literature, have quite the same focus as the New York State Program, or have been attempted on a statewide scale. (Refer to the technical assistance document prepared in 1986 for the MT-I Program, entitled, "Support for First-year Teachers: New York State's Mentor Teacher-Internship Program.) Thus, this year has been a year of "breaking new ground" in the state and for the profession. Local participants were encouraged to take what could be found in the literature and to amalgamate that with their experience and good judgment to cast pilot projects. They were encouraged to experiment with the work of mentoring in its variations. From their experimentations much would be learned. The descriptions of projects which follow in this part, reflect that degree of experimentation and may not discriminate well between that which was found good and usable, and that which in the long run will be rejected by those same planners and practitioners. Thus, the following descriptions while perhaps being "state of the art," may soon not be the best New York State educators have to offer.

The second qualifier derives also from 1986-1987 being the first year of the MT-I Program. Proposal writing, review, and endorsement all occurred on a shortened time-line which, nonetheless, extended into the start of the school year. Most local projects did not get underway until November or early December. A few began informally in September, but as many or more needed until January to get started. The pilot year was a

shortened project year. The delay not only altered the span of time in which mentors and interns might work together (as will be noted in Part Three), but it also changed the plans and schedules of local participants. The descriptions which follow reflect that late start. The full scope of local project efforts may be better realized in future project years.

The balance of Part Two is organized into eight sections which describe the pilot projects: scope of the efforts in local projects, valued outcomes, emphasis on the mentor-intern relationship, variance among the projects, supportive resources project governance and roles, and project stability.

Scope of the Local Efforts

In all, 36 proposals for establishing local projects were received at the State Education Department, in the summer of 1986. After review of these proposals, 25 projects were funded. (One of these local projects never began operation, and funding was eventually withdrawn.) The funded projects are as diverse as school districts involved.

The 24 projects represent a wide range of communities and school systems. Five (5) of the districts can be described as rural in nature; 2 as small, urban districts, 4 as large, urban districts, and 14 as suburban districts. Each of these subgroups may share certain needs, resources, problems or concerns. For instance, there are commonalities among the 4 large city districts, but their differences are also keen. The nature of the district, the people and students it serves, and the

resources available to it made each district unique in its effort to develop a project.

The projects began operating as soon as administrative and project planning activities were completed. About half the projects began operation formally in November or December. Another six or seven projects got underway formally in January. The remaining projects began formal activities in February or early March. These starting points are somewhat misleading, however, since, as will be discussed in Part Three, some of the mentor-intern pairings were actually functioning informally from September on. Other mentor-intern pairings never quite had the opportunity to establish a regular working schedule because of difficulties with released time arrangements, even though the local project was well underway. And a few mentor-interr pairing did not get underway at all. The great majority of mentors and interns, however, were fully functioning, and completed more than half the year in a working relationship.

All together, 293 interns and 163 mentors were involved in the 24 projects. These numbers varied somewhat over the course of the year as personnel changes occurred: maternity leaves, new hirings, and termination of employment were events that decreased and increased the numbers of participants in various projects. The smallest project undertaken involved 1 mentor and 1 intern; the largest project had 42 mentors and 73 interns. The majority (19) of the projects involved fewer than 10 mentors each. Only 3 had 15 or more mentors. Sixteen (16) of the projects matched an

equal number of mentors with interns, while 3 projects had more interns matched with fewer mentors. The largest mentor-intern ratio was 1 to 5. The projects varied in size, but large projects were not always associated with large districts. One large district had one of the smallest projects, and several smaller districts had relatively larger projects. The numbers of interns and mentors involved in local projects in this pilot year reflected more the inclinations of local planners than their hiring patterns. And since local hiring patterns are not simply a function of district size, the size of a local project may not ever be a function simply of district size.

Local planners chose different levels at which to implement their programs. Twelve (12) projects were implemented on a K-12 basis. Seven (7) districts chose an elementary focus, 3 used middle or junior high schools, and 2 elected to work at the high school level alone. The decisions regarding grade levels for implementation may again have represented choices or needs.

Valued Outcomes

Within most of the proposals are found explicit or implicit statements reflecting the outcomes valued by the project planners. These outcomes can be organized into four areas relating to the intern, the mentor, the district, and the profession of teaching.

Project proposals indicated that interns would experience or gain:

- increased knowledge, skills and behaviors

necessary to function successfully as a professional teacher;

- enhanced abilities to adjust to the special needs and demands of his/her particular class, school, or district;
- integration into the classroom, school and a districtwide support network;
- positive view of his/her own competence;
- positive attitudes relative to teaching as a profession;
- awareness of school, community and professional resources;
- competence in content/curricular knowledge instructional processes and management skills;
- personal growth;
- an enhanced feeling of self-assurance and satisfaction with teaching; and
- a sense that he/she is not alone.

This collection of valued outcomes reflect the "great expectations" of project planners. Being viewed as a whole, they might be termed "idealistic." But they may also represent what the real outcomes of the local projects and the statewide MT-I Program might someday be. Presumably they represent what experienced practitioners wish their newer colleagues to experience and be like. Holding such ideals may be a good point at which to begin such an effort.

Most proposals specifically stated valued outcomes for mentors participating in the projects. Thirteen (13) of the 24 proposals noted one or more such expected outcome. A composite list of such outcomes reflects what a mentor might expect to experience:

- o increased job satisfaction;
- o personal growth;
- o a rediscovery and examination of the foundation of his/her own teaching;
- o improved personal, professional, and procedural behaviors;
- o more professional instructional planning, delivery, and evaluation of learning;
- o better classroom management;
- o the development of professional reciprocity with the intern; willingness to learn from each other;
- o increased professional knowledge, skills, performance and commitment;
- o enhanced status and professional responsibility;
- o a rekindled sense of excitement; and
- o a positive attitude toward teaching as a profession.

Although no single proposal cited all of these, there appeared to be a general expectation that mentors participating in the projects would also benefit from the experience.

A majority (14) of the proposals made references to positive

outcomes of the project for the districts. It might be inferred that all expected positive results, but specifically noted were improved delivery of instruction for students, a breakdown of isolation among teachers, and improved retention of the best first-year teachers.

Although it was stated in only a few proposals, some benefit to be gained by the teaching profession was noted. Increased professionalism and the enhanced status of all teachers, as they take a more active and responsible role in the induction process, were cited as outcomes for the profession generally.

Emphasis on the Mentor-Intern Relationship

One of the unique features of the New York State MT-I Program is its emphasis on building a mentor-intern relationship as the chief means toward the end of successful teacher induction. By matching a highly regarded, experienced teacher with a skilled, novice teacher, the MT-I Program creates the means by which a range of professional and sometimes personal tasks of the beginning teacher can be addressed; furthermore, the effort can be suited to the particular needs and interests of the mentor-intern pair.

Each local project is designed to facilitate the initiation and development of such a relationship. Activities such as selecting and training mentors, orienting new interns, arranging for released time for mentors and interns, and engaging in public information efforts are project-level activities undertaken in support of the relationship. But it is the mentor-intern

relationships, not the project activities, that are central to the plan. It is the activities between the mentors and interns that are most crucial to the success of the effort.

All of Part Three of this report will focus on the mentor-intern relationships that were formed in this pilot year. But here it is instructive to consider how the relationship is reflected in the project proposals themselves. While many of the project proposals used such words as, "supportive," "guiding," and collegial" to describe the relationships that were anticipated between the mentors and interns, some saw the relationship as developing more extensively than others. Some number of the proposals seemed to limit the association to assisting the intern with the tasks of learning about teaching; though this would seemingly occur in a warm and friendly atmosphere, there was no anticipation that the relationships might or should become more.

A few proposals were quite unspecific about the relationships. Some merely described it as a "helping" one.

However, the majority of the proposals anticipated that the relationships would address a range of issues, including the tasks of teaching, and become a more pervasive influence on the work of both the interns and mentors. These proposals suggested that the relationships would be confidential, trusting, and mutually respectful. They anticipated that both mentors and interns would benefit from the experience, reflecting an understanding that the relationships would be an "exchange."

Furthermore, personal qualities of the mentors and interns would enter into developing the relationships, and personal benefits would likely accrue. These proposals were willing to extend the boundaries of the relationships, limited in the other proposals.

Regardless of the variances in the proposals in placing emphasis on the mentor-intern relationships, as the year progressed, it was the relationships which took center stage in most projects. Activities to initiate and promote relationships between mentors and interns were carried out at all sites. Local project coordinators, district administrators, teacher union leaders, and other supportive personnel cited workshops that the mentors and/or interns had attended, state and national conferences attended, advisory panel meetings held, parent open-house presentations made, newsletter and newspaper pieces written, and a range of formal and informal actions taken by persons other than the mentors and interns, that were designed to support the work of the mentors and interns. While these activities were in many instances crucial to the functioning of the project, it was the activities undertaken by mentors and interns that were most pervasive, enduring, and directly related to the goals of the projects: the successful induction of beginning teachers.

Released Time Arrangements

The State MT-I Program sought to support the development of the mentor-intern relationships by providing time away from regular instructional duties for the mentors and interns to

prceed with their work. One of the important implementation tasks of the local project planners and was to make the best arrangements for the released time that were possible. In some projects this was one of the most bothersome problems they faced; in others, the arrangements seemed to present virtually no difficulty. Consider the arrangements made in several of the projects.

In Project A, interns were released for a period or subject each day, equivalent to .2 of their teaching loads. A regular substitute who was already a part-time teacher was hired to teach their classes. The local planners felt that the fact the substitute was already known to the staff and community was important in gaining community support. Mentors were released one day every other week, for the equivalent of 18 days; a per diem substitute was used to continue instruction in the mentor's classes.

Project B had parallel arrangemer s for elementary and secondary released time. Elementary intern teachers were released for one hour per day, while mentors were released for one-half hour. A part-time kindergarten teacher's hours were extended to provide coverage. At the secondary level, interns were released for a period per day; mentors for a period every two days. Reading teachers substituted for these teachers, providing a special kind of instruction while substituting. Reports from this project emphasized the problem of needing to plan extensively with the substituting teachers under these

arrangements. All the teachers in this project were also released from duty assignments for the year.

In many projects at the secondary level, or wherever the school day is organized by "periods," the intern teachers were simply hired with one less class to teach. In most instances, the interns were released from responsibility for the class; the replacement teacher took on all the planning, teaching and evaluation tasks for that group of students. In some projects with multiple interns, this reduced load actually made it possible to hire another teacher, sometimes another intern teacher. This arrangement was complicated in this pilot year by the late start up; interns had to give up a class that had been part of the schedule since September, leading to questions and sometimes a sense of loss.

In many projects that sought to provide the released time by hiring substitute or replacement teachers, there were reports of the difficulty of finding qualified teachers to fill those openings. In some cases, because the work was only part-time and in other cases because it was not part-time enough, qualified teachers balked at serving in this role. In several instances, projects reported simply not being able to locate qualified substitute or replacement teachers in the certification areas that were open. To solve these problems, projects called on retired teachers to return to teaching, or sought to extend the work days of part-time teachers already employed. One project reported giving up trying to find replacement teachers for the

mentors, and instead paid the mentors a stipend for working extra time on the project.

When project planners were able to identify and gain the commitment of qualified substitute or replacement teachers, these arrangements worked quite well. Many mentor-intern pairs reported that the substitute and replacement teachers became part of their "team," since their involvement was so directly related to the work of the project.

In Project C, a somewhat different approach to continuing instruction was taken. Each mentor worked with a "cluster" of four interns. Essentially, there were five teachers employed for four classes. The mentors' teaching responsibilities were spread among the classes of the interns. Thus the mentors and interns could team teach, or the mentors could teach while the interns worked on other tasks. The mentors could also work with each intern at the interns' regularly scheduled planning periods. The mentors worked with their interns to establish and adjust the schedule as needed.

In yet another project, a "cluster teacher" is a teacher whose regular assignment is to have no class of her/his own, but to teach lessons in specified content areas in a number of classrooms each week. Cluster teachers were expert teachers and were often selected as mentor teachers. These teachers could more easily be released from their instructional duties than regular classroom teachers. They had some of the same flexibility as mentor teachers in Project C.

In some projects, mentors and interns were "scheduled into" their released time: for example, every Monday afternoon, or 3rd period each day, or 2:00-3:00 each day. Such scheduling allowed for predictability and finding good substitute or replacement teachers. In other projects, mentors and interns were allowed and encouraged to select the days and times of their release from instructional responsibilities as they felt it useful to do so. Thus, they could have two half days or a full day each week; or perhaps two days in one week and none in the next. In allowing for this choice, project planners felt that they were maximizing flexibility for the mentors and interns. One project required simply that arrangements be completed a week in advance so substitute arrangements could be confirmed. Finally, in those projects using "clustering," mentors and interns could set their own schedules, and work on a regular basis quite closely together.

Across the various projects, thus, three aims seemed to be evident in the details of the arrangements for released time. First, project planners, interns and mentors were sensitive to the need for continuity of instruction. Second, they sought to maximize the time that mentors and interns could work together. Third, they sought to keep the structures flexible so that mentors and interns could shape their work together as they best saw fit to do so. None of the particular arrangements would have worked in all the project settings. But to the degree that each project was able to pursue arrangements that met these three

aims, they seemed to be satisfied with the results of their efforts.

Supportive Resources

At the project level, a variety of resources were identified and used in support of the mentor-intern relationships. Though it is not possible to describe the degree to which such resources had a particular impact on the work of the mentors and interns it is useful to consider what those resources were and how they were used.

Workshops and consultants. The local projects sponsored mentors, interns, and other interested parties in a variety of workshops and in working with a variety of consultants. Often these opportunities were organized specifically for the project. But just as regularly they were opportunities available regionally, and project personnel decided to join in. Sponsors of such workshops or sources of consultants included the State Education Department, a local college or university, the teachers' union, and commercially available programs and consultants. Local teacher centers were important resources cited by almost two-thirds of the projects.

The topics focused on through these opportunities included "how to be a role model," teaching and working with adult learners, the life cycle and mentoring, classroom management and classroom discipline, and group dynamics. Each of these topics were seen as valuable for either mentors or interns or both. Over half of the projects sponsored their mentors and interns in

attending some form of principles of effective teaching workshop. While this type of workshop was generally reported to be of value by project coordinators and some mentors, other mentors and interns felt that such a workshop is of greater value placed after some classroom experience is logged. Interns, they suggested, would benefit more from focusing on this type of workshop near the end of their first year or at the start of their second year.

By contrast, mentors and others cited the need for some type of orientation to the work of mentoring early in the project year. Such an orientation might include the topics listed above as well as peer coaching, elements of clinical supervision, and review of the problems of beginning teachers.

Whatever the workshop or work with a consultant, there was some sense that the most valued opportunities were those in which specific strategies were presented and learned.

There was also a sense, reported by project participants, that having opportunities to attend workshops and work with consultants made them feel "special." For many mentors this seemed to be a benefit which, even with their years of experience, they might not otherwise have had. For interns it seemed to be a chance to feel recognized and valued by the schools and districts in which they were hired. So special did some mentors and interns feel that, at least in one project, the building principal worked hard to present opportunities to other staff to participate in these or similar workshops, so that

jealousy and hostility toward the mentors and interns would not develop.

Finally, it should be noted that while mentors and interns generally valued these opportunities, many also expressed some concern that often such work took them from the classroom. This concern was particularly held by the interns who felt a need to be with their students teaching, and particularly with workshops that required several consecutive days of absence from the classroom.

Printed and audio-visual materials. Projects also made use of a variety of articles, books, pamphlets, and audio-visual materials such as videotapes. Generally, these materials focused on the same topics as the workshops and consultants--effective teaching, classroom management, peer coaching, and the work of mentoring. Some materials were specifically oriented to curriculum areas, or instruction in those curricula.

The value of using such materials is unclear. While some received high praise, others were seen as of little use. Simple distribution of such materials seemed a less effective way of capitalizing on their value. The distribution or use of materials in a workshop or discussion setting may have enhanced their value to participants.

Colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education have played a variety of roles in the projects. No fewer than 10 institutions were used in one form or another in the local efforts. These involvements ranged from working with the local

teachers and administrators as partners in writing the proposals and implementing the projects, to serving as consultants when called upon and making library resources available as requested. A few less than half had informal or formal ties with higher education institutions, and generally these ties were seen as valuable and productive.

About half the projects reported that there was no direct involvement with a college or university during the pilot year. One project reported that no college or university is close enough to make such an association easy. At another, the original intent was to call on various teacher-training institutions for consultants, but the late start-up of the project and a heavy schedule of other project activities led to postponing such overtures.

When asked what role institutions of higher education might play in the project, every responding project had suggestions about what forms such an association might take. Primarily colleges and universities were seen as a source of knowledge and skill development: orientation to and study of the work of mentoring; review of instructional planning, sometimes in particular content areas; seminars on selected topics such as child development, classroom management, and content area topics--all were seen as needs which the higher education resource could help meet. Relatedly, it was suggested that colleges and universities might serve as a clearing house on resources related to the work of mentoring in education.

A second set of roles for higher education institutions would bring them into more direct involvement in local projects. Working with mentors and interns to help them clarify their roles, and meeting with them on a regular basis to offer support and feedback are two activities suggested by the local projects. Another is serving as an "outside observer" to the local project staff, helping them analyze the project as it develops. Yet another would be serving as the project evaluator--a part being played in the pilot year by several representatives of higher education institutions.

A third set of roles would build on the more traditional roles colleges and universities have played in teacher education. Several projects pointed to the need and value they would place on coordinating the intern experience with the preservice program: developing a set of shared expectations for what beginning teachers ought to know at the start of an internship; addressing the matter of the internship during the preservice program, such that new teachers would understand and feel positive about participating in it; engaging in follow-up work with recent program graduates to assist them during their intern year in translating what they know into what they can do. Several of the projects expressed interest in having graduate level courses offered on-site, perhaps supporting new teachers as they begin to build a program of graduate study. Courses for mentors were also seen as desirable. "On-site," in these cases, seems to mean the qualities of both easy access and local

relevance. Taken as a whole, this third set of roles seems to point to an interest, expressed by respondents in several projects, that the efforts and structures in educating teachers be coordinated across the traditional boundaries of preservice/inservice programming, and higher education/local school settings. If developed, this coordination would alter traditional practices in teacher education and induction.

Overall, there seems to be an interest on the part of project participants in pursuing productive associations with institutions of higher education. The successful involvement of a number of institutions suggests receptivity toward filling a range of roles in developing and sustaining projects. But the limited experience of the pilot year is not sufficient to understand what the extent or form of this association might yet become.

State Education Department and local networks. More than a few of the projects pointed to the value of having the opportunity to meet regarding the MT-I Program and the work of mentoring. Such opportunities were created by the State Education Development through the three statewide meetings that were held during the pilot year. These meetings gave participants a chance to learn information they wanted to know, to share their experiences and juxtapose them with the experiences of others, and to develop a sense of the importance of their participation in the MT-I Program.

Mentors and interns reported that having the opportunity to

meet with other mentors and interns locally was similarly highly valued. In such meetings, experiences were shared, strategies for working together were explored, and problems associated with the project or a specific mentor-intern relationship were discussed. Both mentors and interns seemed to gain confidence and assurance from such meetings. Several projects attempted to extend the boundaries of such meetings by inviting mentors and interns from other districts or by visiting other districts. Though these state and local "networks" were not available to all participants, they seemed highly valued as a means of addressing organizational and conceptual matters related to the MT-I Program. They are undoubtedly another important supportive resource.

Emergent Roles, Governance, and Management

The establishment and operation of a project in a local setting led to the emergence of a set of role-players who took on the tasks necessary for the project proposal to be written and for the project itself to function. In some projects, the roles were defined and spanned the duration of the project; in others the roles were less clear, changing, and/or ended when particular tasks were completed. Considering these roles is an important part of understanding the MT-I Program at the project level.

Mentor selection committees. The regulations which governed the MT-I Program required that a "mentor selection committee" be formed to identify a pool of mentors; from this pool, persons would be selected by the district superintendent to serve in a

given year. The majority membership of the selection committee was to be teachers, but no other stipulation was placed on the composition and no limit on the size of the committee was set. Several committees were composed of as few as 5 members, but in seven projects, committee members numbered 10 or more; the largest committee had 16 members. The majority of each committee was made up of teachers; they were joined by district and/or building administrators and, in a few instances training specialists in areas such as special education, and speech and physical therapy. Though no function beyond the selection of mentors was specified for the committees, in nearly half of the projects, the committees played additional roles. This continuance of involvement was seen as beneficial in each instance.

The committees largely served as steering committees for the projects. In a few cases, this role was formalized, with the committee receiving updates on the activities of the project, monitoring those efforts, and in one case, managing the budget. Several of the committees played a formal role in evaluating the projects and making recommendations or decisions regarding the second year's proposals. One committee played a formal role in evaluating the intern teachers. A few of the respondents noted that such formal roles are well enacted through the committee structure and intended to sustain such a structure into the second year. One project noted that for committees to function in such roles as these, the legitimacy of the committee must be

well established.

A number of less formal roles were also played by the committees or members thereof. Solving problems related to the activities of project, serving as disseminators of information and offering defenses for particular decisions, and advocating the project to interns, other teachers, administrators, and parents were functions undertaken of a less-formal nature. The value of these less-formal functions should not be underestimated. In some instances, the capacity of the committees or individual members thereof to take on these functions filled a need that would otherwise probably have gone unaddressed.

Local project coordinators. A role that was not specified by the legislation but which nonetheless emerged at each of the sites was the "local project coordinator." The persons serving in this capacity often were the persons designated as the "contact persons" with the State Education Department. As such, these persons typically were the channel of information to and from the local projects, and relatedly handled basic administrative matters.

Many local project coordinators took on an enhanced role. Some were directly involved in writing the proposals, making project start-up decisions, coordinating resources with needs, attending to logistics, and representing the project at statewide meetings. A few were involved in training the mentors. Some acted as leaders of the project: serving as local spokespersons,

solving problems, and providing direction in decision-making. The work of some local project coordinators seemed essential to the successes reported; their knowledge, support, inspiration, and enthusiasm sustained the efforts of other participants through times of uncertainty and discouragement. Several cited "listening" to participants as one of their most important tasks. Though not directly asked, a number of mentors and interns noted the importance of the involvement of their local project coordinators.

The local project coordinators were most often not employed full-time on the project. They were teachers who had responsibilities for instruction and other related work. Or they were administrators, usually at the district level, who took on the work of the project over and above their given administrative responsibilities. The addition of work for this project to the already substantial, if not full-time teaching or administrative responsibilities, created time and resource problems for a number of these persons. Several noted that they could not do all they felt needed to be done in support of the project. Several cited a need for added clerical help. Others reported that they had sufficient time for the project coordination as they had defined the role, letting certain responsibilities fall to teachers or building administrators. In a few cases, second year plans would create the role of coordinator formally, or at least insure that sufficient time and resource support would be available to persons serving that function.

While the MT-I Program was designed to be of benefit to new teachers, the local project coordinators were one group of individuals whose participation produced serendipitous reward. Consider the brief comments of this administrator:

> I have been able to demonstrate my professional commitment to supporting new staff. It has been very enjoyable.

And this:

> The project has offered me the opportunity to experiment with concept related to a new teacher induction process of great interest to me. The programs goals happen to be parallel to my professional interests and the district's needs.

And yet another administrator's response:

> I am personally motivated out of the belief that education must go the route of empowering teachers. This, ideally, would result in a legitimate body of mentors whose focus is improving instruction, including developing beginning teachers and retraining experienced teachers. I haven't derived any benefits from this program as local coordinator, but perhaps vicariously have felt positive about the benefits expressed by the participating interns.

Finally, consider this extended response from a teacher:

> I have been interested in the concept of mentoring for a number of years since I first heard about the Toledo Program. I got involved in this program because I had taught for 17 years and I wanted an opportunity to share my experience and expertise with a new teacher. I love teaching and I hoped to instill enthusiasm for the profession in a new teacher and gain some new insights from an innocent beginner. I did not serve as a mentor; however, I have grown as a person and a professional from my experience as a coordinator. I learned about programs and how to tap resources that I didn't know existed. I had an opportunity to meet

> colleagues from other New York State districts as well as out-of-state districts. I was very impressed with the educators I met and I feel very positive about the future of education in the U.S. I had opportunities to attend conferences and will push in my own district to provice more resources for teachers to participate in these very valuable experiences. I learned that there are many administrative tasks that I will never enjoy and I am not sure whether I will pursue an administrative career in the future. I learned that people hold me in high regard personally and professionally. I learned that I ask too much of myself most of the time and of others some of the time.

Other role players. While the mentor selection committees and local project coordinators were roles created largely because of the MT-I Program, other persons playing already established roles at the local sites were called on to play a part in the projects. Teacher association presidents played an active role in many projects, beyond the tasks of sharing in the development of the project plan and approval, and appointment of the mentor selection committees. Several presidents served as advocates of the projects, engaged in solving problems that occurred locally, and fostered communication among role groups regarding the projects. Union representatives sometimes fulfilled these same functions at the building level.

Principals and vice-principals similarly took on additional roles because of the local projects. Managing released time arrangements and teaching schedules for the mentors and interns were important functions performed in support of the projects. Building administrators also served to represent the projects and their activities to parents. Some building administrators made

efforts to coordinate people and resources such that the projects could fit more easily into the existing structures of the building organizations, avoiding some problems and quickly addressing others.

Intermix of roles in governance and management. Within each local setting, the various role players blended their efforts to make decisions and address problems related to the project. In some settings the blending was well planned; in others it was episodic. While all the projects displayed some capacity to perform the functions of governance and management, some were clearly better ready to do so than others. Thus, decision-making processes, lines of communication, and mechanisms for addressing matters as they emerged were anticipated in some projects, while others had to form these structures as the projects unfolded.

But no single blend of roles emerged as preferable over others. In one project the mentor selection committee was advertised as the local governing body, while particular management decisions would be made by the building principal consulting with the chair of the committee. In another setting, the local project coordinator seemed to serve both those functions while regularly consulting with others involved in the project. Both of these approaches to governance and management were reported to work well, as did several others.

The reported success of a variety approaches suggests that the issue is not what structure is used for these purposes, but rather, that some structure be set. While it is not clear that

the qualities of the governance and management structures of the project were directly related to the qualities of the relationships between the mentors and interns, there are at least several examples in which well planned structures facilitated the work of the mentors and interns, and several examples where ambiguous structures left mentors and interns uncertain, wary, or upset about matters related to the projects. Regardless of the effect on mentors and interns, it is doubtful that projects that have ineffective means of governance and management will be able to sustain the support of other local teachers, administrators and community members.

Variance among the Projects

As different as the histories, values, demographics, and people involved at each of the 24 sites, so too are the projects which were developed this pilot year. The variance among the projects is important to consider for two reasons. First, understanding that the projects differed on many of the dimensions of planning and implementation suggests that no single, "right way" of conducting such a project is yet known or accepted. This fact, coupled with the general reports of success from the different projects promotes the conclusion that, perhaps on many dimensions, project planning and implementation is best determined at the local level where the interests and exigencies of the local situation can be considered in the good judgment of the local sponsors of the project. Second, the differences among the projects and their reported successes suggest that the

statewide MT-I Program is not best suited for only one type of district, teachers, or teacher induction goal. The MT-I Program, perhaps because of a degree of flexibility in enactment, seems well-suited to support a range of different projects.

The differences began with the project proposals. The proposals planned for projects focused at different grade levels and certification areas, different ratios of mentors to interns, and different expected outcomes, all of which was noted earlier in this part. They also differed in the cited research and theory base, in the uses of resources, the delineation of roles, and the design of structures to be used in support of the program.

Another dimension on which the proposals varied was the degree of specificity with which they were written. In looking at the proposals, a five point scale was created to rate the degree of specificity in relation to objectives, activities, outcome indicators and program evaluation. Ratings were based on a proposal's clear statement of its objectives, th identification of appropriate activities to bring about those objectives, and plan to identify and measure the degree to which the objectives were realized. The proposals were then compared on a mean of these ratings. As might be expected, the majority (14) fell near the center of the five point scale. Two (2) proposals were judged non-specific, 5 were judged highly specific, and 3 proposals were judged extremely specific.

Specificity cannot be equated with quality. It cannot be

assumed that the plans worked as specifically anticipated, nor that some proposals were not purposely written in a non-specific manner. Deadlines for submitting the proposals and the difficulty of putting a cooperatively planned agreement together over the summer may explain why some proposals were less specific.

But the considerable variance in the degree of specificity among the proposals may point to two other important conditions. First, educators around the state may be at very different points of awareness and appreciation of mentoring as a means of staff development. And second, educators responsible at the district level for initiating such a project proposal may yet be less certain regarding the processes involved in establishing a viable mentor-intern project, tailored to the local context under the MT-I Program guidelines. Both of these conditions are likely to change over time.

Perhaps the differences among the proposals are less important, and less illustrative of these issues than the differences among the projects as they were enacted. The diversity became most evident to the study team in the course of the site visits. Meetings sponsored by the State Education Department were opportunities for project participants themselves to develop an understanding of the number of ways their particular project differed from others represented at the meetings.

To illustrate how different the local projects could be,

three capsule descriptions have been written based on actual projects. In order to protect the identity of the projects, certain details have been changed or omitted, without damaging the capsules substantively.

Project D was in a small, suburban district. A mentor-intern project was established in order to improve the feelings of self-assurance and satisfaction with teaching among the faculty. It was hoped that the direct effort of the mentor teacher would aid the interns through developing specific performance goals, offering assistance, and monitoring progress toward meeting the individual needs of each intern.

The district established a steering committee comprised of administrators and a majority of classroom teachers. The committee was conceptualized as a body to oversee the operation of the entire program. It was agreed that the chairmanship of this committee would alternate yearly between teachers and administrators.

The steering committee established general goals for the mentor-intern project and selection process for mentors and interns. They decided to run their project with one mentor for the two interns who would be eligible. Applications for the position of mentor were sought and a mentor was selected. Among the committee members there was general agreement on the mentor. They puzzled, however, over how to notify those applicants who were not selected.

Needs assessment was done in two ways: one was to agree upon

the needs of the district; the second was to have the mentor and interns develop individualized internship plans that would identify the needs of each intern and lay out steps to meet those needs. The plans for each intern were reviewed and discussed by the committee. They were updated and checked periodically during the year.

After needs had been identified, specific training sessions and other activities were planned. It was decided to provide training in effective teaching and clinical supervision for the interns and the mentor. College specialists from a local university were brought in to provide training in peer coaching. Attempts were made to use the UFT's Research and Dissemination Project as a source for information.

The local project evaluation was done by a consultant. The report of this evaluation was based on questionnaires and interviews with the participants. Recommendations were made for revisions in the project for next year. The steering committee held responsibility for making appropriate changes and for providing continuity and stability to the project as it develops in the future. All participants reported that the project had been worthwhile.

Project E was in a large suburban district. The purpose of this mentor-intern project was to integrate the interns into a district-wide support network. The proposal was detailed. Both short and long term objectives were identified for the district, all revolving around improved instructional services for

students.

A teacher was designated as the coordinator for this project. She was responsible for the overall management and orchestration of the plan. A selection committee was used to identify and select mentors. Interns were identified in accordance with the State definition. It was planned to have 10 mentors and interns in one-to-one associations. Matches were made and plans were developed to provide for needs assessments of each intern, appropriate training and group activities, and release time. The selection committee did not meet after the plan had begun. Responsibility for the project was left to the coordinator, as well as to the individual mentors and interns.

The local evaluation would be conducted by an outside consultant if one could be obtained. The coordinator maintained control throughout the year and was chiefly responsible for any changes in the proposal for the second year.

Project F was in a very large school district which could be described as being party rural and partly suburban. The project had three major objectives: (1) to attract and keep able teachers, (2) to define and reinforce more effective ways to learn and teach, and (3) rekindle a sense of excitement in experienced teachers. The project was designed as a test within the district, and was planned for only one mentor and one intern. This project was seen as an integral part of the district's staff development program, which was already well developed, including components of differentiated instruction, critical thinking and

problem solving, children at risk, stress and time management, effective listening and questioning, and use of computers for instruction.

A building principal served as the project coordinator. The selection committee identified both the mentor and the eligible intern. Several types of interaction were planned for the pair. They included: coaching, observing, counseling, and joint planning. An emphasis was placed on allowing the mentor-intern relationship to develop in a non-threatening, collegial manner. It was hoped that they would share and support one another in a helping, learning relationship.

It was planned that the local project evaluation would be done by a specialist from the local college. The district also planned a communication network to inform siginificant others in the school community about the nature and purpose of the project.

Projects D, E, and F differed on a number of dimensions: governance and management, numbers of mentors and interns, grade level focus of the project, explicitly stated induction goals, and support structures and resources made available to the mentor-intern pairs. Yet each was judged by its own participants and other local observers to be successful in aiding the induction of new teachers. While none of the three would disallow changes in future years, each has already established a workable project within the state MT-I Program.

Stability of the Projects

Even as the pilot year unfolded, it became clear that the

future of some projects was in doubt. Consider that in a small district, the hiring of new teachers may occur irregularly over a period of years: one year, first-year teachers will be hired and the project will be needed, but perhaps for the next two years no new hiring will occur and the project will be dormant. Further, when hiring of new teachers does occur, it will likely be done at a different grade level or content area than the last recent hiring. Sustaining the knowledge, skills, and values related to a mentor-intern project over a period of dormancy, and activating them when needed with a different set of role players may be problematic.

Consider that all districts are the settings for many different kinds of projects and activities. A project that addresses the needs of beginning teachers competes for the attention, energy, resources, and commitment of local educators with those other important projects. Developing and sustaining a mentor-intern project in such context would require developing an appreciation of the importance of the project to reaching the larger goals which sustain educators' actions over the course of years. Without an appreciation of this importance, other activities and projects--even the day-to-day work of teaching and administering--would likely erode the support needed to maintain a high quality mentor-intern project.

Take one further point into consideration. At the project level, the MT-I Program necessitated that educators think and act somewhat differently from what has been standard practice in new

teacher induction. New kinds of decisions, and decisions involving persons not typically involved have been required. Extra work on the part of many participants, including mentors and interns, has been generated. New avenues of communication have been needed. New problems have been created and addressed. All these developments and others have depended on a degree of cooperation among the role players in each project. Their willingness to be patient, their ability to communicate clearly, their capacity to design and adapt activities, and their trust of one another are all part of the larger fabric of the local district. In many ways it is durable, but it can be torn. The mentor-intern project, because it is part of the weave, may be limited to the same degree of durability.

Thus, for a variety of reasons and circumstances, the long-term stability of particular projects remains in doubt. Almost regardless of the quality of a project in assisting beginning teachers, some may not be sustained.

Strategies for stability. Local project coordinators were asked to identify the strategies they felt were necessary for the project to develop or maintain stability in the district. Their responses pointed to several actions.

Give adequate preparation. Setting plans for the project before the school year starts was cited by several coordinators as related to project stability. This suggestion related both to the state funding timetable and to the initiation of local planning. Adequate preparation is seen as a means of avoiding

particular problems and generating greater acceptance.

Maintain flexibility. Both an appeal to the state to keep flexible its guidelines, and advice to local participants not to set rigid structures which will fail to accommodate the needs of interns and mentors, this strategy was cited as key to keeping the project responsive. Flexibility in the definition of and arrangement for released time, in the definition of "intern" teachers, and in the design of local project activities are instances where flexibility was noted as important.

Broaden funding use. Several coordinators cited state funding as necessary to continuing the project. But they and others cited the need to broaden the use of funds to include support for a local project coordinator or manager (some one who could devote more time to overseeing the project and working with others in solving problems) and additional incentives for mentors, and perhaps other local participants, who found themselves working long hours beyond their released time allocation to make the project work.

Establish good communication and public relations. Both within the building faculty and with parent groups, communication regarding the purposes and structures of the project was noted to be important. This may legitimate the activities of mentors and interns as well as of the project itself. It may communicate how the project will affect the activities of others--children, parents, administrators and supervisors. It may set a means by which concerns from these others may be identified and addressed.

Resolve local problems. Chief among the local problems for many projects was the provision of released time for mentors and interns, and the consequent search for substitute replacements who could maintain the quality of instruction. But other problems were also cited: poor communication among the levels of local participants; petty jealousies toward mentors and interns; understanding a role building administrators should play in the project. The capacity of the project participants to identify and resolve problems was seen as key to enhancing stability.

Learn about mentoring. Understanding the values and practices, and developing the skills associated with mentoring new teachers was cited by one respondent as critical to project stability. Such knowledge and skill would come with direct study and experience, and would in the longer run make projects more effective and valued.

Show results. Understanding and being able to cite the effects of developing a mentor-intern project was suggested as important for enhancing stability. Good effects need to be cited for the beginning teachers, but also for the mentors and the school as an organization.

Trust and cooperation. Several of the coordinators tied stability of the project to the trust and cooperation that exists between district officials and teacher union leaders. Where trust and cooperation were hallmarks of the local situation, it was anticipated that the project could be sustained through whatever variations and problems might arise. Where trust and

cooperation were at a minimum, the future of projects were in doubt. The importance of trust and cooperation cannot be overstated.

The comments of the coordinators reinforced an impression formed about many of the projects in this pilot year: that the mentor-intern project had becom a "cultured" effort. Individuals responsible in the local setting for decision-making kept this project from becoming a "bargaining chip." (By contrast, recall that one of the 25 projects never got underway; information regarding that failure suggests that the project was seen as a bargaining chip in which a deal was never struck.) Individuals instrumental in getting things done made sure that the project had what it needed to succeed. Even building principals, some of whom felt left out of the planning of the project, wanted it to succeed and worked to insure its success. In the pilot year, when many situations were encountered for the first time, requiring extra thought, time, and effort, participants were willing to take the extra steps. In this environment, it is not surprising that many mentors and interns felt "special," and privileged to be a part of the project; they too wanted the project to succeed and worked toward that end.

A philosophical commitment. Perhaps what undergirded this degree of trust and cooperation was, what one coordinator termed, a "philosophical commitment" to the induction of new teachers through mentoring. Holding such a commitment in common gave diverse parties a ground upon which to make decisions and solve

problems. While other activities might fire dispute, this project seemed to promote negotiation and agreement. Whatever their views on other matters, participants believed strongly in the value of a project designed to ease the beginning teachers' induction to the local school and the profession.

A vision of the larger picture. Though not evidently shared by all local participants, a vision of the larger context of the project was held by at least one participant in several of the projects. That person might be the superintendent or assistant superintendent; it might be the union president; or it might be the local project coordinator. To these individuals, the project was one part of a larger picture: a larger picture of school improvement, or a larger picture of staff development, or a larger picture of the development of teaching as a profession. The vision into which the projects fit provided these individuals with a backdrop against which to consider the issues and practices associated with the projects. Though it is not clear that they were able to share their vision with other local participants, at least for these individuals, the vision may have been a source of some stability.

Shared governance and ownership. In several settings, the trust and cooperation led to what one teacher characterized as a "shared governance" of the projects. In one project, the shared governance was formalized through negotiation, while in a few others it was informal and characterized by extensive consultation and joint decision-making. In the several settings

where governance was shared, there may have been broader "ownership" of the project. Some coordinators reported that the project was "owned by" primarily those who benefitted or participated in it--mentors, interns, and coordinators. Others included assistant superintendents and principals. But most pointed to a combination of role players: the administrative staff and the union; or the union president and the assistant superintendent; or the teachers, the administrators, and the board of education. A broad sense of ownership probably reflected broader understanding, commitment, and participation. It may also be a source of project stability.

Part Three. The Nature of the Mentor-Intern Relationships

The central feature of the New York State MT-I Program is the establishment of a relationship between an experienced, highly regarded teacher and one who is just beginning the work of teaching. Much of the resource of the MT-I Program is directed at forming such a relationship and supporting its development over the course of the school year. Time released from instructional duties allows the mentor and intern to work together to address matters they identify as important, and to build a trusting, supportive, friendly and productive association. Project-level activities such as workshops, seminars, and conferences may enhance the relationship by developing skills which they will need to work together, by stimulating the mentor's and intern's thinking regarding a range of instructional and professional education matters, and by offering assurance as they move toward a more confident partnership.

It is through the relationship that the primary goals of the MT-I Program are accomplished: easing the induction to the school and profession of a new generation of teachers. The expertise and wisdom of the mentor teacher coupled with the eagerness and competence of the intern teacher are trusted to map out a work plan which will produce from these qualities a more productive

and satisfying first year experience. Through the relationship the particular needs and interests of individual new teachers can be addressed as they are identified, and through means that are seen as most helpful and timely. Thus the induction effort becomes highly individualized. By inducting new teachers through mentoring, the New York State MT-I Program holds the promise of substantially improving the transition from teacher preparation to teacher service.

Because of the centrality of the mentor-intern relationship in the T-I Program, it is essential that this report look in depth at the range of relationships as they were experienced and reported in this pilot year. As with the project-level analysis, there are qualifiers on what follows. First, because this has been a pilot year in the state, and because there were so few existing examples of formalized mentoring programs for new teachers, the mentors and interns involved in 1986-1987, were pioneering as they worked together. Their relationships might have been different if they had substantive models to study, or if they themselves had prior experience in a formalized mentoring program. How they would begin, what goals they would pursue, and what means they would select might be different now that a year's experience has been gained. Nonetheless, a description of their experience in this first year is valuable, as it may stimulate recall in them or provoke interest in others.

A second qualifier derives from the foreshortened project year. Starting in November, December. and January or later, the

mentor-intern pairs may not have developed quite the same kind of relationship that might be characteristic of one begun in the first weeks of September, when crucial events are experienced by the first-year teacher. And it might be different from one which spans the entire school year, giving more time to move through stages of a relationship. Still, descriptions of relationships in this pilot year should be of value to educators interested in the MT-I Program.

The balance of Part Three is divided into six sections which describes the mentor-intern relationships: selection of the mentors, selection of the interns, demographic and professional backgrounds of the mentors and interns, the matches made, the workings of the relationship, and relationship-level problems.

Selection of the Mentors

The process of soliciting for mentors and selecting them varied somewhat from project to project. Some local planners were very careful to send letters to all teachers in the district informing them of the project and soliciting their applications; other planners focused on only the schools in which intern teachers would be hired; others seemed to depend more on word-of-mouth information about and solicitation of applications.

In a few local projects, the application consisted of an oral expression of interest. In most, the process was more elaborate: a letter of application; an application form; a short personal essay about "why I'm interested in being a mentor"; recommendations from colleagues; and interviews of prospective

mentors. In retrospect, most local program coordinators felt that the process of mentor selection had been adequate, though most also anticipated some refinement of the solicitation and review process.

Selection criteria. Asked to report the criteria that had been used in the selection process, local program coordinators pointed to those required by regulation:

> ...a teacher who is permanently certified in the same area of certificate title as the intern,..and who has demonstrated his or her mastery of pedagogical and subject matter skills, given evidence of superior teaching abilities and interpersonal relationship qualities, and has indicated willingness to participate by being a mentor in an approved mentor teacher-internship program, and who continues to provide classroom instruction for at least 60% of the time spent in performance of such individual's duties.

They also noted a range of locally determined criteria that bore upon the selection committee's consideration. Below these criteria are grouped into what seem to be related categories:

- leadership qualities; organizational skills; ability to suspend absolute judgments;
- attributes of a mentor; interest in and commitment to the mentor project and in serving as a mentor; experience with informal mentoring before the project;
- building location; compatible schedules with intern teachers;
- professional background; years of experience in teaching and experience in the district; knowledge of local policies and procedures;
- excellence in teaching; good lesson planning skills; knowledge of effective teaching skills; knowledge of particular

curricula; appropriate certification/license; and

- high regard among colleagues; professionalism; positive attitude toward professional growth.

For the most part, these criteria simply further defined the more general state regulations.

Coordinators were also asked to describe what the local criteria should be for selecting mentors. They endorsed the criteria in use, but elaborated on them. Professional knowledge and skills in teaching was extended to include:

> knowledge of effective teaching skills; knowledge of clinical supervision practices; ability to teach adults; understanding of the balance between the art and science of teaching.

Perhaps reflecting the fact that mentors in the pilot year often reported spending substantial extra time on the project, their suggested criteria included indicators of willingness to extend oneself for professional matters:

> willingness to work beyond the normal school day; involvement in extra curricular activities; experience with committee work; involvement in union activities; involvement in community groups; history of participation in inservice education.

What might be termed "personal characteristics" received the greatest attention in their elaboration of the existing criteria:

> flexibility; having good interpersonal skill; firmness; self-confidence; positive self-image; willingness to take risks; being an avid reader; being inquisitive; ability to accept differences; ability to bring about change without "cloning" self; enthusiastism for teaching; being able to see many different ways to accomplish a purpose; able to establish respect and rapport; and

possessing humor and personal warmth; having good verbal skills; pleasantness; ability to work well with colleagues and administrators; ability to relate to a variety of personalities.

The distinction between the criteria used and the elaboration of those criteria is probably not so clear. All the criteria were probably functional to a degree in each project as members of the selection committees made their decisions. Viewing the lists as "before and after" descriptions suggests that with experience the criteria will become more particular and better understood. Combining the lists forms the basis for a more explicit and complete description of the qualities sought in a mentor teacher.

Appointment of the mentors. Though state relations indicate that the appointment of the mentors would be done by the district superintendent working from the pool created, it is not clear how often local projects followed such a procedure. In some projects, the selection criteria included concerns about matching mentors and interns, and thus, essentially, mentors were selected to match with the interns. The pool of mentors was equal to the number of mentors needed; in these instances, appointment decisions were moot.

In one project a pool of mentors was created; but again with the endorsement of superintendent, the selection committee identified the mentor teachers who best matched the interns. The superintendent made the official appointments. In yet another project, an insufficient number of teachers applied to fill the

mentor posts anticipated; in that district particular teachers were then approached and asked to consider serving as mentors. Again the matter of appointment seemed moot.

Problems related to selection of mentors. Despite the variety of processes and criteria for selection of mentors and the different ways in which mentors actually were appointed, there seemed to be relatively few major problems generated by these activities. There were reports of dissatisfaction with communications about the application and selection process: that not enough information was provided teachers who might apply; that there wasn't enough time to consider or complete applications; that the timing of the process was poor. There were reports in some projects of disappointment over the small number of applicants. Some number of teachers, project coordinators, and principals suggested that building administrators ought to have played a more direct role in selection the mentors.

There were a few reports of disappointment and anger expressed by teachers who were not selected to be part of a mentor pool or appointed to serve in that post in the pilot year. Their expressions were sometimes directed at those teachers who were appointed as mentors.

Mentor teachers also rather commonly reported some good-natured kidding from their colleagues once their appointments were announced. "Look, here comes the mentor teacher..." and "What makes you so special?" were the kinds of comments mentor

teachers endured as friendly barbs. But in some instances the comments seemed to be more hostile than good-natured, and many mentors reported that they tried to overlook such comments, and to trust that they would not continue.

Selection of the Interns

Definition of intern. The MT-I Program was intended to support first-year teachers with their transition. Operationally, the first year was defined as the first year in which a current teaching certificate was put to use. This operational definition led to the appropriate inclusion of numbers of beginning teachers, but also resulted in a range of situations, some of which seemed to participants and others rather anomalous. For example, one teacher who had taught for over a decade some years earlier and was now re-entering the profession in a new certification area was appointed as an intern teacher. A number of teachers who had taught in private or parochial schools for a range of years were appointed as interns in this pilot year as they activated certificates to begin teaching in the public schools. Less dramatic were many examples of teachers who had substituted on a regular basis in the same schools in which they were appointed as intern teachers.

In one large project, new teachers are regularly hired on a long-term temporary basis for a year or more, before they are given regular appointments. Interns in this project (and indeed their colleagues, administrators and central office staff), conceived of their first year of teaching as having occurred

several years before this official internship year. They felt they needed a mentor's help then, but now consider themselves experienced teachers, in much less need than others who presently are teaching on long-term temporary basis.

By contrast, there were reports of some teachers returning to the classroom after years of absence for parental care or, perhaps, time in non-education jobs. Because they were teaching under the same certificate as years earlier, they were not eligible to be included as intern teachers, even though they might have wanted a mentor's assistance, and their administrators would have valued such assistance being available to them.

Finally, there were instances of new teachers who qualified as interns but who were not hired until well into the school year. For reasons of funding, and the project-level difficulties of selecting additional mentors and initiating new relationships, these first-year teachers were not included in the projects. It is not clear whether they will be as much in need of or eligible for inclusion in their second year.

The operational definition of the intern teacher seemingly led to the inclusion of some teachers who felt that they did not need, perhaps as much as others, the assistance of mentors. Other first-year teachers were not included, if not because of the operational definition, then because of the management problems of setting a relationship in motion at mid-year. It is perhaps a matter for debate about whether the projects served those teachers who most needed the assistance of mentors; or, for

that matter, about whether anyone teaching for the first time in a new certification area ought to have the assistance of a mentor teacher, certified and current in the practices of that area; or about whether anyone teaching for the first time in a public school ought to have the assistance of a mentor. What is clear is that, in the pilot year, while the MT-I Program largely served those for whom it was intended--beginning teachers--the judgments of local planners of the projects, if exercised, would have resulted in a somewhat different group of beginning teachers being included. Whether the operational definition of intern teacher should be broadened, or should be determined more at the local level, are perhaps considerations worth making.

Voluntary and required participation. In most of the projects, those who qualified as intern teachers were required to participate in the project. Often they were told as part of their employment screening interview that such a project was planned for the coming year, although important details were not yet available. Most often the project was presented as an opportunity that would benefit new teachers through released time and the assistance of experienced colleagues.

In at least one project, participation by the intern teachers was voluntary. Project planners felt that since the MT-I Program was in a pilot year, and since at least to some degree the project was "experimental," they were unwilling to require new teachers to participate.

Intern hesitance. Whether required to participate or

volunteering to do so, many interns seemed to express some hesitance about the project and their roles in it. Ambiguities that characterize any new undertaking, and this year, uncertainties deriving from the late start of the projects probably prompted further hesitation on their parts.

Some interns reported that they were not sure what it meant to be an "intern" or how that would affect their teaching. Some interns objected to the word itself: "intern" somehow represented a status lower than "teacher" to them and, especially if they had prior experience, they objected to this perceived demotion.

For many intern teachers, there was a lengthy gap in time between when they were interviewed and told they would be expected to participate, and when the projects actually got underway. During that time, they were interns only in name, and generally formed no strong attitudes toward the denotation. But when the projects began and their teaching responsibilities were reduced, for some of them the sense of being demoted became real. This sense grew when they had to explain to students, parents, and colleagues why they would no longer hold particular instructional duties; some felt that they were being perceived as "not ready" to be teachers. Interns noted that if the project had started with school year, they would not have had to deal with such situations. Being an intern might not have carried negative connotations.

Being unclear about the facts of the project (the meaning of "intern" and how being an intern would affect their teaching

role), and being uncertain about the benefits of participation (whether it would indeed help them and help them secure the teaching post for the second year), but having early-on to deal with problems deriving from the project, some interns entered the role cautiously if not reluctantly.

Demographic and Professional Backgrounds

The mentors and interns selected to participate in the pilot year projects provided information which makes it possible to summarize selected background characteristics. (Note that all of the following summaries are based on responses to the D&PB Questionnaire distributed to 97 mentors and 131 interns, with response rates of .81 and .70, respectively.) Summaries of those reports are presented below.

Gender and age. Table 4 summarizes the distribution of the interns and mentors into gender and age categories. Reviewing the table, it can be seen that the majority of the interns and mentors were female. Nearly a majority of interns were under age 26, with a few being as old as 40 and 50 years of age. The mentors are more evenly distributed across the age categories, with some being under 30 years of age.

Academic background and certification. Table 5 displays the academic backgrounds of interns. They were educated at a variety of types of institutions, and the great majority received their degrees in this present decade. Relatively few have earned graduate degrees at this point in time.

Table 4
Interns and Mentors Distributed by Gender and Age

	Interns (n = 92)	Mentors (n = 79)
Gender		
female	78 (.85)	65 (.82)
male	14 (.15)	14 (.18)
Age		
no response	--	3
under 26	43 (.47)	--
26-30	17 (.19)	10 (.13)
31-35	14 (.15)	8 (.10)
36-40	11 (.12)	17 (.22)
41-45	4 (.04)	11 (.14)
46-50	2 (.02)	15 (.20)
51-55	1 (.01)	5 (.06)
56-60	--	6 (.08)
over 60	--	4 (.05)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are percentages.

Table 5
Academic Backgrounds of the Interns

Nature of Undergraduate Institution Attended	frequency
no response or no undergraduate study	4
state college	24
small private college	25
large private college	17
state university	22

Table 5, continued.

Undergraduate Degree Earned	
no degree	4
Bachelor of Arts	33
Bachelor of Science	51
Bachelor of Fine Arts	4
Year Undergraduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree	8
before 1970	6
1970-1979	17
1980-1983	14
1984	10
1985	12
1986	25
Nature of Graduate Institution Attended	
no response or no graduate study	64
state college	7
small private college	4
large private college	9
state university	8
Graduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree	64
Master of Arts	7
Master of Science	19
Master of Business Administration	1
Certificate of Advanced Study	1
Year Graduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree earned	64
before 1980	6
1980-1983	5
1984	1
1985	3
1986	11
1987 (projected)	2

Note. n = 92.

Table 6 displays the academic backgrounds of the mentors. Many mentors got their undergraduate degrees from state colleges, and an equal number obtained their graduate degrees from large private colleges. Most mentors had completed their degree programs before 1980.

Table 6
Academic Backgrounds of the Mentors

	frequency
Nature of Undergraduate Institution Attended	
no response	1
state college	30
small private college	19
large private college	18
state university	11
Undergraduate Degree Earned	
Bachelor of Arts	35
Bachelor of Science	44
Year Undergraduate Degree Earned	
no response or no undergraduate study	3
before 1951	8
1951-1955	7
1956-1960	8
1961-1965	10
1966-1970	15
1971-1975	8
1976-1980	14
after 1980	6

Table 6, continued.

Nature of Graduate Institution Attended	
no response or no graduate study	14
state college	15
small private college	8
large private college	30
state university	11
Graduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree earned	15
Master of Arts	25
Master of Science	43
doctorate	1
school district administrator	4
school administrator and supervisor	1
Year Graduate Degree Earned	
no response or no degree earned	20
before 1960	4
1960-1969	9
1970-1979	28
1980-1983	16
1985	1
1986	1

Note. n = 79.

Table 7 displays the areas of certifications held by interns and mentors. As expected, a wide range of certification areas are represented in both the intern and mentor groups.

Table 7
Certification of the Interns and Mentors

Certificate Areas	Interns (n = 92)	Mentors (n = 79)
no response or no credential	4	--
elementary (K-6, N-6, K-8)	39	34
reading	5	4
English	7	8
mathematics	7	3
social studies	6	7
general science	3	5
Earth science	3	2
biology	3	5
chemistry	2	
physical science	2	1
health	3	1
French	1	2
Spanish	5	5
Italian	2	1
TESOL	1	1
foreign languages	2	--
art	9	4
music	4	2
physical education	3	2
home economics	--	1
vocational education	3	5
business education	6	3
driver education	1	--
special education	13	18
speech and hearing	4	4
media specialist	--	1
guidance	--	1
teaching assistant	1	--

Note. Numbers exceed the total number of respondents since individuals may hold more than one certificate.

Teaching histories and experiences. Mentors were asked to provide information which described their teaching histories and experience with mentoring, teacher preparation, and induction. Table 8 summarizes their responses. While the majority had substantial experience in teaching, and in the districts and building in which they acted as mentors, a few had suprisingly little experience in these regards. many of the mentors themselves had had mentors at some point in their careers or as adults. The great majority of them had experience with teacher preparation through hosting student teachers, or with induction through assisting beginning teachers.

Table 8
Teaching Histories and Experiences of the Mentors

Teaching History	frequency
years of experience	
no response	2
3-5	5
6-10	14
11-15	14
16-20	25
21-30	15
over 30	4
years of experience in current district	
no response	1
1-2	2
3-5	10
6-10	15
11-15	14
16-20	22
21-30	14
over 30	1

Table 8, continued.

years of experience in current school	
no response	3
0	1
1	5
2	1
3-5	20
6-10	17
11-15	9
16-20	14
21-30	9
Experience with Mentoring	
had a mentor at start of career	
no	54
yes	25
had a mentor during the career	
no	45
yes	34
had a mentor as an adult	
no	50
yes	29
Experience with Teacher Preparation and Induction	
number of student teachers sponsored	
none	16
1 - 3	27
4 - 10	20
more than 10	16
number of beginning teachers assisted	
none	10
1	6
2 - 3	25
more than 3	38

Note. n = 79.

Current teaching positions. Interns and mentors were asked to describe the teaching positions which they held during the pilot

year. Table 9 summarizes their responses. Just as their certification areas represent a wide range of fields, so too do their assignments for teaching. As expected, interns and mentors seem similarly distributed across the various grade levels and fields.

Table 9
Current Teaching Positions of the Interns and Mentors

	Interns (n = 92)	Mentors (n = 79)
Grade Level		
no response	3	4
Pre-K	3	4
N-6, K-6	37	25
K-8	1	4
K-12	1	3
6-8	5	3
7-12	42	36
Subject Area of Instruction		
no response	26	20
reading	5	4
English	5	8
mathematics	5	4
social studies	5	4
general science	2	--
Earth science	1	1
biology	2	6
chemistry	1	2
physical science	3	--
health	1	2
humanities	--	1
French	--	2
Spanish	10	4
Italian	1	1
ESL	1	1

Table 9, continued.

art	11	3
music	3	1
physical education	2	1
vocational education	8	7
business education	2	2
computer education	--	1
special education	22	22
speech and hearing	6	6

Note. Non-response under Subject Areas of Instruction is probably attributable in large measure to elementary classroom teachers who cited no subject area.
Note. Numbers under Subject Areas of Instruction exceed the total number of respondents since individuals reported teaching more than one subject area. Thirty (30) interns reported teaching more than one subject area. Twenty-four (24) mentors also reported teaching more than one subject area.

Interns were asked to rate how similar their current teaching positions were to experiences they had as part of their teacher preparation programs, and to list key features upon which they made the comparison. Table 10 summarizes their responses. The majority reported some similarity to their, preparation experiences, though about a third saw little or no similarity. Grade level and age, subject matter, working conditions, and student characteristics were the features upon which many interns focused in making their comparisons.

Table 10
Intern Comparison of Current Teaching Position to Preparation Experiences

		frequency (n = 92)
Rating Scale		
no response		3
not at all similar	0	11 (.12)
	1	23 (.26)
similar	2	34 (.38)
	3	14 (.16)
almost identical	4	7 (.08)
Key Features of Comparison		
grade level/age		35
subject matter		34
working conditions		28
student characteristics		23
teacher duties/responsibilities		17
teaching materials/equipment		11
coursework/preparation		8
organization for instruction		8
managment techniques		5
teaching techniques		4
community socio-economic status		4
colleagues		4
location		4
ten other features reported by 1, 2 or 3 respondents		

Note. Numbers under Key Features exceed the total number of respondents since individuals reported more than one key feature.

Interns were asked further to rate how familiar they were with the schools to which they were assigned during the pilot year, and to describe the basis for that familiarity. Table 11 summarizes their responses. Half the interns had developed some familiarity with the schools to which they were assigned through

a range of sources.

Table 11
Intern Familiarity with Assigned School

		frequency
Rating Scale		
not at all familiar	0	31 (.34)
	1	15 (.16)
familiar	2	18 (.20)
	3	6 (.06)
extremely familiar	4	22 (.24)
Basis of Familiarity		
substitute teacher		18
student teaching/field experience		15
prior contacts		11
reports by others		10
paraprofessional service		9
live(d) in district		9
attended school in district		8
visitation/interview		6
own child's school		5
two other bases reported by 1 respondent each		

Note. Bases of Familiarity were reported only by those who reported some degree of familiarity.

The mentors were asked to rate how similar their current teaching positions were to the positions of their interns, and to list the key features upon which they made the comparison. Table 12 summarizes their responses. The mentors saw great similarity between their teaching positions and those of their interns; only a few saw little or no similarity. Key features in such a comparison were grade level and age, subject matter, and student

characteristics.

Table 12
Mentor Comparison of Own Teaching Position to Intern Position

		frequency (n = 79)
Rating Scale		
no response		1
not at all similar	0	5 (.06)
	1	5 (.06)
similar	2	30 (.38)
	3	21 (.27)
almost identical	4	17 (.22)
Key Features of Comparison		
grade level/age		43
subject matter		43
student characteristics		33
working conditions		15
organization for instruction		12
location		8
teaching techniques		6
management techniques		5
teacher duties/responsibilities		5
ten other features reported by 1, 2 or 3 respondents		

Note. Numbers under Key Features exceed the number of respondents since individuals reported more than one key feature.

The Matching of Mentors and Interns

An important set of decisions in each local project dealt with matching the prospective mentor teachers to the intern teachers who needed to be supported during the year. As described above, the selection of mentors was often done while concurrently considering with what interns they would be matched. Thus,

although the state regulations make the appointment, and hence the matching, an administrative prerogative, mentor selection committees often played a role in this decision. While final authority for the decision lay with the district superintendent, it was reported that principals, vice-principals, and assistant superintendents, or combinations like union president and director of personnel, or department chairpersons and the local project coordinator--were the persons who actually made the matches between mentors and interns. In some cases, the selection committee did so alone. In nearly all projects, there was considerable discussion among the parties before decisions were made.

Several participants in the projects described the difficulty of making matches between individuals whom they did not know well. This was frequently the case regarding intern teachers. Often some mentor teachers were not well-known by colleagues in different buildings; under these circumstances, advice from persons more likely to know them and their work was sought. To some degree these other persons played a role in the matching process.

Information considered in matching decisions. Certain information in making the matches was clear: certification areas; building assignment; proximity within the building; compatibility of schedules; and availability of substitute teachers. Other information was considered important, but less easily defined: a mentor who would most benefit the intern (eg., willingness to

spend extra time); "our 'best' teacher"; and personality (eg., motivation of the mentor, similarities in personal characteristics, anticipated compatibility). In some cases, the prospective mentors and interns had had prior contact which was considered in making the matches. In one reported instance, the mentor and intern requested to work together, which was granted. (The late start up of the projects in the pilot year meant that some mentors and interns, before they realized they might be assigned to one another, had already begun a relationship that they valued.)

The mentors and interns were asked to respond to several questions regarding the process of matching and the matches that had been made for them. They were asked to rate the importance of "making a good match." Table 13 displays their responses. It is evident that the interns were generally more concerned about having a good match made than the mentors. The mentors

Table 13
Importance of a "Good" Match

	Interns (n = 88)	Mentors (n = 75)
Rating Scale		
no response	1	2
not important	1	4
somewhat important	16	27
very important	70	42

appeared to be more confident of their abilities to work with a variety of new colleagues. Some of the mentors stated that as long as the intern was willing to learn and committed to teaching, the match should be of less consequence. One mentor even went so far as to say that a good match was unimportant because it is the mentor's responsibility to make the relationship work.

The interns and mentors were asked to rate a range of information that should be considered in making matches, and to list additional types of information they felt would be important. Table 14 displays their responses. Interns and mentors largely rated the information similarly, emphasizing the importance of considering content area and school building assignment. Interns placed more importance on content area and grade level, perhaps reflecting a concern for gaining help with instructional and curriculum matters. Interns also placed greater importance or consideration of personality; this may reflect their need to work with someone whom they like and trust, and with whom they feel secure. Relatively little importance was placed by both interns and mentors or consideration of age and gender.

Interns and mentors added a variety of other types of information to the rating list: several interns seemed to point to the need to have a positive, "up-beat" mentor who reflected the good side of teaching, and someone with whom they could sense an agreement of ideas; several mentors pointed to the importance

Table 14
Importance of Selected Information in Making a Match

Types of Information	Interns (n = 88) importance			Mentors (n = 75) importance		
	not	somewhat	very	not	somewhat	very
age	65	22	1	61	12	2
content area	2	22	64	1	26	46
gender	59	25	3	60	17	1
grade level	8	42	38	9	49	14
personality	2	31	55	5	36	32
personal background and interests	33	48	7	32	38	4
school building	13	25	50	8	22	45
teaching style	14	42	30	19	41	13

Selected Additional Types of Information Cited

-mentor's positive attitude	-interest in being a mentor
-mentor's good attitude toward job	-mentor's concern about education system
-mentor's empathy for and memory of own first year of teaching	-maturity of the intern
-mentor's enthusiasm and sincerity	-intern's ability to take criticism
-compatible philosophies of education	-intern's degree of need for help
-agreement on basic educational ideas	-mentor's understanding of project

Note. The number totals are not consistant across the Types of Information because of incomplete responses or responses referring to multiple interns with one mentor.

of the intern being open to learning about teaching and committed to the work, and a mentor's interest in the project and

commitment to the profession.

The ratings and listings provided by the mentors and interns should not be understood as objective fact, but rather as a reflection of their experiences. For example, one mentor who rated age as a very important consideration, did so because she/he felt too young to help the intern; for her/him age seemed to be one of the most important considerations. By contrast, one intern who was about the same age and had several similar personal and family interests as her/his mentor, felt those matters were inconsequential; rather, differences of teaching style were noted as the source of problems in the mentor-intern match. Thus, the ratings reflect respondents' interpretation of their experiences--what seemed to matter in making their relationships work or falter.

The number of interns per mentor. The state regulations allowed for local arrangements to be set such that a mentor might work with more than one intern. Though most projects matched one intern to a mentor, there were examples of two, three, and four interns per mentor. One project even matched five interns to a mentor. (Recall that one project was not represented in the data collection effort because of its late approval; in that project the post of full-time mentors was created. The number of interns assigned to mentors in that project was not known to the study team, and their experiences are not represented here.)

Mentors and interns were asked to describe the advantages and disadvantages they saw in working with a particular mentor-

intern ratio. Their responses are informative. The great majority of the respondents worked in a one-to-one relationship. Both mentors and interns lauded this ratio as allowing them to become more knowledgable of each other's classes, ideas, and needs. It allowed them to select a particular focus for their work, to engage in team teaching, and as one mentor described it, to engage in "special conspiring." They pointed to special, close, and personal relationships that had grown.

Interns regularly noted that they were particularly pleased not to have to share their mentors; they felt that they could receive immediate attention, and not worry about taking the mentor away from another intern. Numbers of interns said that it would be easier to coordinate schedules, to be more flexible, and to establish the working relationship if the mentor had only one intern. Importantly, many interns in a one-to-one relationship noted that they felt such a ratio led them to be more open with the mentor, having a higher level of trust, a greater sense of confidentiality and privacy; they were not sure that they would have felt the same, sharing their mentors with other interns.

Mentors felt that the help they were able to give the interns was already demanding, and did not see how they could have done quite as well with more than one intern to be attentive to. Both mentors and interns noted that having to work closely with substitute teachers took considerable time in itself; one intern said this was like "my mentor already having a second intern." One mentor reported that being appointed to more than one intern

would have diminished his/her interest in being a mentor.

Overall, both mentors and interns in one-to-one relationships, though they had no experience with other working ratios, felt strongly about this proportion. As one intern said, "this should be the target ratio for the program."

Interestingly, mentors involved in relationships with more than one intern generally also felt positive about their associations as did their interns. They saw an advantage in having multiple perspectives to learn from. Interns liked having someone in "exactly the same situation" they were in. And interns working with the same mentor reported that they supported each other when the mentor wasn't available. But this advantage was realized only if they did indeed get together; this did not always take place. Having multiple interns sometimes also meant that the mentor worked with new teachers in several buildings. Interns in buildings separated from their mentors and other interns regularly noted that they felt greatly disadvantaged regarding opportunities to meet.

Both mentors and interns reported that, generally, having four or five interns was too demanding on part-time mentors. (However, one mentor who had four interns felt the ratio was acceptable.) Interns in such pairings felt they did not have enough time with their mentors; mentors felt they were "spread too thin." Working with three or two interns was seen as better than with four or five. One mentor felt it possible to work with five interns if relieved of all additional responsibilities. It

is not clear from the responses if working with larger numbers of interns would be seen as acceptable if the mentor teacher was a full-time appointment.

Changes in the matches. Local project coordinators were asked if any changes had been made in the original matches between the mentors and interns. In most projects, that seemed not to be the case. In one project, changes were considered before the late start-up, but presumably not after.

One coordinator reported that soon after the project started, participants were contacted to see if changes might be desirable. Though none were requested, a mechanism had been established for that possiblity.

In one project, several changes were made. One mentor left the district and a new teacher was hired. Another experienced teacher volunteered to serve as mentor to both the old and new interns. In that same project, an intern requested to be assigned a new mentor, and this was done. All the changes in this project were handled through the local project coordinator, who consulted in each instance with all the people involved.

In yet another project, a match was changed because of the joint request of the mentor and intern. They felt they were too far from one another geographically to build a relationship.

Finally, in one project, the coordinator reported that ineffective matches were simply discontinued.

The quality of the matches. Interns and mentors were asked to rate the match(es) that had been made for them. Table 15

Table 15
Ratings of the Mentor-Intern Matches Made

Ratings of Match	Interns (n = 88)	Mentors (n = 75)
poor	6	6
reasonable	10	21
good	72	57

Note. Number total of mentor ratings exceeds number of respondents since some mentors worked with multiple interns and rated the matches separately.

summarizes their responses. Overall, both mentors and interns reported that their matches were "reasonable" or "good," with interns slightly more positive in their ratings. Given the difficulty of making a match, as noted earlier in this section, the matches made were amazingly well regarded by interns and mentors. This regard may have resulted from the use of selected information in making the matches, or perhaps it reflects more what the matches became over the course of the year. It might, as the one mentor suggested, be an indicator of the capacities of the mentors (and interns, too) to make a relationship work.

In the few cases where interns rated the match as poor, they pointed to several causes: the mentor's negativism; the mentor's poor social skills; not being matched in content areas; personality clash; mentor's inability to address intern's needs; differences in teaching style; being in different buildings and grade levels; mentor's disdain of the intern's questions.

Mentors also pointed to the causes of poor matches: the mentor not being old enough to mentor; the intern not having completed a teacher education program, and the mentor being unable to make up the difference; the intern already being an accomplished teacher and the mentor having nothing to add. One mentor pointed to racial and economic differences, but did not elaborate. Finally, one mentor reported that because she/he was working with several interns, it was possible to compare the relationships: one was rated "poor," and another by contrast, "good." It is worth noting that several of the mentors who had multiple interns chose to rate the matches separately. Other mentors in that situation did not do so.

The Workings of the Relationship

Once the new teachers had been hired, the mentors selected and the matches made, the project refocused at the relationship-level. It was here, between the mentors and interns, that the substantive work of the project would largely occur. It was here that the state MT-I Program would have its design potential realized.

Motives and expectations. While the interns were usually required to participate in the project, and somewhat uncertain about what being an intern would be like, it would be incorrect to conclude that they were not interested and hopeful. The majority of interns wrote positively about their opportunity to participate. They used verbs such as "thrilled," "excited," "honored," and "motivated" in expressing their feelings. Their

comments pointed to what they perceived as the potential of the project for them: "...getting feedback from an experienced teacher on a regular basis..," "...refreshing to discuss and exchange ideas with a colleague..," "...provide guidance in many routine procedures..," "...a good learning experience and beneficial for a new teacher like myself..," and "the subject and grade level (are) different from anything I had taught before," or "project would be extremely helpful." Even some interns who felt they did not need a mentor were not unhappy about being in a "supportive" project.

A few interns were quite unhappy about their participation: "...I wasn't given any choices..," "not eager to be 'under someone else's control' as in student teaching days..," and "...at first I was interested, (but) when I learned we were expected to leave plans for substitutes on a regular basis, I was appalled..." Another intern felt anxious and upset over losing one of her/his favorite classes.

The mentors were almost always eager volunteers. Though they too were often uncertain about the precise nature of their roles or the details of their patricipation, their motives for participating disposed them to be positive at the start. A few experienced teachers considered themselves to have been informal mentors for years, sometimes because of a need for fellowship in small, specialized areas, or because of a desire to make their particular building program as successful as possible. Comments such as "...worked with student teachers in the past and felt

this situation similar, yet better..," and "...I do this type of activity all the time--always help new teachers if I see I can do so gracefully..," reflects their sense of continuing a practice they already valued. Recurringly, mentors indicated they recalled their own first and/or early years. "A lot of good teaching energy went into coping those first few months." Over and over again, the mentors made remarks such as, "I remember clearly my first year in school and how I would have benefitted from some caring person assigned to answer my questions--all of them."

For most of the mentors, professional concerns were interwoven with personal and practical needs. Some indicated they longed for "a change of pace," and "more contact with adults," or were entering a "new phase" of professional development. Some likened it to being on the "cutting edge." Some saw it as a chance to move up into an administrative position. Curiosity about the pilot was listed at least three times, and one mentor minced no words stating, "...it was about time to get some recognition."

In addition to what they desired for themselves, mentors expressed a concern about the need for one professional to help ancther get started in the field. Statements such as "I might be able to salvage some of our new teachers," "recognize the difficulty in transition," and "teachers helping other teachers make Letter teachers" characterize their motives. "It has been my thought for many years that experienced teachers need to share their knowledge, techniques, and methods with teachers starting

out" was typical of many responses. It would appear that many mentors had been longing to share their expertise for some time. "Numerous years of accumulated knowledge and wisdom" were waiting to be tapped. Taken further this motivation might be described as concern for the professionalization of teaching.

First meetings and first impressions. Though for many of the interns and mentors, their projects did not start formally until almost mid-year, quite often they had begun working together informally. Mentors were asked to indicate the informal and formal starting points of their work with the interns. Table 16 displays these responses. The beginnings of the relationships

Table 16
Beginning Months of the Mentor-Intern Work

Starting Point	Informal	Formal
before school year	8	3
September	19	7
October	8	11
November	7	8
December	8	10
January	7	12
February	7	4
March	--	8
April	--	1

Note. n = 64.

spanned six or seven months. Several mentors already had established relationships with their interns who either had been

their student teachers the previous year or had worked in the building, perhaps as substitute teachers. Other mentors reported meeting their interns over the summer, or the week before the opening of school when teachers returned to plan and put their classrooms in order. Mentors who knew they would be part of the projects sometimes made the first move in contacting their interns: "I immediately contacted her and asked if she would like to get together. She was most receptive." The majority of other mentors and interns had to wait until their district received word that their proposals had been approved before any kind of formal "teaming" was established. While some of these teachers spoke of meeting on an informal basis, they often were concerned about the late start their formal projects got.

How the first meetings evolved were rather varied. Mentors who weren't officially assigned interns until the winter months sometimes mentioned offering their help early in the year, both out of "sympathy and collegiality." New teachers approached those who seemed open for advice on everything from how to do requisitions for regular classroom supplies to information about emotional disorders in special education classes. A small group of pairs had been "thrown together by chance," such as in cooperating teacher-student teacher arrangements or as grade level colleagues. In some projects, the first meetings were structured, as in organizational meetings at the district offices or "get acquainted" meetings. Some attended master teacher training sessions and/or observed in each other's classrooms.

Project coordinators who knew both parties were sometimes given credit for matching them and introducing them to one another. Occasionally the first encounters were troublesome, including distress over the "comfortability of the situation," or "a difficult first meeting," and "a session filled with tension and frustration...due to a mentor who 'became very defensive' when asked questions." Finally, it should be noted that since most interns had no choice in whether or not they were participating in the project, the first meetings might have played an important role in enhancing their receptivity to and comfort with the project. When they perceived some kind of balance in the relationship, characterized by more than one intern in statements such as, "(The mentor) felt she could learn from me as well as my learning from her," they seemed more open to the project.

The mentors' impressions. Most mentors were overwhelmingly positive about the characteristics they saw in their interns right from their first encounters and through several weeks of the evolving relationships. The most positive descriptions of interns included adjectives such as "caring," "competent," "perceptive," "positive," and "open," with "eager," "enthusiastic," and "energetic" used most. While "young" was a word chosen to describe some interns, "mature" appeared even more often, perhaps due to a number of interns who have returned to teaching after starting families or as second careers. Mentors used statements such as, "I looked at her and saw myself so many years ago," and "She's self-assured since she's had prior

experience" to explain their first impressions. Others commented on their appreciation of the qualities of "organization" and "sense of humor" in their interns.

While some mentors with multiple interns grouped them all together, others compared and contrasted characteristics, having warm relationships with one or two, and more formal but cordial relationships with others.

About one seventh of mentors had neutral or less positive first impressions of their interns. "Overwhelmed," "strong minded," "pessimistic," "reserved," "lacking in confidence" were used to describe them. Some beginners in the field were described as "very new" or "needs to be more professional." An older intern was characterized as "knowledgeable but quite possibly lacking in communication skills necessary to reach lower tract students." Problem areas perceived by mentors regarding interns were inability to write clear objectives, wanting to do things one's own way, and hesitation in permitting observations.

In just a few instances, the first impressions were negative. "Needing to learn to live with personal problems," "being a strong minded individual who doesn't respond to suggestions easily," and "moving too quickly with insufficient explanation of complicated materials," seemed to characterize these impressions.

The interns' impressions. The interns developed positive first impressions of their mentors. Adjectives chosen to describe the mentors were, however, somewhat less effusive. "Knowledgeable," "professional," and "organized" appeared with

the greatest frequency. Phrases such as "anxious to help me," "supportive of me," and "mentor's friendliness made me feel comfortable," indicated interns' appreciation of the expertise and recognition of the dedication of their mentors.

Interestingly, the words "seemed to" appeared regularly in the descriptions of the interns. Examples such as "seemed open," "seemed to be highly involved," "seemed to care about the program and helping us" may have been indicative of a kind of testing period during which some interns were checking out the credibility and espoused values of their mentors.

No interns mentioned the fact that they shared a mentor, nor complained of a comparison being made between or among them. However, some interns perceived the same mentor differently. In one such pair, the first intern described the mentor as "snobby" explaining this adjective further with a description of a perceived attitude of "I know everything, I was assigned to you because you know nothing"; the intern also saw this mentor as desirous of having everything perfect. The second intern assigned to this same mentor labeled this person as "very organized with lots of information to offer"; the "outspokeness" of the mentor was also mentioned with a lament, "I do not want to feel like I must always apply her ideas."

As did the mentors, a small fraction of interns regarded their relationships as neutral or less positive. One intern described the mentor as "serious" and "traditional." Others characterized their mentors as "qualified," "needing more flexibility,"

"friendly though reserved," "union activist but nice person," "set in ways," or "concerned with outcomes, not development of concepts." One intern who learned of the mentor's well established reputation felt "...experience has shown the mentor that rote methods work best. For my own protection, I should follow what my mentor is doing." Another intern speculated about the mentor as an "unknown quantity" who because of over twenty years of experience might preach and restrict the intern's own style.

The impressions sustained. Both mentors and interns most often reported that their first impressions were "on target." Their positive first impressions seemed to be sustained and strengthened. In a number of cases less-positive first impressions were reversed, as with the intern who was first seen as "nervous" and "unsure," but emerged as "confident in class now, yet eager to learn from me." And statements, such as "comfortable now in asking for suggestions, yet don't feel trapped or controlled," "enthusiasm and sincere concern has never wavered," and "has always been available, even for problems and complaints" are indicative of the trust that grew between them. In a few instances, a positive first impression was replaced with negative feelings as in, "...my intern (now) explains why my suggestions don't work rather than trying them."

It is not clear to what degree, if any, the first impressions formed by mentors and interns molded the relationship that eventually developed. Because both the first impressions and the

subsequent relationships were overwhelmingly positive, there might be inclination to link the two causally. But that cannot yet be done. Exceptions to such a rule are evident. Nonetheless, it's difficult to believe that if the initial impressions had been largely negative, the mentors and interns would have been as pleased with their relationships. It is probably better to start the mentor-intern relationship positively.

The developing relationships. In March of this year mentors and interns were asked to describe the relationships that had developed. (Recall that for some pairs, this description could be based on three or more months of working together; for others, it was based on less.)

The responses from the mentors were, as in their earlier reports, overwhelmingly positive. Their comments seemed to reflect combinations of professional and personal regard. One mentor described the intern as a "person and colleague" with whom a "friendly, caring relationship" had developed, providing "each (with) support in good and bad times." The warmth and personalness these relationships did not, however, diminish their attention to the work of learning about teaching. While perceiving themselves as supporters, facilitators and encouragers, mentors also spoke about "task-oriented meetings" with "chosen pertinent objectives." Focus of such "meetings" was frequently curricular and instructional matters.

The degree to which these essentially professional

relationships took on personal dimensions varied. While no one seemed to feel obligated to develop the personal aspects of the association, many delighted when those developments occurred. There were mentors who wrote about becoming a "good friend" to the intern. Some of these mentioned mutually held values, "families similar in age and composition," attending parties together, and "a 'mutual-admiration society' with a nice friendship..." They seemed to view the mentor-intern relationship as one of providing moral support in the form of a person to whom the intern could turn when needing trusted advice in dealing with problems that one person described as potentially "nerve-wracking." And by contrast, one mentor reported feeling that it was necessary to keep the relationship at a formal, professional work level: since the intern had not completed a teacher preparation program, the mentor felt obligated to develop the relationship in the direction of basic teacher preparation.

Interns also wrote about the supportive relationships in which they were involved. They indicated these relationships were warm and caring ones, in statements such as, "My mentor and I have built a trust. I have a great deal of respect for her as a person and as a teacher," and "I feel very comfortable with my mentor in my class." Again, "I don't feel that she's judging but observing for very positive reasons," were indicative of these responses. Honesty between the two and the openness in sharing feelings were highly valued and often mentioned. Help with evaluating, teaching lessons, new techniques and strategies were

areas in which the interns expressed the desire for help, and gratitude for having received same. Interns called their pairings, "relaxed yet professional," "friendly but working," "motivating" and "constructive." Mentors were represented as "professional and willing to do anything to help you better yourself" and "giving time to discuss problems and situations faced in the classroom in general." "My mentor and I have established both a professional and personal relationship," "she is very much a professional as well as a role model..," and "she is a wonderful colleague, friend and sometimes a big sister," were the kinds of statements illustrating intern's perceptions of their relationships.

In many of these valued relationships, both the mentors and interns reported that there was an exchange of ideas--a give and take. mentors had much to offer the interns, but interns, too, brought much to the relationship that benefitted the mentor. Mutual support and "sharing in all aspects of teaching" from feelings to "specific educational techniques," seemed to be an important quality of these relationships that enhanced both their professional and personal value.

There were also reports of relationships that had not developed so positively, or were outright negative. But these were far fewer in number, perhaps because the participants in these pairings were reluctant to respond to the surveys. Those that are documented point to a lack of "receptiveness" on the part of the intern, an unwillingness to learn, or a lack of trust

between the two. The relationship is "amicable, but a little restrained...(the intern is) perhaps intimidated by me and by the situation..." Occasionally the mentor felt overwhelmed by all the intern needed to learn, and unable to provide all the guidance it would take to do so. One intern felt the mentor was very threatened by the intern, adding, "I believe this is because she gained her knowledge through experience and thinks this is the best way for a teacher to learn." In another case, the intern called the time set aside for the relationship as an "unpleasant experience," and enjoyed days when she/he could work by alone or with other interns.

A particular note must be added, at this point, about mentor-intern relationships in which mentors had more than one intern. No intern reported feeling compared or in competition with his/her mentor's other interns; actually, as described in an earlier section, having contact with other interns, who may have worked with the same mentor, was seen as a source of support and colleagueship. And most mentors who worked with several interns, chose not to distinguish among them in responding to the surveys. Still, however, it is clear that the mentors were keenly aware of the different relationships they had established with each intern. They could describe the different needs each of their interns had, the different ways in which they worked together, and the different foci of their efforts. (Needing to respond to four or five interns on these many differences, as noted in an earlier section, was very demanding on the mentors.) They were

also aware of the different degrees of "personal-ness" in each of the associations. Mentors seemed keenly aware of and to value interns' differences, and seemed to feel no pressure to treat them all alike or to establish similar relationships with each. Thus, though mentors with more than one intern differed among them, it did not seem to be the source of problems, but rather a stimulus for individualized assistance.

The uses of time. In the MT-I Program, funds were provided so that mentors and interns could be released from a portion of their regular instructional responsibilities, and use that time to address those matters which they judged most important for helping the intern. The released time is the MT-I Program's single, most important means of fostering the development of a relationship between the mentors and interns. In Part Two, a description was offered about how various projects handled arrangements for the released time of the mentors and interns.

But it became evident, very early on, that many mentors and interns would not confine their work to the time provided formally through the project. Rather, their association would span the school day and week, and for a number of them, would spill into evenings and weekends.

The Weekly Records of Involvement (WRI) form allowed mentors and interns to report how they made use of the released time provided and the additional time they spent on the project. Reviewing those records shows how the many pairs of mentors and interns structured their time, what forms of activities they

engaged in, who they involved in their work, and what the foci of their efforts were. In a sense, the WRI forms document the nature of the relationships.

Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 display completed WRI forms as they were submitted by interns and mentors. In Figure 1, it can be seen that the Intern A, in this early week of the formal project, reported 9 instances of activity related to the project. Though regular meeting times seem to have been scheduled, the mentor and intern also carried out related activities during lunch and after school. Several of the activities involve others: teachers, students, and a student teacher. Activity forms included observations, discussions, and participant teaching. The focus of the activities included instructional strategies and skills, grading and record-keeping, and parent relations.

Intern B, whose activites are reported on Figure 2, met with the mentor each day at a scheduled time. This pair engaged chiefly in discussion that week, focused on the intern's class profile, their roles as mentor or intern, time management, and lesson plans.

Figure 3 displays the activities of Mentor C. Note that the times and activity forms vary, and that sometimes the mentor worked alone. Mentor C worked with two interns, with whom different foci of activity were set.

Figure 4 revisits the reported activities of Intern A, now in May. While the schedule of activity times is similar to the December example in Figure 1, and other people continue to be 1

Figure 1.
Record of Involvement
in the Mentor-Intern Program

Code Intern A

Week of December 1, 1986

Use this sheet to record all your daily involvements in the mentor-intern program. Give approximate starting and ending times, describe the form of the activity, state whether you did this alone or with someone else, and describe the focus of the activity.

DAYS	TIMES	FORM OF ACTIVITY	PARTICIPANTS	FOCUS OF THE ACTIVITY
MONDAY	11:30 12:15	Lunch meeting	3rd grade teachers	discussion of report cards
	12:15 1:15	I observed a Reading lesson Group of 6 children	Intern Mentor Student teacher Students	To see how a small reading group is handled while the rest of the class is working independently.
TUESDAY	11:30 12:15	Lunch meeting	me and mentor	To discuss telephone conversations about parents.
	12:15 1:15	I observed a Social Studies lesson	me mentor students	To see how a new topic of study was introduced to the children.
WEDNESDAY	12:15 1:15	I participated in a science Lesson in my mentor's class.	me and mentor and students	To help the children discover how to make a complete circuit and light a light bulb.
THURSDAY	12:15 1:15	Conference about Report Cards	me and mentor	Discussion about various grading procedures and record keeping techniques.
	3:45 5:15	Discussion of Weekly Progress	me and mentor	Plans for following week.
FRIDAY	12:15 12:45	I observed a Reading lesson	me mentor students	To see how a reading group is handled with children missing.
	12:45 1:15	Discussion of parent/intern telephone conferences in reference to behavior	me mentor	To share various techniques when speaking with parents.

Figure 2.
Record of Involvement
in the Mentor-Intern Program

Code Intern B

Week of December 15. 1986

Use this sheet to record all your daily involvements in the mentor-intern program. Give approximate starting and ending times, describe the form of the activity, state whether you did this alone or with someone else, and describe the focus of the activity.

DAYS	TIMES	FORM OF ACTIVITY	PARTICIPANTS	FOCUS OF THE ACTIVITY
MONDAY	9 50 10 30	Discussion	Mentor and I	focus on roles and how they will be accomplished.
TUESDAY	9 50 10 30	Discussion	Mentor and I	focus on overview of Interns class profile.
WEDNESDAY	9 50 10 30	Discussion and review of lesson plans and materials used.	Mentor and I	focus on Interns lesson plans, and suggested specific materials.
THURSDAY	9 50 10 30	Discussion	Mentor and I	focus on how to manage time. Time management program for intern. DLM - material
FRIDAY	9 50 10 30	Discussion	Mentor and I	focus on where the program will lead us.

Figure 3.

Record of Involvement
in the Mentor-Intern Program

Code Mentor C

Week of December 15, 1986

Use this sheet to record all your daily involvements in the mentor-intern program. Give approximate starting and ending times, describe the form of the activity, state whether you did this alone or with someone else, and describe the focus of the activity.

DAYS	TIMES	FORM OF ACTIVITY	PARTICIPANTS	FOCUS OF THE ACTIVITY
MONDAY	8:45-9:20	Informal discussion	intern + me	Ending personal ID Topic with all classes.
	11:00-11:15	Planning	myself	long/short term goals for interns
	11:15-11:30	Informal discussion	Dept. Chair + me	How mentor program is going
TUESDAY	8:45-9:05	Formal Meeting	2 interns + me	Philosophy of program long range plan for each intern
	9:10-9:20	Discussion	Intern + me	Her individual program
WEDNESDAY	4:00-6:00	Long range goals	myself	Planning individual Programs + goals for interns
THURSDAY	8:45-9:00	Informal discussion	Intern + me	Plan test. Where to wrap up lessons before vacation Pre-observation. What intern will see in class tomorrow
	9:00-9:05	Phone Calls	1 intern	
	10:30-10:57	observation	2 Asst. Supt. of curriculum	wrong name of state papers
	10:58-11:10	follow-up discussion	Intern #2 + mentor	mentor's class
			Intern # 2 + mentor	follow up discussion
FRIDAY	8:45-9:10	Informal discussion	Intern #1 + me	Recommendations for re-tracing students
	11:45-12:00	observation	Intern #1 + me	Problems involved with written testing of lower track students.

Figure 4.
Record of Involvement
in the Mentor-Intern Program

Code Intern A

Week of May 4, 1987

Use this sheet to record all your daily involvements in the mentor-intern program. Give approximate starting and ending times, describe the form of the activity, state whether you did this alone or with someone else, and describe the focus of the activity.

DAYS	TIMES	FORM OF ACTIVITY	PARTICIPANTS	FOCUS OF THE ACTIVITY
MONDAY	12:15 1:15	Coteaching Reading lesson	Reading Group, mentor/intern	Determining which syllable is accented in a word. Discussion of a reading story.
TUESDAY	12:15 1:15 2:15 2:45	Conference Common Planning	3rd grade teachers, special teachers Reading consultant 3rd gr teachers Ass's. Principal	Introduction to our new reading series for next year. Plans for student placement for next year.
WEDNESDAY	12:15 1:15 3:30 4:00 4:00 6:00	Coteaching Reading lesson meet new principal Conference	Reading group mentor/intern whole staff mentor/intern	Discussion about accents and speaking correctly. Short speech. Discussion of plans for week. Working on art and paper and pencil supplies.
THURSDAY	12:15 1:15	Coteaching Reading Lesson	mentor/intern small group	Inference questions.
FRIDAY	8:00 8:45 11:30 12:15 12:15 1:15	Breakfast Lunch Reading is Fun sharing	All teachers and staff same mentor's class mentor intern	catered by P.T.A. Teacher Recognition Day sharing book projects

Figure 5.
Record of Involvement
in the Mentor-Intern Program

Code Mentor D

Week of May 4, 1987

Use this sheet to record all your daily involvements in the mentor-intern program. Give approximate starting and ending times, describe the form of the activity, state whether you did this alone or with someone else, and describe the focus of the activity.

DAYS	TIMES	FORM OF ACTIVITY	PARTICIPANTS	FOCUS OF THE ACTIVITY
MONDAY	2:30 3:00	Plan To Visit Schools: 1 Elementary 1 High School Special Education	Mentor & Intern.	Visit an Elementary Ed. Special Self-Contained Classroom. A High School Resource Room
TUESDAY		We didn't meet		
WEDNESDAY	all Day	School Visitation Day	Mentor & Intern	Investigated literature and observed classroom situations.
THURSDAY		—		
FRIDAY	3:00 4:30	Planning	Mentor Intern and Remedial Skills Class	We set up a schedule for intern's class test; how to distribute and proctor the test.

involved, the focus of activities is somewhat different: planning for the second year is underway, and the mentor and intern seem to be engaged in more co-teaching as they work together with students.

Figure 5 displays another mentor's activities, this time in May. Mentor D worked with the intern on three days that week, on one of which they made a school visit to another district.

These figures are helpful in illustrating several important matters regarding the use of time in the project. First, every mentor-intern pair had the opportunity to create a unique working relationship. Variations in how they were provided with released time were only one part of that uniqueness; the activities they chose and the matters on which they chose to focus were additional differences between and among the mentor-intern pairs, even in the same district project.

Second, the working relationship often changed over time: what the mentor and intern started out doing was adjusted and refocused over time, as they thought best.

Third, though the mentor and interns made use of the released time, often their associations were not confined to those blocks. Furthermore, their efforts were not confined to what might be the more expected forms and foci of activities; mentors and interns worked together in a wide range of activities, focused on an equally wide range of topics. Viewing the work of the mentors and interns in this fashion suggests that for many of the pairs, the relationship became quite complex, and quite integrated into

their lives as teachers.

In an effort to develop a broader picture of the work of the mentors and interns, the WRI form data were analyzed systematically. Each entry on the forms was treated as a separate "activity instance," and coded as such. Sets of coding categories were developed inductively to code the activity forms, the participants, and the focus of the activities. Thus, the data could be summarized using simple, descriptive statistics. What follows is a review of that summarization.

First, recall that the entire set of responses was randomly sampled, as described in Part One. The process produced a set of forms for mentors and a comparable set for interns. Fifty-three (53) mentors, citing 1,221 instances of work activity related to the projects, are represented in the following summaries. Sixty-seven (67) interns, citing 1,120 instances of activity, are represented in the corresponding parts of the summaries.

Days and times. As described in Part Two, some mentor-intern pairs were provided specific times for their work together; others were free to set their own schedules. Table 17 displays the distribution of activities across days of the week. Table 18 displays the distribution of activity starting times across time blocks in the day.

Table 17
Activity Instances Distributed across Days of the Week

Day	Interns	Mentors
Monday	169 (.15)	241 (.20)
Tuesday	241 (.21)	257 (.21)
Wednesday	265 (.24)	262 (.21)
Thursday	251 (.22)	241 (.20)
Friday	186 (.17)	208 (.17)
Saturday	1 (.00)	6 (.00)
Sunday	7 (.01)	6 (.00)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are the percentages.

Table 18
Activity Instances Distributed across Time Blocks in the Day

Activity Starting Time	Interns	Mentors
before school, until 8:29	133 (.12)	130 (.11)
morning, 8:30-11:29	493 (.44)	593 (.49)
mid day, 11:30-12:29	133 (.12)	133 (.11)
afternoon, 12:30-3:29	300 (.27)	290 (.24)
after school, 3:30-5:29	41 (.04)	42 (.03)
evenings, after 5:30	20 (.02)	33 (.03)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are the percentages.

From Table 17 it is evident that the work of the interns and mentors is fairly well distributed across the days of the week; some activity occurs on weekends as well.

From Table 18 it is evident that interns and mentors had similar distributions of activity instance starting times across the school day, with the heaviest periods occurring in the mornings. Both groups reported some activity instances late after the school day or in the evenings.

Forms of activities. In most instances, the mentor-intern pairs were free to select their own forms of activities. Nine categories were inductively developed from the WRI responses to code the forms of activites actually used. The categories are as follows:

- mentor observing the intern,
- intern observing the mentor,
- observing others (teachers, classes, schools, and so on),
- performing as teacher (team teaching, conducting field trips, going on home visits, and so on),
- engaging in scheduled events (workshops, meetings, seminars, conferences, or interviews--local, state, or national),
- preparing for teaching, planning, or reviewing materials,
- completing paperwork,
- holding discussions or conversations either on a regular or episodic basis, and
- traveling between sites.

Table 19 displays the distribution of the activity instances of the mentors and interns across these forms. The single most frequent form of activity was simply holding discussions or having conversations. It would seem that much of the work the

Table 19
Forms of Activities

Activity Forms	Interns	Mentors
mentor observing the intern	71 (.06)	92 (.07)
intern observing the mentor	54 (.05)	77 (.06)
observing others	41 (.04)	18 (.01)
performing as a teacher	46 (.04)	81 (.07)
engaging in scheduled events	184 (.16)	155 (.13)
preparing for teaching	115 (.10)	140 (.11)
completing paperwork	54 (.05)	70 (.06)
holding discussions or conversations	549 (.49)	554 (.45)
traveling between sites	6 (.01)	34 (.03)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are the percentages.

mentors and interns had planned together could be accomplished through this form. Engaging in scheduled events such as workshops, seminars or conferences, was the second most frequent form for both interns and mentors, followed by preparing for teaching. These three forms of activities accounted for nearly three-quarters of their reported activity instances. But observations, either mentor of intern or intern of mentor, or of another teacher, together also comprised a substantial portion of the reported activity instances.

Participants in activites. While the interns and mentors were provided released time to work together, it was not intended that all the time spent would be on a one-to-one basis. The intern

might sometimes work alone, or other persons might engage with the mentor and intern in their efforts. Ten categories of participants were derived from the WRI responses:

- self alone,
- intern and mentor,
- other mentor(s),
- other intern(s),
- other teacher(s),
- principal, supervisor, or department chairperson,
- intern and mentor and other teacher(s),
- intern and mentor and student(s),
- others, and
- substitute teacher(s).

Table 20 summarizes the percent of activity instances in which various participants were involved. Most of the instances involved the mentors and interns together, and in a fair percent of the time with students. Other persons, such as consultants or specialists also worked with mentors and interns about a sixth or a fifth of the time respectively. In one-tenth of the instances, interns worked alone; the mentors worked alone in slightly more instances.

Table 20
Activity Participants

Participants	Interns	Mentors
self alone	118 (.10)	160 (.13)
intern and mentor	525 (.47)	580 (.47)
other mentor(s)	1 (.00)	5 (.00)
other intern(s)	34 (.03)	5 (.00)
other teacher(s)	16 (.01)	12 (.01)
principal, supervisor, or department chairperson	18 (.02)	26 (.02)
intern, mentor and other teacher(s)	20 (.02)	40 (.03)
intern, mentor and student(s)	157 (.14)	215 (.18)
others	216 (.19)	157 (.13)
substitute teacher(s)	15 (.01)	21 (.02)

Note. The numbers in parentheses are the percentages.

Foci of activities. It is important to understand toward what matters the efforts of the mentors and interns were directed. Five broad foci were developed inductively from the WRI responses. Each broad focus has several sub-foci which help illustrate it more particularly.

Curriculum

- understanding the content to be taught,
- gearing content to appropriate student level; narrowing or focusing content,
- understanding curriculum guides,
- planning new curriculum, and
- understanding a new or special program offered locally.

Instruction

- understanding particular methods (for example, using basal readers, inquiry methods, lecture or discussion methods, learning centers, science laboratory, cooperative learning strategies),
- using particular instructional skills (for example, questioning, giving clear directions, using audio-visual aids, individualizing instruction),
- understanding and planning for lessons and parts thereof (objectives, activities, preparation of materials, evaluation),
- understanding lesson delivery (pacing, orchestration, involvement of students),
- reviewing student work and tests, and
- grading, completing report cards, conducting parent conferences on students.

Management

- establishing routines or procedures,
- understanding methods of discipline, and
- dealing with particular discipline incidents.

Organizational Matters

- understanding school organization (for example, hierarchy of authority, school policies),
- understanding procedures within the school (ordering materials, securing and inventorying equipment, using student records, budget planning),
- understanding and participating in school events (for example, holiday parties, school fairs, field trips and extra-curricular activities),
- understanding and forming associations with other faculty members,
- understanding professional organizations and professional concerns; attending conferences,

- o arranging for substitutes, and
- o participating in the mentor-intern project.

Personal Matters

- o establishing friendships,
- o managing personal time,
- o developing a sense of self-as-teacher, and
- o other matters.

Table 21 displays the distribution of activity instances reported

Table 21
Foci of Activities

Focus	Interns	Mentors
Curriculum	73 (.07)	60 (.05)
understanding content	12 (.01)	7 (.01)
gearing content	14 (.01)	16 (.01)
understanding curriculum guides	12 (.01)	7 (.01)
planning new curriculum	5 (.00)	4 (.00)
understanding special program	30 (.03)	26 (.02)
Instruction	552 (.49)	511 (.42)
understanding methods	240 (.21)	204 (.17)
using particular skills	39 (.03)	50 (.04)
understanding or planning lessons	103 (.09)	96 (.08)
understanding lesson delivery	29 (.03)	30 (.02)
reviewing student work	67 (.06)	68 (.06)
grading and parent conferences	74 (.07)	63 (.05)
Management	47 (.04)	62 (.05)
establishing routines	14 (.01)	21 (.02)
understanding methods of discipline	13 (.01)	21 (.02)
dealing with particular incidents	20 (.02)	20 (.02)

Table 21, continued.

Organizational Matters	362	(.32)	504	(.41)
understanding school organization	41	(.04)	60	(.05)
understanding school procedures	67	(.06)	46	(.04)
participating in school events	43	(.04)	63	(.05)
forming associations with other faculty	10	(.01)	27	(.02)
understanding professional organizations and concerns	44	(.04)	70	(.06)
arranging for substitutes	4	(.00)	5	(.00)
participating in the mentor-intern project	153	(.14)	233	(.19)
Personal Matters	86	(.08)	82	(.07)
establishing friendships	21	(.02)	35	(.03)
managing personal time	8	(.01)	3	(.00)
developing sense of self-as-teacher	29	(.03)	21	(.02)
other matters	28	(.02)	23	(.02)

by the mentors and interns across the various foci and sub-foci. Instruction was the focus of activities in almost half the instances reported by interns, with organizational matters comprising about a third. Four-fifths of the mentors' activities were about equally given to instruction and organizational matters, with curriculum, management, and personal matters comprising the balance. In order to understand how or whether the focus of the interns' and mentors' work changed over the course of the year, the distribution of activity instances across the months was studied. Tables 22 and 23 display these distributions. Though the percentages do change across the several months, the changes are not readily interpretable. It is

Table 22
Changes in the Foci of Intern Activities across Several Months

	Month					
	Dec (n=181)	Jan (n=197)	Feb (n=139)	Mar (n=207)	Apr (n=121)	May (n=162)
Main Focus						
Curriculum	.08	.05	.11	.05	.11	.03
Instruction	.60	.50	.42	.52	.57	.40
Management	.05	.04	.07	.06	.02	.02
Organizational Matters	.23	.37	.34	.31	.23	.43
Personal Matters	.04	.04	.06	.05	.07	.11

Note. Percentages for June have been omitted from the analysis because of the small number of responses for that month.

Table 23
Changes in the Foci of Mentor Activities across Several Months

	Months					
Main Focus	Dec (n=202)	Jan (n=194)	Feb (n=156)	Mar (n=212)	Apr (n=159)	May (n=188)
Curriculum	.10	.05	.06	.02	.02	.07
Instruction	.45	.44	.40	.43	.38	.40
Management	.08	.08	.05	.06	.02	.01
Organizational Matters	.35	.41	.47	.43	.45	.42
Personal Matters	.02	.03	.02	.05	.13	.10

Note. Percentages for June have been omitted from the analysis because of the small number of responses for that month.

not clear whether the changes represent a pattern or are more the result of chance error in the analysis.

Continuing the relationship. The interns and mentors were asked, late in the pilot year, to look ahead and speculate about whether the relationships they had formed would likely continue. The majority of both sets of respondents projected that their relationship would continue. Interns and mentors frequently wrote about the deep sense of trust and caring that had developed in their relationships; some wrote that they were "comfortable" and "easy" and "open" with one another. Importantly they felt a mutual respect. More than a few wrote that their relationships were both professional and personal--that good friendships had developed. These characteristics, they believed would form the basis of what several interns hoped would be years of working together.

Several mentors and interns were careful to point out that their future relationships would be as "peers" and "colleagues." One mentor wrote about the intern needing to be "independent," and one intern wrote of "weaning" herself from her mentor. But none saw these goals as precluding the interns continuing to have many questions and to seek advice of the mentors. Indeed, a few of the mentors and interns projected that they would be working together over the summer to help the interns get ready for the second year. One intern wrote that the mentor would be available in the early months of the second year, since in the pilot year, the getting started routines were over before the project began.

A good number of both mentors and interns tied their continuing relationships to work they would be doing together in

the second year: in the same program, in the same content area or grade level team, on a special project in which they were both involved. Some expected to team teach for part of the year, and one intern wrote that a "team" had formed among the mentor and two interns, which was expected to be a source of continuing support. Another intern wrote hopefully of how such a team might also include other teachers. And in at least one project, the interns and mentors were "working to see that their schedules coincided in the second year, so that they could continue to work together:

> There seems to be consensus that after all the work and benefits which come from being a part of the program, it would be senseless not to continue. We would like to see time scheduled for teachers to get coverage for a class (perhaps once a week) to observe peers teaching and for conferences. I feel no matter how long one has been in the profession, it is important to keep communication open with colleagues.

In a number of responses, mentors and interns indicated that their relationships would likely continue, but on the informal basis which, for many of them, had existed before the project got underway. They seemed to value this prospect as well.

The chief impediment to continuing the relationship was being in separate buildings. Both mentors and interns pointed to this as making communication difficult; telephone and district mail systems would be used, but face-to-face discussions would only occur at district-wide meetings or when severe problems arose for the interns. The lack of time would further impede the relationship, even with former mentor-intern pairs in the same building.

Where the interns and mentors were most doubtful about the relationship continuing was when the mentors were retiring or the interns were leaving the districts (usually relocating or being excessed). But even in these circumstances there was an occasional hope expressed: the mentor teacher retired would still be available by phone; the mentor is interested in the excessed intern's job hunt and will continue to offer advice; and the mentor and intern would keep in touch in the event support was needed. Clearly, in many of the responses, interns were interested in continuing the relationship and confident that their mentors would be willing to do so. Mentors showed themselves also interested, and available to the interns when needed. In only a few instances did the mentors or interns indicate an unwillingness to continue the relationship, pointing to some conflict between them, or the general sense that it would be better not to do so.

Problems Encountered by the Interns and Mentors

The interns and mentors were asked to describe the biggest problems they encountered during the course of the project year. The great majority of the respondents reported some problems although they were sometimes qualified as relatively minor, or outweighed by the perceived benefit of the projects. A small number of mentors and interns reported that they had no problems.

The three most frequently cited and among the most frustrating problems were often inter-related:

- o not having enough time to do all that needs to be done,

- o scheduling of released time so that mentors and interns could work together, and
- o finding, orienting, and working with substitute or substitute or replacement teachers.

Mentors and interns set plans for working together that often required more time than was available through the released time of the project. The fact that mentors were often also involved in a number of other local projects or activities exacerbated the shortage of time. Even though interns were released from one-fifth of their instructional responsibilities, they still often reported not having enough time to dc all the work they wanted or needed to accomplish. Some mentors and interns reported spending hours after school working together, and long hours into the evening catching up on the paper grading or planning that did not get finished during the school day.

When schedules could not be set or adjusted such that mentors and interns could meet in a timely manner, their problems with time were worsened. One intern reported, "... we meet every day for a half-hour.., hardly getting started before it is time to get back to class." Some reported that the schedule made it impossible for observations to be followed by discussion or debriefing; when interns could not talk about the observations until the next day or several days later, they understandably felt that the experience was not fresh in their minds and important issues were lost or forgotten. Some interns and mentors in separate buildings reported losing time in travel (one reported having to drive 78 miles for each visit), building

schedules that did not match well, and less frequent contact because of the difficulties of scheduling and travelling.

Arrangements for released time for many mentors and interns also required planning for, working with, or recouping from substitute or replacement teachers. When good coverage teachers could be found, this became less of a concern; but for more than a few it was a continuing problem which consumed time intended for work between mentors and interns. As described in Part Two, in some cases, the coverage teachers became "second interns" for the mentors or, more positively, became part of the mentor-intern "team."

Time problems were exacerbated by some requirements of the projects. Needing to complete paperwork, including local and state project evaluation forms, was cited by a number of respondents. Project meetings, sometimes scheduled at the last minute or in conflict with other scheduled events also left mentors and interns frustrated. Finally, in at least one project, videotaping the classes and keeping daily logs "for the local project coordinator" were cited as time consuming tasks.

A series of problems that some respondents tied to the pilot nature of the project were described. Many pointed to the late start up of their local projects, and regretted not having a full year to work together. One intern said the project "never really took off." Relatedly, a number of mentors and interns reported that as the project got started, there was less direction and guidance from the project planners or administrators than would

have been helpful; some felt that they lost time while they were trying to infer what their roles should be, or until the mechanics of released time arrangements were set.

Though most mentors and many interns seemed not to need direction regarding how they could or should work together, there was a sense of disorganization at the local level. This disorganization was most frustrating when it resulted in lack of support from administrators and other teachers. One intern reported that she/he repeatedly had to explain to fellow teachers that she/he was not a "student teacher" but a "real teacher." A few teachers--mentors and interns--reported that other teachers were jealous of their released time, and other teachers perceived the opportunities to attend conferences as "perks." One intern reported being scorned by veteran teachers who themselves never had the help of mentors. Administrators who did not like the project or would not cooperate in the mechanics of scheduling were also a source of frustration. One respondent reported the perception that the local teacher association, though having signed-off on the proposal, was really fighting the project. All of these types of problems, respondents felt, could be resolved, if the purposes and activities of the project were described at the beginning of the year in local meetings and support was generated.

A small number of mentors and interns pointed to problems generated by the match between them. Personality clashes, or mis-matches of grade level and/or content areas were problematic

for some. One intern felt that though working with the mentor had been productive, it began awkwardly since no one introduced them to each other. A mentor reinforced this notion, citing a need to overcome "a lack of common experiences at the start" of the relationship. Another intern who felt the relationship was productive also harbored the doubt that the mentor was doing this work freely; she/he emphasized that mentors really need to be "volunteers." A number of interns pointed out that they would have valued forming closer relationships with other interns, in addition to their work with the mentors. Finally, one mentor reported the "problem" she was having trying to distinquish between what was simply his/her "personality and style" and what were actually markers of good teaching generally; having such a distinction clearly in mind would have helped in his/her work with the intern.

More than a few mentors and interns cited time away from teaching as an important problem. Concern about students' achievement, and about placing students in circumstances where they had to adjust to ever-changing substitute teachers were expressed by the respondents. Teachers again noted the difficulties of planning for the substitutes, and of recouping lost time and forgotten management practices when they returned to their classrooms. Such concerns were also expressed by parents and administrators, which heightened further the mentors' and interns' awareness of the issue.

A range of problems were cited by only one or two

respondents. Though they were not commonly cited, it is useful to note several of them here, since they may alert others to the potential and reinforce statements made elsewhere in the report:

- o finding a space for the mentor and interns to meet without constant interruption,
- o developing a means by which the mentor and intern can evaluate their work together; some feedback mechanisms on the work of the mentor-intern pair,
- o some local participants assuming a directive role over others without authority to do so,
- o informing new teachers of their participation in the project as interns when they are hired; encouraging interns to be receptive to working with their mentors,
- o wanting the mentor to give more direct feedback, even criticism, as a reality check for the intern,
- o having to switch mentors or interns in mid-year, leading to a sense of having lost the relationship in which an investment had been made, and
- o the mentor having too many interns to work with.

In describing the problems they had encountered, mentors and interns often noted which ones had been addressed and resolved, and which ones had not. Some problems they felt would not extend beyond the pilot year, or would diminish after more experience with the concept and workings of mentoring in education. Other problems they felt were to be expected because of the nature of teaching and school organization; these problems would need to be addressed each time the project began. With changes in teaching or school organization, some of these persistent problems might diminish or disappear.

Finally, it is useful to note that relatively few

respondents pointed to established mechanisms for addressing problems. Most noted that problems were addressed as they arose, usually through discussions or confrontations with the parties involved. However, in one project, bi-weekly meetings were held--presumably involving mentors, interns, local project coordinators, and possibly administrators--to talk about how the work of the mentors and interns was progressing and to identify and address problems that may have been encountered. Respondents felt that this mechanism was useful for such a purpose.

Part Four. The Impact of the Projects

Of interest to all participants and observers of the New York State MT-I Program is the matter of the impact of the projects. Simply put, people want to know if the MT-I Program "worked." But like any complex and sustained educational opportunity, no simple answer to such a query satisfies, nor does it likely represent the facts well.

The evaluatic Study Questions assumed that the MT-I Program, when enacted through a set of projects, would have an impact on the intern teachers for whom it was designed. There was, as well, a potential for having impact on the mentor teachers and the school organizations. To understand whether the MT-I Program "worked," it would be necessary to extend the documentation to at least these other levels. Thus the matter was pursued.

The documentation of impact is based largely on the responses of the participants to open-ended questions on Focused Logs and the survey of principals and supervisors. While some readers might question the value of self-report data in determining effect, it can reasonably be argued, to the contrary, that people's perceptions are by and large the basis of their actions. For them, what they have perceived <u>is</u> their reality; what they report, others may accept and use as the basis of their

own decisions and actions. Thus, in this study, it was deemed important to summarize what the participants themselves saw as the impact of the projects.

In addition, an effort was made to provide a basis for discussing the relative value for a beginning teacher of participating in a mentor-intern project. Toward this end, the Beginning Teacher Views of Self (BTVoS) Questionnaire was developed and administered to interns and to a comparison group of beginning teachers, as described in Part One. Because of uncertainty about the quality of the instrument as a measure, the results of this data collection must be viewed cautiously. It may, however, point to areas of impact that can be pursued more directly in the future.

Part Four is organized into three sections: impact on the interns, impact on the mentors, and impact on the school organizations.

Impact on the Interns

The great majority of intern teachers who responded to the questions posed, pointed to a positive or very positive impact participating in the projects had on them. Consider this extended response offered by one intern:

> Working with a mentor has had a tremendous impact on my professional life. From the first week of school, I never felt like an outsider or a newcomer. I never went any substantial length of time without knowing something or feeling too "new" to belong. My mentor always made sure that I was well informed and up to date with everything. Having a mentor did not interfere with getting close to the rest of the faculty. I was able to develop a fantastic rapport and many

> close friendships with other faculty members as well. In fact, many other teachers were extremely interested in the program and I had many lengthy discussions about it with them. Having a mentor was wonderful for boosting my self-confidence. Even when I knew I was doing something wrong--and my mentor knew also--she always had a very special way of letting me know it was all right to make mistakes and there were some things I could never learn from someone else. (It would take years of my own experience!) Finally, having a mentor stimulated me to want to help someone with less experience than myself. I found myself always helping the student teachers, new substitutes, and some first year teachers. I loved giving helpful hints and advice from my own experience. It made me feel like I could be a mentor myself to someone....

Another intern pointed to an increased capacity to be self-analytic and solve problems:

> My level of confidence has risen in regard to working with staff, administration, students and parents. My mentor has helped me identify my strengths and has shown me ways in which to channel them most effectively. She has also, helped me to see areas in which I could improve. I have lost that initial fear and have become more self-critical and am able to evaluate myself when problems arise. I am able to eliminate so many problems now. I feel more confident as a teacher and I am able to identify my very own teaching style and put it to good use!

These responses point to several areas of impact that other interns also noted: growth of self-confidence, introduction to the faculty and school procedures, a lessening of a sense of isolation, and a growing sense of accomplishment. Another intern responded in this manner:

> I believe that the program has had a positive effect on my professional life in the respect that I have learned to share and exchange ideas and lesson plans and materials. Being a "beginner" is no longer embarrassing, intimidating or a cause of isolation.

These interns pointed to knowledge they gained through working with their mentors, and displayed an interest in learning more, and an openness to working in collegial relationships with other teachers.

> I have become more knowledgeable about school procedures, specific tests and materials, dealing with parents. I feel more self-confident and have even shared my new "expertise" with others. My mentor has become a friend and valued colleague with whom to share insights and reactions to articles, professional materials, etc.

A few interns felt that they had learned more quickly because of having the experienced mentor to call upon. One reported simply, "I've learned a lot in a short period of time; this has built my self-confidence as a teacher." But another addressed the same point more elaborately:

> I have learned faster those things that would have taken a while to figure out: information sources for curriculum enrichment, social rules' of the 'pecking order' in the school building & district,..

and another:

> It has given me a sounding board and a chance to develop as a teacher without feeling alone. Art teachers are often isolated in a school. With having a mentor the feelings of isolation do not exist. My mentor has provided me with an insight into the administration and viewpoints of my district that would have taken me 20 years to discover. I feel that this program has helped my professional life through exposure within my district and to other districts. This program has been a true facilitator to educational sharing.

Some interns credited their mentors with providing important moral support:

> After returning to teaching, I needed the reassurance given me by my mentor. I had been away from the profession for over ten years and was unsure of myself after such a long absence. My mentor gave me the boost I needed!

One intern's response suggests that having a mentor made the difference in the completing the first year of teaching:

> I did not know much of anything or what was expected of me. To have that one special person always be there for everything, has been a god-send to me! Working with my mentor has given me the strength to carry on both personally and professionally. She has been a professional in the...field who has been through it before. She has lent me much support! I honestly feel that if I did not have her all year, I would not have made it alone! She has always made me realize that you cannot be a super person and conquer everything in one year!!

While no others were so direct in such an attribution, many comments suggest that the mentors played an important sustaining role in the interns' careers.

Perhaps the impact of the project is most simply stated as one intern wrote (a bit awkwardly):

> Has been a great help in getting me established as a teacher. The obligation I have to be a good teacher (even in the first year) was made possible by this program.

Clearly, these interns, who together represent the great majority of the respondents, felt that participating in the mentor-intern projects had a positive impact on their experience as beginning teachers.

But not all of the responding interns felt that the impact had been positive. One intern reported a mixed review:

> Sometimes working with a mentor was a real hassle. There were times when a mentor only

> wanted me to do things his way, instead of letting me try things my way (a new way). Sometimes working with a mentor was a large relief! At times my mentor really was an invaluable help.

And a few others are represented by the very modest endorsement of this intern:

> In some instances, it has been an immediate source of help. Other than that, the "mentorship" has been pleasant but not necessarily helpful.

Decidedly negative impact was reported by a handful of respondents. (Perhaps, others who also felt the projects had a negative impact on them chose not to respond, leaving this point of view underrepresented in the data.) Consider these responses:

> It has made me push myself to explore new tests, procedures. My mentor has not really served any purpose for me. It was time consuming. I have yet to talk to someone who enjoys the program!

and,

> I don't think it has made an effect on my professional life at all. My mentor appreciates her time away from her class. There are other teachers in the building who resent us for being selected in the program.

and,

> Little impact as defined by program activities. It has been helpful to know that someone is there who is designated to answer questions, however.
> It has taken a great deal of mentor's time. Others in school are jealous or resentful, often due to increased release time for interns or more monies available for activities. Administration doesn't even seem aware of program.

One final, extended description is offered here to point to the extent of the feeling generated by a negative experience:

> I would say "it stinks!!!!!!" My mentor is not well liked by anyone in the school I work in. I

> have heard such comments throughout the year: "I feel sorry for you," "I'll bet you can't wait until next year," etc., when I have discussed the mentor program with common collegues of my mentor and myself. My outlook in the first month of the program was very positive towards this program because I am an uncertified teacher and I really wanted the extra help. However, I quickly realized no matter what question was asked I was either put down, laughed at, sneered at, or she took a condescending approach. I then resented being forced to work with my mentor and formed my own chain of people who would answer my questions honestly, candidly and without making me feel below the curb in the street! This may sound like an exaggeration but this questionnaire is about the only time anyone in the whole program has asked my opinion of my mentor within the... administration. I have tried relentlessly to be relieved from the program since November, but here I am gritting my teeth waiting for June. I didn't tell anyone in...the real reason of my hating this program for the fear as a first-year teacher of being labeled as "difficult" or not trying hard enough with my surrounding collegues. It has been a sticky issue all the way around. As you can see, I have a lot of bound up frustration but I love my class and will return next year (as long as I am <u>out</u> of the mentor program).

Clearly, these interns felt that the project had little positive impact on them, and had actually created problems which they had to confront. In several cases, but not all, these interns also indicated that in the coming year they expected to divorce themselves from their mentors and projects, some by leaving the districts or buildings in which they had been teaching. Though these individuals seem to comprise a minority of the interns, that does not diminish the importance of their experiences, particularly for them and their associates. One might conclude that for these new teachers, the MT-I Program "did not work." But with only a relative few interns reporting a negative impact,

it isn't possible to identify generalizable reasons for or correlate factors of their experiences. While their own words speak loudly about their sense of the problems, much more needs to be known about such developments.

Beginning Teacher Views of Self data. A second way of understanding the impact of the projects on the interns is provided by reviewing the BTVoS Questionnaire data. (For convenience, a brief description of the BTVoS Questionnaire is repeated from Part One.) The Questionnaire attempted to have intern teachers describe themselves on a series of 28 items. The items were drawn from the literature on beginning teachers, and include matters on which new teachers have reported changes in their views of themselves over the course of the early part of their careers. For each item, respondents were asked to place themselves on a seven point continuum on which three points were identified:

1
2 = I am just beginning to look at this matter
3
4 = I have made substantial progress on this matter
5
6 = I have developed this matter into one of my strengths
7

Respondents were also asked to indicate, in their judgments, how many years of teaching experience they brought to their internship year.

The BTVoS Questionnaire was first administered to the intern teachers in early March, and once again in May. Concurrent with the second mailing, the BTVoS Questionnaire was mailed to a

randomly selected group of beginning teachers from around the state who were not participants in the MT-I Program.

Table 24 displays the 28 items and the mean responses for the two administrations of the BTVoS Questionnaire for interns, and the one administrative for the comparison group. From this table it is evident that on almost every item, intern teachers progressed toward a point of greater strength. This apparent progress must be qualified by the knowledge that the March and May intern respondent groups can be considered only roughly equivalent. Contrasting the May intern scores with the comparison group, it is evident that on almost every item the interns report greater strength than the comparison group teachers.

Table 24
Mean Responses for Three Administrations of the BTVoS Questionnaire

BTVoS Item	Intern Teacher Group Mar (n=87)	Intern Teacher Group May (n=114)	Comparison Teacher Group May (n=101)
1. I know how to use the curriculum guides for my content area(s) which are available in my district.	4.2	4.8	3.7
2. I know and use a variety of instructional methods appropriate to the content area(s) I teach.	4.6	5.2	5.0

Table 24, continued.

3. I can sequence activities such that student learning is maximized.	4.4	5.0	4.6
4. I have identified individual differences among my students and adjust for those differences in my planning and teaching.	4.8	5.2	5.0
5. I can pace my lessons so that students are neither overwhelmed nor bored.	4.4	5.2	4.7
6. I can adjust a lesson in the midst of teaching it if I feel it is appropriate to do so.	5.3	5.7	5.4
7. I teach in such a way that students do participate or perform as I would like them to.	4.9	5.3	4.9
8. I am well organized for carrying out my work efficiently and effectively.	4.9	5.5	5.2
9. My daily planning consistently results in lessons which turn out the way I intended them to.	4.7	5.1	4.6
10. I can make reasonably accurate judgment about the progress my students are making.	4.9	5.5	5.0
11. I use several different techniques to evaluate my own teaching.	3.6	4.6	3.8
12. I have established a good rapport with my students, as individuals and as a group.	5.9	6.0	5.9

Table 24, continued.

13. I use management skills which make good use of time and other resources, minimize interruptions, and keep students engaged.	4.6	5.2	4.8
14. I have established class routines which students understand and follow.	5.2	5.7	5.5
15. I have established expectations for students' behavior that they understand and respond to.	5.2	5.5	5.2
16. I discipline students in ways that I feel are appropriate and effective.	5.1	5.5	5.1
17. I understand the general procedures (e.g., attendance taking; classroom materials; supplies acquisition; filling out district forms) used in the building(s) in which I teach.	5.5	6.0	5.4
18. I feel like I have found a place for myself with the faculty and staff in the building(s) in which I teach.	5.6	5.	5.3
19. I know where to turn in the school(s) when I need to resolve problems.	5.8	5.9	5.2
20. I feel comfortable in approaching and working with other teachers, the school administrators, and other staff.	5.8	5.7	5.3
21. I feel I am part of the district as well as my school.	5.0	5.0	4.6

Table 24, continued.

22. I feel comfortable in exchanging ideas with the people with whom I work.	5.8	5.8	5.3
23. I am a participant in the profession (through organizations and associations) which enhances my work and sense of self.	4.3	4.7	4.1
24. I manage well the demands of teaching along with the demands of my personal life.	4.6	5.0	4.7
25. I see that teaching is work through which I can express myself.	5.3	5.5	5.4
26. I see that as a teacher, I will be able to make an important contribution to society.	5.6	5.7	5.6
27. Teaching has enhanced my sense of self.	5.5	5.6	5.4
28. Through my efforts, I can enhance the quality of the school and district in which I teach.	5.4	5.4	5.3
Teaching Experience	---	2.1 yrs	1.3 yrs

Note. Mean scores are based on a 7 point scale.

Because the intern teacher group averaged almost a year more of reported teaching experience, the data of the May administrations were re-sorted by years of experience for the first three years. Table 25 displays this data. On nearly every item, the intern teacher group reporting 0 years of prior

teaching experience reports similar or greater progress than the comparison group teachers. For those reporting 1 year of prior teaching experience, the result is the same. For those reporting 2 years of prior teaching experience, the results, while still generally favoring the intern group, are more mixed. (While Table 25 does not display the data for teachers with three or more years of reported prior experience, it should be noted here that in that data, the differences between the two groups diminished further to a point where the groups seemed not to be distinguishable.)

Table 25
Mean Responses for the BTVoS Questionnaire by Years of Experience

BTVoS Item	Intern Teacher Group Years of Experience 0 (n=27)	1 (n=29)	2 (n=14)	Comparison Teacher Group Years of Experience 0 (n=39)	1 (n=29)	2 (n=16)
1. I know how to use the curriculum guides for my content area(s) which are available in my district.	4.3	4.8	4.8	3.3	3.5	4.1
2. I know and use a variety of instructional methods appropriate to the content area(s) I teach.	5.3	5.1	5.3	4.8	4.8	5.5

Table 25, continued.

3. I can sequence activities such that student learning is maximized.	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.9
4. I have identified individual differences among my students and adjust for those differences in my planning and teaching.	5.3	4.8	5.4	5.2	4.9	4.5
5. I can pace my lessons so that students are neither overwhelmed nor bored.	5.2	5.2	4.9	4.5	4.5	5.3
6. I can adjust a lesson in the midst of teaching it if I feel it is appropriate to do so.	5.5	5.5	5.9	5.5	5.2	5.3
7. I teach in such a way that students do participate or perform as I would like them to.	5.4	5.1	5.1	4.7	4.8	5.1
8. I am well organized for carrying out my work efficiently and effectively.	5.3	5.4	5.7	4.7	5.4	5.7
9. My daily planning consistently results in lessons which turn out the way I intended them to.	5.2	5.1	5.1	4.4	4.5	5.2

Table 25, continued.

10. I can make reasonably accurate judgment about the progress my students are making.	5.4	5.2	5.6	5.2	4.6	5.1
11. I use several different techniques to evaluate my own teaching.	4.4	4.2	4.8	3.3	3.7	4.0
12. I have established a good rapport with my students, as individuals and as a group.	6.0	6.2	6.1	6.1	5.7	5.7
13. I use management skills which make good use of time and other resources, minimize interruptions, and keep students engaged.	5.0	5.4	5.1	4.5	4.9	4.9
14. I have established class routines which students understand and follow.	5.6	5.9	5.9	5.1	5.7	5.8
15. I have established expectations for students' behavior that they understand and respond to.	5.4	5.7	5.7	5.0	5.2	5.3
16. I discipline students in ways that I feel are appropriate and effective.	5.4	5.[illegible]	5.5	4.9	5.0	5.1

Table 25, continued.

17. I understand the general procedures (e.g., attendance taking; classroom materials; supplies acquisition; filling out district forms) used in the building(s) in which I teach.	6.0	6.1	5.6	5.0	5.3	6.1
18. I feel like I have found a place for myself with the faculty and staff in the building(s) in which I teach.	5.6	6.3	5.6	5.6	4.9	5.1
19. I know where to turn in the school(s) when I need to resolve problems.	5.5	6.1	5.4	5.4	4.6	5.2
20. I feel comfortable in approaching and working with other teachers, the school administrators, and other staff.	5.5	6.3	5.9	5.5	4.8	5.4
21. I feel I am part of the district as well as my school.	5.0	5.4	4.9	4.9	4.2	4.3
22. I feel comfortable in exchaning ideas with the people with whom I work.	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.5	4.9	5.9

Table 25, continued.

23. I am participant in the profession (through organizations and associations) which enhances my work and sense of self.	4.2	4.8	4.4	4.1	4.0	4.1
24. I manage well the demands of teaching along with the demands of my personal life.	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.5	4.8	4.7
25. I see that teaching is work through which I can express myself.	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.5	5.1	5.7
26. I see that as a teacher, I will be able to make an important contribution to society.	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.5	5.3	5.7
27. Teaching has enhanced my sense of self.	5.8	5.7	5.6	5.3	5.2	5.7
28. Through my efforts, I can enhance the quality of the school and district in which I teach.	5.5	5.5	5.2	5.2	4.9	5.6

Note. Mean scores are based on a 7 point scale.

No tests for significance seemed warranted for this first use of the BTVoS Questionnaire. Rather, the data are offered at face value for what they might suggest regarding the impact of participating in projects on intern teachers.

Impact on the Mentors

The mentor teachers were asked to describe what impact, if any, participating in the projects had on them. As with the interns, the great majority of the respondents pointed to positive effects, the most frequently cited being the challenge of re-examining philosophies, practices, and one's own experience as a stepping stone to helping the interns:

> It has made me more aware of my own teaching philosophy and techniques. There has been more introspective reflection. I have re-examined certain "habits" of my own--reviewed my videotapes, and attended workshops.

This type of reflection led many mentors to develop a greater appreciation for the complexity of good teaching and the skills they had already aquired:

> Helped me examine what I do and why I do what I do when I teach. Made me realize how much I've learned, how much I still could learn. Made me realize how complex effective teaching is. Got me interested in finding out/learning skills to help other people learn to teach.

And,

> I have never thought of, evaluating my own methods (instructional, clerical, etc.) in terms of what really "works" before. I've come to a new awareness about what is truly efficacious--and have had no compunction about passing these things along to the next generation of teachers.

Several mentors pointed to a broadening of the understanding of teaching, as reflected in this comment:

> To observe the positive results that came about from the variety of teaching techniques employed by the interns was a humbling experience. This removed some of my own rigid approaches.

And several mentors noted that their participation provided them

with opportunities to learn, and suggested areas in which they could learn more.

> It has provided a very positive and rewarding experience of growth and renewal. (I knew I could still improve; I now know the direction.)

And,

> I feel the program has made me much more aware of my own performance on a daily basis, not just when interns are observing. As I had hoped, initially, it has made me keep current in matters relating to my field in general and has stimulated research into areas that I do not usually deal with due to intern needs.

Sharing ideas and learning about fresh approaches to the practice of teaching was the second most frequently cited positive impact on the mentors.

> I found the sharing of ideas has been very rewarding. Working with someone just out of school brings fresh ideas and new approaches.

And,

> An exchange of ideas has allowed me to re-evaluate my lessons. Also her techniques (have) allowed me to implement different strategies.

The self-examination and stimulation of new ideas led a good number of the mentors to report that they were themselves actually better teachers:

> Knowing that I was being observed daily and looked to for sound advice raised my awareness of what it is I do. Every lesson became a model. I was labeling the devices I use to cope with different situations so we could have a frame of reference when discussing them.

And,

> Observation provides an opportunity to be an objective viewer of teaching techniques (good and poor). Subsequently this identification results in discussions, "What works?" "what doesn't?"

> "Why?" Then follows all the "shoulds" and "should nots" for effective teaching. Finally, how could a mentor avoid "practicing what she/he has been preaching"? Perhaps I, too, became a better teacher!

Realization that years of experience in teaching led to the development of valued skills was a source of gratification to many mentors:

> I feel that I have been rejuvenated in the process of teaching and surprised at many of the skills that I take for granted are greatly appreciated.

And,

> It's kept me on my toes and more enthusiastic. It reminds me why my strategies have developed a long the lines they have (discipline problem prevention). It's made me feel validated--someone thinks I'm doing my job correctly and someone thinks I might have good advice.

It was also gratifying to watch the intern develop and affirm commitments to teaching with the assistance provided. Being told that one has contributed to the development of others provides strong reward:

> I love being a mentor. I want to be a mentor again and again. I love working with an adult. It's an extension of myself. I am interested in being part of this program and perhaps on a greater scale in the future...has told many, many people in the district, including administrators how much I have helped her get through this year. People have come up to me personally to let me know. When the younger colleages in my department heard that I was a mentor, their response to me was "how lucky" my intern was. They were sorry that the program was not in effect when they were hired.

Several mentors felt that their participation in the projects had reduced their sense of isolation. One mentor stated

that she/he had grown closer to another mentor. For some it created a stronger colleague group:

> It has allowed a feeling of collegiality to develop among mentors and interns very intentionally, and that feels right and wonderful. We want more!!!

Others pointed to an increased visibility in their districts: "It has provided me with a marked increase in the professional respect accorded me by my colleagues." And a few combined this recognition with their own greater appreciation of the larger issues of the districts and projects:

> Because of discussions and evaluations with members of the district, such as administration, union officers and delegates. I can get a better view of the operation of the school district, which I found to be interesting. These people also got to know me better than they would have, had I not been in this position. Getting involved, as such, hopefully is beneficial for all participants.

A number of mentors stated that their participation in the projects gave them access to resources and opportunities like conferences that they would otherwise not have had. This in some cases made them feel "special." Having access to resources and working with the interns, for many mentors, provided the opportunity for renewed enthusiasm and rejuvenation:

> My intern was straight out of college and full of enthusiasm. It was like a transfusion to me after 14 years in the field. It also made me stretch myself a little in regard to record keeping. Somethings that I preach but don't always practice have now improved.

And,

> A sense of renewal of the excitement felt in my own early days of teaching.

For many of the mentors, the impact seems related to an enhanced understanding of teaching as a profession and a sense of professional worth:

> It has made me more professional, and I have seen the profession through the eyes of younger people just starting out. I have been more reflective about my own past experiences and how I would like the teaching profession to change.

And,

> A heightened awareness of my own professional capabilities. A greater sense of self worth. Something sadly lacking when teachers have taken the blame for society's ills over these past years. Sort of a "sense of control."

While the great majority of the mentor teacher respondents pointed to positive impacts on them, like the intern teachers there were also a few who felt that negative effects of the projects offset positive effects. For some, on balance, the impact was negative. Several mentors pointed to the increased workload they carried because of the projects. Several noted that the released time was insufficient:

> It has added job stress. There hasn't been enough time to coach and have a full schedule. The time allowed is peanuts!

And another felt that because of time and scheduling problems, he/she had not done as well as a mentor as might have been the case:

> Extra-added pressure--feeling that I was inadequate to be a mentor due to lack of time within my schedule. Feeling guilty about not being able to meet.

Lack of resources was marked by one mentor as the reason she/he

had lost enthusiasm for the project:

> Before school started I was excited about being a mentor in the pilot program because I had been very active in our...program and felt I had a lot to offer. Resources I thought would be available weren't primarily because...of many structural changes this year...I feel as though I have let my interns down because of the lack of availability of resources I had planned on introducing to them.

For two mentors, the negative impact cited was directly related to association with the intern teachers.

> My involvement with two different interns has had two totally different effects on me. Since one was a very positive experience, there is self-satisfaction in knowing someone has benefitted and was grateful for what she considered a boost to her development as a teacher...
>
> However, because of problems that were apparent with the other intern, assumptions were wrongly made against me by the intern and other colleagues. A rapport which was developed between my colleagues and me, I felt, was threatened. Unfortunately, this happened quite recently, and hopefully is in the process of being resolved with the help of the union president. Naturally, I question some of the procedures that were set up and I hope I will have input in developing next year's program, should there be one.

And,

> There has been no real impact that I can recall or discuss at this time...My intern feels that she has not gained anything from my expertise in the field...I will be relocating to a different school and the relationship will end in June.

For these mentors, the experience was undoubtedly deflating and unsettling.

Impact on the School Organizations

To understand the impact that might have resulted on school districts or buildings in which projects had been established,

both mentors and interns were asked to note what effects they saw, if any. Principals, supervisors, and department chairpersons in project buildings were also asked to comment on this matter. Responses to a range of other types of questions, and information reported during site visits sometimes also related directly to understanding this level of impact.

It would seem that the responses could be divided into those reporting no impact, versus those reporting on impact--positive or negative. Whether this contrast represents differences in an understanding of the meaning of "impact," or differences in the sensitivity of the respondents to developments in their schools, or whether this contrast represents real differences in particular features of the projects that would promote or impede a broader impact is unclear.

For example, in one project, the mentor, intern, and school principal intentionally "downplayed" the activities and resources of the project so as not to generate jealousies among other faculty members. In another project, a principal attributed the lack of any impact beyond the mentor and intern to the fact that there was only one mentor-intern pair in the building; it was not expected to produce a larger effect. In reading other responses, it is clear that many of the participants neither held particular goals related to other faculty and the school organization, nor were disappointed when no such effects were evident. By contrast with these projects were those which actively promoted the involvement of other teachers in the project, reported to the

faculty regarding developments in the project, and actively discussed how this project might change aspects of school work ranging from teacher induction and staff development to broader issues of decision making. These activities may have affected the degree of impact, or perceived impact, on the school organizations.

First, consider those responses which cited no impact. A great many of the respondents reported that they were unaware of any impact the projects had on others in the school or on the school organizations. In many cases, mentors and interns reported that others seemed to be unaware of the projects or only limitedly knowledgeable about it. As such, one would not expect a recognized effect. Many principals and supervisors, while often noting positive impact on the mentors and interns, reported that they saw little or no impact on the broader contexts in which the projects operated.

But, in citing a positive impact on the interns alone, respondents were inadvertently pointing to an effect on the organizations: improved teacher induction is a step of staff development. One principal noted that the project made official what she/he had been doing unofficially for years. A department chairperson describes the impact in this fashion:

> It has certainly improved the communication among teachers in the department. In the past, I have seen new teachers get quite frustrated over feeling like they're imposing on the busy old" hands--and while the older teachers mean well, the hectic pace of the school day does not really lend itself to guiding a new staff member. This program is a valuable tool for communication.

A principal tied the project's impact to the more general concept of staff training:

> The staff involved from this building have reported increased idea and project sharing. This writer has observed the positive changes at the classroom level for both mentors and interns. The extra help in new staff training is long overdue and welcome.

Improved teacher induction, and the consequent improvements in staff development and the faculties themselves, may have been for many assumed but unremarked impacts.

In contrast with those who cited no impact beyond the mentors and interns were those respondents who pointed to more widespread effects of the projects. Perhaps the most extreme example is offered by this resource leader:

> The program has sparked many teachers in each of the effected schools. Discussions among professionals about professional matters are now common place in our faculty rooms. A spirit of collegiality exists. As many of our "new" teachers (permanent, subs, etc.) were left out of the mentor-intern program. We established a peer counseling program to meet their needs. The success of the mentor-intern program has become contagious.

A mentor from the same project reported, "Most of our peers view the program as being successful. All agree that it is a program long overdue." In another project, a principal attributed the success of the project to how it has been structured in the district:

> I have seen those involved in the program grow in capabilities and confidence. I think it is an excellent program. This is due in large part to the way it has been structured in our district ...Everyone seems to have "bought in" to the

program.

Such structures may have also made it possible for others to understand the projects and feel their impact. A supervisor in the same project notes:

> Others are looking at mentoring as a "special." In spite of negative attitudes at the inception of the program, most staff want to know how they can "buy into" the program.

Broadening the opportunity for involvement in the projects may be a point of contrast between projects which have a positive impact or the organizations and those which are less so. A principal in one project offered this observation:

> There has been no effect on "others." Interns and mentors have developed a fraternity. I think that they would do much to promote the program if they included more participants in some of their work, or held an informational meeting to describe the program.

And a supervisor in another project points to a similar concern:

> The relationship between the mentor and intern has been very positive. However, it has also excluded other relationships from developing. The continuous contact for professional tasks and inquiries has made this an exclusive relationship. I question the benefit.

By contrast, the report of an intern in yet a third project points to the benefit of opening the project to others, and the positive impact it might have:

> Other teachers in our department have seen how the mentor program is working and have been extremely receptive. My mentor has been very helpful with offering assistance with the pacing of materials. She is not, however, teaching a course I am teaching. Other teachers have offered materials and information in courses we have in common. I believe the program has helped them all remember what it was like when they began

> teaching. There is an abundance of information to be learned

Other negative effects have already been cited indirectly, in noting the impact on interns and mentors. In some few schools, the projects have led to heightened mistrust and jealousies; some teachers not selected to be mentors have felt "snubbed"; some participants have felt extra pressure, a reaction which some administrators echoed as they had to address the issues of released time arrangements and parent relations. A few administrators also pointed to what they saw as an "erosion of administrative authority," and a general concern among principals and supervisors about the practices and longer-term effects of the projects. Surely in schools where teachers and administrators noted these reactions to the projects, some degree of conflict or disruption of working climate must have resulted.

Overall, in those projects where impact on others or the school organizations was noted, it was generally seen as positive. Some respondents cast the benefits beyond the local contexts to in the larger field of the teaching profession. One mentor said it this way:

> Other teachers felt it was a good program to be involved in, that it had good overtones for the future. They echoed, "Wish I would have had a mentor program when I started!" A few were fortunate to have had a "mentor" of sorts and were glad of it.

And one assistant principal notes the same:

> There is an increased awareness among other teachers that mentoring as a professional growth concept in teacher education is alive and (getting) well(er).

Part Five. Conclusions and Recommendations

The statewide evaluation study of the MT-I Program has been a substantial undertaking. Through the cooperation and trust of participating educators in each of the projects, a great quantity of data has been collected regarding their experiences in the first pilot year. That data has been analyzed and represented here as the study team members have judged best. And this report is about 200 pages in length.

Still it seems incomplete. Descriptions at three levels--the state MT-I Program, the projects, and the many mentor-intern relationships--can only tentatively be described. Cause and effect connections between elements of the participants' experiences are at best still hunches. And the question of "Did it work?" can only be answered in relative, not absolute terms.

Regardless of these limits, it seems warranted, and perhaps necessary, to draw a set of conclusions, however tentative, about the first pilot experience, and on the basis of full report and those conclusions to make a series of recommendations. Such will be the purpose and structure of Part Five. If those conclusions and recommendations are read with the tentativeness with which they are set forth, they may contribute more assuredly to the knowledge and practices of teacher induction through mentoring now developing in New York State.

Conclusions

Regarding intern teachers. The teachers participating as interns in the projects in the first pilot year may be a group somewhat different from what is more typical of first-year teachers. These individuals reported having more teaching experience than what might have been expected of persons in their first year of certification status. Indeed, one reported having had an earlier career in teaching before leaving and now returning with a different certificate. Several others pointed out that they had taught in private or parochial schools for years before obtaining or activating their state certificates.

But these individuals may also be different in that, since they are the first designated interns to participate in projects, they were perhaps less clear and less ready to be "intern" teachers. Mentors and project planners also expressed many early uncertainties, but for them the "stakes" of involvement were not so high. Numbers of interns reported early reservations about their role. Many were told of the projects when they were hired, but some did not find out till later on; nearly all had settled into their teaching roles before the projects got underway. Becoming an intern after the year had begun left them less receptive to the projects and their mentors. This lack of receptivity was reported by a number of mentors, who accepted it and worked to offset its effects.

In future projects, teachers who are to be interns will not

only be able to find out early about their participation, but some clearer description of the intern role and mentor-intern relationship may be offered them. Further, teachers in preparation may begin to recognize the internship year as part of their professional education, and enter it more eagerly than those who encountered it this past year.

For this combinations of reasons, and perhaps others, the collection of intern teachers this year was perhaps unusual. Their experiences may have been somewhat different from what future cohorts of interns will experience.

There is no doubt that the majority, perhaps the great majority of teachers designated as interns saw themselves as benefitting from participating in the mentor-intern projects. In most instances, the benefits were tied to the opportunity to draw on the advice and support of an experienced colleague. Having time released from regular instructional duties to work with a mentors, or to visit other classes, or to work on lesson planning and follow-up tasks eased the demands on the new teachers and helped them understand and do better at the work of teaching. Having access to resources such as teaching materials, professional conferences, and workshops led many new teachers to feel supported by the mentors and other school personnel, to feel encouraged to become the best teachers they could be, and to develop a sense of collegiality early in their careers.

Many intern teachers, seemed to have developed the idea that teaching is a practice about which one can and must continue to

learn, beyond the years of formal study in teacher education programs. Furthermore, they seemed, through their relationships with their mentors, to have built a base for pursuing that learning for at least the immediate future of their careers.

Intern teachers reported having benefitted in a wide range of areas. Most reported that their knowledge, understanding, and skill in classroom practices had been enhanced. A majority also reported that understanding matters of curriculum guides and curriculum issues, of the structure and procedures of the school organizations, and of means of accessing needed resources were points of assistance provided through their mentors or the projects. They were introduced to other teachers and made to feel welcome. They discussed matters of the work of teaching and the profession. They became more self-confident and felt themselves valued members of the school enterprise. For many the relationships became characterized as deep friendships, confidant trusts.

It cannot be said that this learning and these developments would not have occurred without the MT-I Program. Indeed, a number of interns and mentors indicated the projects simply formalized an association that they had already begun. But for others, this was not the case. In a few cases, interns attributed to their mentors the credit of having saved their careers. In more than a few instances, both interns and mentors felt that the relationships they had formed made possible a quicker, less traumatic transition to the work of teaching and to

teaching effectively.

There were a number of instances in this first pilot year in which interns reported that their participation in the projects was not helpful, and perhaps even debilitating. Some small number of intern teachers did not complete the school year or indicated that they would not return to teaching, at least not in the same districts, in the coming year. While some tied this result to conditions of their teaching or employment--which the mentors and projects seemingly could not effect--others tied it directly to their work with the mentors who they did not trust, did not feel to be supportive, or did not judge to be expert. For whatever reasons, their experiences in the projects were not favorable.

As with the reported success, it cannot be said that these intern teachers would have had markedly different experiences if they had not been participants in projects. It can only be noted that they, sometimes with their mentors concurring, felt the projects did not work in their favor, as intended.

Regarding mentor teachers. A variety of selection criteria were used in the identification of mentors to work with the projects in this pilot year. Chief among the criteria were reported excellence in classroom teaching and the interpersonal qualities that were believed to be important in serving as a guide, coach, advisor, confidant, trusted colleague--in other words, a "mentor." Also considered important was selecting teachers whose certification areas and teaching experience would

match well with prospective interns.

In most projects, no pool of mentor teachers was formed. Rather, mentors were selected and matched with interns, in an almost concurrent process. In only a few projects were a set of "potential mentors" readied in the prospect that they might be needed.

It is not clear how similar or different this year's group of mentors was compared to the more general teacher population in their various districts. Their academic backgrounds were rich, and they reported a variety of credentials that might well recommend them as teachers and mentors. They were a fairly experienced cohort, though several reported a surprisingly few years of teaching experience. Many of them had involvements in other school projects, and some might be characterized as "school leaders" in their own settings.

It can also be said that generally this cohort of mentors was comprised of individuals who displayed enthusiasm and commitment for the work of teaching, and more specifically for the work of mentoring. They were "upbeat" and optimistic. They exuded personal qualities such as friendliness, understanding, openness, empathy, flexibility, and approachability. They were perceived and reported themselves to be willing learners, although they seemingly were already expert. They were perceived as non-judgmental, although they presumably had formed firm views on the work of teaching and the profession. They displayed an understanding of the ethics of teaching and an extension of that

code for mentoring. All things considered, this cohort might be described as exceptionally good for the work of mentoring.

There were, however, presumably some few who did not fit that description. In the reports of some interns, and even of some mentors themselves, there is evidence that some teachers selected for that role did not enjoy it, did not feel comfortable with the tasks it put before them, and perhaps did not perform the role as their project planners had intended.

While the mentors provided much assistance to the interns, they themselves reported a range of benefits that accrued to them because of their participation. The recognition of colleagues, the gratification of helping someone, and the sense of contributing to the advancement of the profession were psychological rewards. Learning new skills, re-analyzing and enhancing present methods, being able to participate in and influence project decisions were professional rewards, as were having access to resources and special opportunities. Though mentors were provided released time for their work, this was generally judged insufficient for what they planned with their interns. On the whole, mentors' workloads were markedly increased by their participation in the projects.

Regarding the mentor-intern relationship. At the heart of this state first-year teacher induction effort is the formation and support of a relationship between an experienced and respected teacher and a qualified beginning teacher. The major portion of funds in the MT-I Program are allocated to provide

released time so the mentor and intern can work together to develop a relationship. The relative success or failure of the overall statewide MT-I Program is likely to be found, in large measure, in the sum of effects reported by the many mentor-intern pairs.

The relationships, to a degree, seemed to have a life independent of the state or local projects. Even when some local projects were reported to be bound up with problems, politics, or uncertainty, the mentor-intern relationships were active and developing. And in some smoothly-functioning projects, some relationships seemed to falter.

The matches formed, largely took note of certification areas and content or grade level assignments of the selected mentors and prospective interns. Gender and age were not widely considered important in decisions regarding the matches. While many project planners recognized the importance of personalities in such a match, not knowing the intern teachers, or not being sure what personality features would matter, made this "criterion" less operant. Many planners seemed to trust that the mentors selected would be able to form the association desired.

Many of the relationships formed in this first pilot year were described by mentors and interns as professional and personal. These two descriptors capture the qualities and focus of their work together: they focused on a range professional matters, and in doing so formed bonds of caring, trust, and friendship.

The relationships varied from one mentor-intern pair to the next. What specifically they focused on, how they structured their time, the kinds of activities they set to accomplish their ends, and degree of personal association were factors on which they differed. Mentors who worked with two or more interns often reported seeing the differences among them, working differently with each of them, and valuing them each for their uniqueness. This variance allowed mentors and interns to use their unique professional and personal strengths, and to direct their work together toward what they judged to be the most important and productive ends. In a real sense, the various projects were "individualized" through the mentor-intern relationships, an outcome that would not likely have resulted from a more centralized, project-directed effort.

From the reports, it is also evident that not all of the mentor-intern relationships achieved the ends that were intended. In a very few instances, mentors reported that they were working with interns who had not completed teacher preparation programs, and felt overwhelmed by what these interns needed to learn; clearly these mentors felt unable to make up the deficit. The MT-I Program was designed with the assumption of at least basic competence in intern teachers; the experience of these few mentors suggests that that assumption is appropriate.

Other relationships faltered, or did not develop as they might have because of mentors' and interns' lack of time to regularly work together, perceived conflicts of role or style, or

qualities perceived in the mentors (such as inflexibility, behaviors which undermined the development of trust, and lack of expertise or genuine caring) or interns (lack of receptivity or commitment to teaching). In a few instances, relationships which started off well, soured; in others, the opposite occurred. In some projects, mentors and interns were able to initiate changes in their matches, which seemed to resolve concerns that had become apparent.

While relationships between the mentors and interns might deepen both professionally and personally, some mentors and interns suggested they were enriched by including others--other teachers, substitute teachers, other mentors and interns, resource leaders and chairpersons, and even administrators--as was appropriate for the tasks undertaken. By contrast, at least a few participants expressed concern about "exclusive" relationships which might impede the interns' integration into the school buildings and districts.

Finally, there is good evidence to suggest that given supportive conditions, the relationships established in the pilot year will extend into the coming year and perhaps beyond. Many mentors and interns expressed a hope that this would be the case. Some had taken particular steps toward that end. Thus, the relationships may be a vehicle to provide longer term support, beyond the new teachers' first year.

Regarding the projects. The 24 proposals funded to establish the projects in this first pilot year varied

considerably. The resources used, the mechanics of the released time arrangements, internships differing by grade level and content area, and local governance activities were all points on which the projects varied. Planners accounted for a range of particulars as they set out to design the project to suit their local needs, in their urban, suburban or rural, small or large districts. Yet at the heart of each was the establishment and support of a series of mentor-intern pairings. Given this central feature, projects could be planned to foster one such relationship or dozens, as their needs and interests dictated. Thus, while the projects were quite different, they were also in essence the same.

The flexibility that was allowed by the state legislation and encouraged by the state planners has served well to promote the introduction of the concept of mentoring, as a form of teacher induction, into a range of different settings. Local planners could do much to form the projects to the exigencies of their districts and the professional interests they valued. Without such flexibility, it is doubtful that all of these districts could have undertaken projects, could have managed the projects through the first year, or could have felt as accomplished as they have reported. Indeed, some project planners and participants have argued for greater flexibility--in the use of state funds, in the definition of "intern," in the prescription for released time, and in other matters.

In so far as variances already evident have allowed local

planners to design projects which, apparently with widespread success, promote valued and productive mentor-intern relationships, flexibility might be marked as a key to the overall success of the MT-I Program. Further variances which also promote mentor-intern relationships may be warranted. Providing local planners with the flexibility they need to design such projects may yet further enhance their work and enhance the relationships they foster.

The projects were established in the districts by a variety of role-players: union leaders, teachers, assistant superintendents and superintendents. Generally there was cooperation between and among parties as the proposals were written and as the projects were implemented. In a few instances, participants reported that one party or another had not been fully aware of the structures and activities of the projects and grew resistant or uncooperative. Most projects began and ended with a sense of joint ownership, or at least common interests served.

To manage the projects, some persons in the districts assumed a role that might be titled "local project coordinators." Some were formally designated as such. These persons were teachers in some districts, while in others they were district administrators. Their responsibilities varied, but generally they completed tasks such as planning project activities, serving the mentor-intern pairs, solving problems, and channeling communications about the projects to whatever persons or agencies

inquired. In some projects, these coordinators played critical roles in planning and operation; in others, they served more as monitors of project activities.

In addition to creating the role of the local project coordinator, the introduction of projects into school districts often led to some re-thinking of existing roles. Advisory committees were formed in some districts, and given decision-making authority. Principals, supervisors, and department chairpersons marked changes in their roles, and their relationships with both new teacher interns and experienced teacher mentors. Even other teachers may have been uncertain about how to relate to the mentor-intern pairs in their midst. While many expressed concern that the planners had not fully considered how the projects would impact on the traditional functioning of these role players, they were largely supportive of the concept of new teacher induction through mentoring, and took actions to assist the work of the mentors and interns when needed.

There remains a good deal of uncertainty about how the introduction of a project should affect the roles of non-participant teachers and administrators. While some projects seem to have resolved the matter, at least in the first pilot year, others have not done so to the satisfaction of all. New projects will undoubtedly face the same situations. There probably needs to be some further discussion, in each setting, of the roles various parties should continue or begin to play, with

the initiation of a project.

Finally, there is a question of the stability of the projects. A set of conditions gave rise to the proposal and development of each project. As those conditions alter the project itself may cease or become dormant. Furthermore, many projects in this first pilot year survived and were even reported successful, seemingly because local planners, participants, and other teachers and administrators worked hard to assist the projects: solving problems, providing resources, offering moral support. If such a sense of cooperation diminishes, the projects may be in jeopardy.

The stability of the projects is important, because it is not clear how the knowledge, understanding, and skill needed to initiate and develop a mentor-intern project can be sustained across a year's lapse or more in activity. While the mechanisms of the project may be reproducible even after several years' time, the understanding of good mentor-intern relationships may be less easily preserved without fresh experience. Perhaps most importantly, garnering the commitment of district officials, administrators and teachers, and of prospective mentors, a project that will likely end each June with uncertain prospects for future years, seems itself unlikely. Yet such commitment may be crucial, as it seems to have been in this first pilot year, to making the project succeed. Thus, the stability of the projects may itself need to be an interim goal of the MT-I Program.

Regarding problems and potentials. Probably all programs in

their first year of operation confront or generate problems. Fewer give rise to thinking about what potentials the programs hold for the future.

Many of the problems faced by project planners and participants in this first pilot year grew from the late start the MT-I Program had. Problems ranging from new teachers not being aware of their "intern" status, to having to adjust to changes mid-term in their schedules, to not receiving support in the first crucial weeks of the school year, would not likely have occurred if the projects had been authorized to begin in September. With experience and greater lead time, matters such as clarifying roles, providing mentor training, working out problems in scheduling and released time coverage would likely have been more easily addressed, or at least addressed under less pressure to be operational.

Probably the single largest problem area revolved around the provision of released time and the consequent arrangements for continuity of instruction. In some projects these matters were readily and satisfactorily addressed. In other projects, they persisted as difficulties about which mentors, interns, coordinators, and administrators fretted. For some mentor-intern pairs, the problems were never resolved, and the time to work together was limited in favor of providing instruction to students. Project planners and local administrators devised a variety of ways to provide for released time coverage; some projects employed different means for different mentor-intern

pairs.

Interns sometimes expressed the concern that they wanted to be with their classes at particular times of the year, or through crucial instructional periods. Being required, as some were by their projects, to leave their classes at these times seemed to them counter-productive. Mentors sometimes expressed the same views. Both noted that some important learning for new teachers derives from classroom experiences. They would argue for greater flexibility in the requirement and distribution of, and arrangements for released time. While few questioned the value of released time for mentors and interns, all recognized the difficulties such a provision could create. Designing more, and more-flexible arrangements which meet the dual goals of providing for continuity of instruction and supporting the work of the interns and mentors, seems yet to be a need in several projects.

(Other problems areas evident in this first pilot year have been discussed elsewhere, related to mentors, interns, the relationship, and the projects. They will not be repeated here.)

Regardless of the problems encountered by planners and participants in the first pilot year, there was also a sense, expressed by many, across the project sites, that the MT-I Program was an important step--for some, long overdue--in improving the work of teaching and schooling, and in advancing the profession. Clearly the MI-I Program, as enacted through the projects, has stimulated educators around the state to think about matters of teacher preparation and induction, collegiality

among teachers, effective teaching, teacher and staff development, cooperative or shared decision-making in school projects, and the professional ethics required in light of the projects and their activities. Some educators have rethought traditional instructional arrangements, at first to solve problems, but then to explore potentials. Clarified or extended thinking about such matters has led some educators to action in those same regards. In a sense, well beyond the impact the projects might have had on mentors and interns is the impact they might have had and might yet have on the practices of teaching and schooling across the state.

Regarding levels of understanding the experience of the first pilot year. Having had the opportunity to study the MT-I Program statewide, it has become clear to the study team that there are distinct levels of encountering and understanding the experience. For some fewer educators, it is a state program, having aspects of policy, funding, and state agency organization. A larger, more diverse group of educators has encountered the experience at the project level; for them it is an experience of interpreting state policy, making practical decisions regarding project implementation, and solving project problems. For them, a specific set of individuals in particular roles is involved. At the third level are the interns and mentors themselves. Their experience revolves chiefly around their work together. Linkages between levels are provided by the state project managers and the local project coordinators; but their numbers are modest compared

to the total number of educators involved at the three levels. Broad experience, and hence broad understanding of this statewide effort is limited to a relative few educators. For while these levels overlap to a degree, for many educators the experience is centered at one level, exclusive of the others.

Interestingly, too, each of these levels has a degree of independence from the others. The planning and activities that go on at each level are quite different, as are the problems that are encountered and must be resolved. However, independent as they might be in some regards, they are inextricably linked. Accomplishments or failures at any one level will likely affect the other levels sooner or later.

It is, perhaps, important for educators at each of these levels to recognize that others associated with the MT-I Program may have quite different experiences, concerns, and hopes for the work in which they are involved: their judgments about the value of the MT-I Program may differ markedly as a result. Developing an appreciation for the experience of other educators at different levels of the enterprise, may help each educator hold his or her own experience in perspective. It may, as well, suggest the degree of interdependence that is necessary for the MT-I Program to be successful overall.

Recommendations

For the State Education Department.

A. Continue to recognize the mentor-intern relationship as the central feature of the MT-I Program. Promote the

understanding of how such relationships can provide individualized assistance to beginning teachers as they face a range of tasks at the start of their careers.

B. Maintain present degrees of flexibility in MT-I Program administration, continuing to locate important design and implementation decisions at the local level, where project planners have an understanding of the purposes of the MT-I Program and also a clear view of the needs and exigencies of the local contexts. Maintaining such flexibility may encourage creative and thoughtful project designs. It may also be the best support the state can offer as local planners address problem areas such as providing for released time and continuity of instruction, project management arrangements, and project evaluation requirements.

C. Consider the prospects for further supporting the development of mentor-intern relationships by providing additional flexibility on particular matters. For example, consider the prospects of spreading the present internship over a two year span (with perhaps two-thirds of the released time in the first year and one-third in the second year). Interns and mentors could distribute their work together over a longer period of time, have the opportunity to experience the school year cycle twice, and spend less time away from classes in a given year. (If such an arrangement were tried, it would be important to study whether the distribution of time for working together inadvertently weakened or delayed the development of a strong

relationship between the mentors and interns. If it did, it might better be discouraged.) Such a prospect may also address the matter of stability in local projects by maintaining project activity in years that might otherwise be times of project dormancy. Such a prospect would also recognize the literature on teacher career development that suggests that while the first year of teaching is critical, important developments occur over a longer span (perhaps the first three to five years).

As a second example, consider the prospect of making internships available to any teacher not presently permanently certified. Such a prospect would allow a larger number of beginning teachers, all presumably in the first five years of their experiences, to draw on the benefits of a mentor-intern relationship.

As a third example, consider the prospect of allowing the use of s' 'e state funds to reward mentors for the additional work they undertake as participants in the local projects. It is not recommended that a stipend simply replace the released time benefit: time available during the school day has been demonstrably well used, and it is unlikely that some of the kinds of interaction between interns and mentors that have been reported would occur outside the school day. Rather, it seems warranted that their willingness to share their expertise, and to make a commitment to the development of new teachers be rewarded in some fashion that recognizes the effort and value they bring to the projects. Such a prospect might encourage experienced

teachers to participate in the projects and insure a healthy pool of prospective mentor teachers from which appointments could be made. (However, if such a prospect was pursued, it would be necessary to discourage applicants for the post of mentor who were attracted merely by the matter of a stipend.)

D. Increase the percent of released time offered mentors, to match that of their interns. While the present 10 percent to 20 percent ratio seems to encourage a 1:2 mentor-intern ratio, a 1:1 ratio was widely reported as desirable; yet a 10 percent release for teachers at either elementary or secondary levels fails to match existing instructional arrangements. Increasing the project time of the mentors would relieve some of the time pressures reported by participants and would likely simplify arrangements for maintaining continuity of instruction.

E. Continue to require that new teachers designated as interns have completed programs of teacher preparation. It is unreasonable to place mentors in the position of being responsible for basic teacher preparation, for which they neither have studied nor command resources. Mentors ought to be able to assume that the interns they are to assist have already demonstrated at least minimal competence in programs of study and field experiences.

F. Establish a forum in which project participants at all three levels and teacher educators in colleges and universities can discuss the articulation of teacher preparation programs with the internship year. Such a forum might explore how preservice

teachers should be informed about and encouraged to be receptive to an internship experience. It might also explore connections between the internship experience and the graduate study of teaching.

G. Study the prospects for stability of projects around the state. Consider factors which encourage or impede the establishment and sustenance of local projects; such factors might include perceived needs, availability of resources and staff, understanding of the concepts and practices involved, and levels of funding. Consider what measures should be taken to promote stability.

Relatedly, consider the prospects of concentrating MT-I Program projects in a more limited number of districts whose knowledge and commitments, needs and experience would serve well the processes of new teacher induction through mentoring. Such "portal districts" might serve the entire education system of the state by providing new teachers the best induction to the profession and then linking them to teaching opportunities around the state.

H. Consider supporting the formation of a clearinghouse of information on the knowledge and practices of mentoring in education settings. Such a service- (and perhaps, research-) oriented resource could assist the state and local projects in the understanding, design, and evaluation of efforts made in this arena of staff development. Such a resource could assist in communicating with the public and with interested parties from

other states regarding New York State's efforts.

For local projects.

I. Continue to design and implement projects such that they recognize the mentor-intern relationship as the central feature of the MT-I Program generally, and the project's purposes and activities more specifically.

J. Notify new teachers as they are hired, of the prospects of their being involved in a mentor-intern project. Describe for them what the purposes of the project are, how the mentor-intern relationship might function, and that the matter of teacher evaluation will be handled separately.

K. Provide opportunities for mentors to prepare for their roles by introducing them to concepts of adult development, teacher career development, teacher effectiveness research, classroom observation strategies, mentoring, and the qualities of productive interpersonal communication. Provide opportunities for mentors to practice skills which will enhance their work with their interns.

L. Initiate the relationships between the mentors and interns. Plan an opportunity to introduce them and have them get acquainted. Review for them together the purposes of the project, particular details of their involvement (released time arrangements, project meetings, project evaluation plans, and so on). Explain the structures of the local project for governance and problem-solving, and the roles various participants and non-participants might play.

M. Consider establishing some mechanism for monitoring the project. This mechanism might also be intended as a vehicle for communication, problem solving, and project evaluation. The mechanism might also serve as a source of support for mentors and interns as they progress in their work together.

N. Communicate with the faculty and staff in the district as well as in particular buildings, regarding the general purposes and activities of the project. Describe the governance structure of the project. Suggest how others who are interested might become involved.

O. Consider setting up regular meetings of groups of mentors and interns. Such meetings might be settings in which problems are identified and addressed or simply opportunities for sharing experiences. Such meetings might be opportunities to extend collegial ties, and to identify interests which might become the topics of workshops or resource acquisition.

P. Create a pool of mentor teachers who meet the state and locally set criteria and from which appointments could be made at the start of the year, and as situations arise in which new, alternate, or replacement appointments need to be made during the year.

Relatedly, consider the prospects of recognizing what seem to be natural alliances that form between some beginning and experienced teachers very early after their initial introductions. Consider building on these early associations to form mentor-intern matches.

Again relatedly, consider a mechanism for dissolving relationships which the mentors and interns judge to be unworkable or unproductive, and drawing on the mentor pool for a second match. Design the mechanism such that it is thoughtful and responsive, is seen as acting in the good interests of the parties involved, and achieves its end without bringing judgment to bear upon either mentors or interns.

Q. Consider in what ways local resources such as teacher centers, colleges and universities and B.O.C.E.S. units could play a role supportive of the specific mentor-intern relationships, or the project more generally.

R. Study the experiences of other projects to learn about the structures and activities that have been employed, and the value attributed to them.

S. Study how the project can and should impact on larger local efforts related to staff development, school improvement, and long-range planning. Consider how alternate instructional or staffing arrangements are made possible by the project, leading to benefits for interns and mentors, as well as other faculty and students.

For interns and mentors.

T. Demonstrate a willingness to participate in the project. Show a willingness to learn, approachability, and receptivity.

U. Be flexible in scheduling, in the forms of working together, and in the topics upon which work is focused. Make changes in these matters as is judged necessary to meet immediate

and longer term needs and interests.

V. Consider ways in which other teachers and staff who have valued knowledge and skills can contribute to the work at hand.

W. Understand that the relationship will be unique, and need not imitate others. Recognize that the relationship is fundamentally professional, but that as in many human enterprises, personal investment and a sense reward or loss are to be expected. Expect that the relationship will likely have degree of both professional and personal involvement, the particulars of which will develop over time.

X. Demonstrate a openness and candidness in mentor-intern interactions. Show support and caring, and evidence a sense of trust and trustworthiness in all matters of exchange.

Appendix
The 1986-1987 Pilot Projects

1. Bethlehem Central School District
   Delmar, NY

2. Buffalo City School District
   Buffalo, NY

3. Eldred Central School District
   Eldred, NY

4. Freeport Public Schools
   Freeport, NY

5. Hamburg Central School District
   Hamburg, NY

6. Ithaca City School District
   Ithaca, NY

7. Jefferson-Lewis-Hamilton
   Herkimer-Oneida BOCES
   Watertown, NY

8. Lindenhurst Public Schools
   Lindenhurst, NY

9. Madison-Oneida BOCES
   Verona, NY

10. Nanuet Union Free School District
    Nanuet, NY

11. New York City Board of Education
    Brooklyn, NY

12. Plattsburgh City School District
    Plattsburgh, NY

13. Rensselaer-Columbia-Greene BOCES
    Castleton, NY

14. Rochester City School District
    Rochester, NY

15. South Huntington Union Free School District
    Huntington, NY

16. Suffolk 3 BOCES
    Dix Hills, NY

17. Syosset Central School District
    Syosset, NY

18. Three Village Central School District
    Setauket, NY

19. Utica City School District
    Utica, NY

20. Valley Stream Central High School District
    Valley Stream, NY

21. Wappingers Central School District
    Wappingers, NY

22. Washington-Warren-Hamilton BOCES
    Hudson Falls, NY

23. West Islip Union Free School District
    West Islip, NY

24. Wheatland-Chili Central School District
    Scottsville, NY