

# APPENDIX 6 – Additional Recommendations

## Professional Development

The proposed salary allocation model (SAM) moves away from compensation based on credits and clock hours and towards a career ladder compensating teachers for career advancement by attaining higher certifications. The certifications embedded in the SAM measure a teacher’s performance against national standards. However, this mechanism does not provide the means for teachers to develop specific knowledge or skills required at a federal, state or local level. The state certification and evaluation systems expect educators to grow professionally. However, the state only funds 180 days of instruction. The 180 school day calendar is focused on student’s academic development and does not provide time for educator-focused development. School districts are providing professional development through locally funded days or requesting waivers to the 180 school day calendar in order to embed professional development into the 180 day calendar. In addition, some local school districts are scheduling half days of instruction in order to provide time for professional development during the second half of the day.

The U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences reviewed nine rigorous studies of teacher professional development effects on student achievement. The review found that intensive professional development, an average of 49 hours, can increase student achievement scores by 21 percentile points.<sup>1</sup>

The Washington Institute for Public Policy (Exhibit 8-Estimates of the Effect of an Additional Day of General Professional Development on Student Outcomes) also conducted a meta-analysis and found that “focused PD can improve student learning.”<sup>2</sup>

### **Past Policy Recommendations for Professional Development:**

#### **Quality Education Council (QEC) 2012 Report:**

The Quality Education Council (QEC) recommended in their 2012 report that the Legislature should direct the Compensation Technical Working Group to “include the professional development needs of principals, teachers and classified staff in its work, including mentoring programs for all education employees.”<sup>3</sup> The QEC recommendation was based on recommendations from the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee, the Building Bridges Work Group and the various technical working group reports, with the QEC recognizing “the importance of supporting education professionals by providing high-quality training and mentoring.”<sup>4</sup>

Additionally, the QEC recommended that the Legislature direct the Compensation Technical Working Group to “include the possible need for science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) related professional development in its examination of educator professional development needs, and examine strategies and incentives to recruit and retain STEM teachers.” The QEC also recommended that “the Legislature should direct the Compensation Working Group to utilize educator professional development needs data, including cultural competency and competency in language acquisition for the following purposes:

- i. to identify strategies and incentives to recruit and retain diverse teachers;
- ii. to examine data from other states regarding certification options and requirements that support competency in language acquisition and cultural competency;
- iii. to identify professional development requirements for continuing teachers regarding cultural competency and language acquisition; and
- iv. to identify current policies that make it difficult to recruit and retain diverse teachers.<sup>5</sup>

#### **Basic Education Finance Task Force (BEFTF):**

The Basic Education Finance Task Force (BEFTF) recommended increasing the number of Learning Improvement Days (LID’s) to ten as part of their proposed salary allocation model. Additional recommendations included providing a mentoring professional development program to new and early career teachers, with intense support during a teacher’s first year and progressive decreases in intensity based on need.<sup>6</sup>

#### **Washington Learns**

The Washington Learns Committee recommended that the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction design and pilot a professional development delivery system that focuses on teacher knowledge and skill areas identified by the state.<sup>7</sup>

#### **Arguments For Funding Professional Development Time:**

- Gaining additional expertise through professional development units geared to individual professional growth plans is supported by the teacher licensure requirements through the Professional Educator Standards Board.
- Evaluation systems will require more focus on professional development and improvement over time, necessitating more funded professional development.
- Local school districts could focus on locally determined needs to respond to the needs of students. The professional development time could be flexible to change over time to allow for responsive intervention and teacher development.

#### **Arguments Against Funding Professional Development Time:**

- Some professional development programs are not aligned to state expectations for teacher development and should not be included for the purposes of providing additional compensation.
- Additional resources would be necessary to manage a professional development structure to review and verify the training completed by teachers.

### **Professional Development Recommendation:**

The Compensation TWG recommends that the state include ten professional development days for certificated instructional staff in the definition of basic education. School districts should have the flexibility to distribute the time in a manner that best fits their needs. The group discussed the possibilities of professional learning communities, individual professional growth planning, and focused seminars. The time should be directed to educator growth in the state expectations for teacher certification and development.

The Compensation TWG also recognizes that professional development for instructional aides is critical as they work in partnership with teachers to provide a comprehensive education for K-12 students. The Compensation TWG affirms the FTE recommendations for instructional aides found in the Classified Staffing Adequacy Report that includes time for professional development.<sup>8</sup> The Compensation TWG recognizes that additional classified positions may also require additional funding for targeted professional development, but further work is necessary before development of a recommendation for non-certificated instructional staff positions.

## **Instructional Coaches**

Research supports the fact that teacher classroom practices have a significant impact on improving student learning, and the practice of instructional coaching is effective as a professional development strategy to improve instructional practices. Since instructional coaches deliver professional development and improvement strategies in the classroom, researchers find that coaching coupled with job-embedded professional development has an even larger impact on student achievement. The significant impact of instructional coaches in the broader professional development program has been noted by Joyce and Calhoun (1996)<sup>9</sup>, and by Joyce and Showers (2002).<sup>10</sup> Some research also suggests that coaching may increase communication and collaboration between teachers, ultimately increasing teacher effectiveness and satisfaction. Additionally, the research finds that the effects of professional development are almost negligible without the classroom-based coaching.

An instructional coach is defined “as someone whose primary professional responsibility is to bring practices that have been studied using a variety of research methods into classrooms by working with adults rather than students.”<sup>11</sup> The majority of the research on instructional coaches is focused on individual cases studies of programs and characteristics of successful instructional coaching programs. However, the research identifies “three broad categories of skills that an effective coach should possess: pedagogical knowledge, content expertise and interpersonal skills.”<sup>12</sup> The instructional coaching model allows for “opportunities for professional development for teachers and principals modeled on the expectations of students in standards-based reform.”<sup>13</sup> Coaches help other teachers expand their pedagogical content knowledge and their teaching skills, update and extend their teaching strategies, reflect on student thinking, design effective lessons for all the students in their classes and use a variety of feedback and assessment data to assess and revise continuously.<sup>14</sup>

## **Past Policy Recommendations for Instructional Coaches**

### **Quality Education Council Report (2010)**

The Quality Education Council provisionally recommended the following FTE for professional development coaches in each prototypical school:

- 0.6 FTE facilitators for a 400 student prototypical elementary school
- 0.7 FTE facilitators for a 432 student prototypical middle school
- 1.0 FTE facilitators for a 600 student prototypical high school

### **Basic Education Finance Task Force (BEFTF)**

The BEFTF recommended the following FTE coach ratios based on each prototypical school model:

- 0.5 FTE facilitators for a 400 student prototypical elementary school
- 0.5 FTE facilitators for a 432 student prototypical middle school
- 0.75 FTE facilitators for a 600 student prototypical high school

### **Washington Learns**

The Washington Learns report included a recommendation of an allocation of 2.5 FTE instructional coaches for a school of 500 students or 1 instructional coach for every 200 students. This translates into:

- 2.2 FTE facilitators for a 432 student prototypical elementary school
- 2.25 FTE facilitators for a 450 student prototypical middle school
- 3.0 FTE facilitators for a 600 student prototypical high school

### **Arguments For Funding Instructional Coaches**

- Instructional coaches support school improvement efforts, are responsive to teacher professional development needs and provide opportunities for increased teacher effectiveness which can increase student achievement gains.
- The evaluation and certification systems require continued professional development and improvement activities and should be supported by a dedicated staff member.
- Due to the multiple state and national educational policy changes, it is necessary to have at least one person responsible to disseminate and educate staff members on the changes and best practices for implementation.

- Providing an allocation for instructional coaches provides career enlargement opportunities for successful teachers to serve in advanced leadership roles, which may help retain teachers.

**Arguments Against Funding Instructional Coaches**

- Effective teachers should remain in the classroom teaching students, not pulled out to provide professional development and coaching to colleagues.
- Instructional coaching models vary and there is a need for training and professional development for instructional coaches, in order to ensure an effective program.

**Instructional Coaches Recommendation**

The Compensation Technical Working Group recommends that instructional coaches are funded through the prototypical school funding model. As an allocation, the school districts can determine the appropriate use of the funding to best support the needs of their teachers and students. As an allocation, school districts could choose to spread the allocation to multiple teachers within a school or centralize instructional coaches at the district office.

Recommended allocation levels for instructional coaches are:

- 1.1 FTE for a 400 student prototypical elementary school
- 1.1 FTE facilitators for a 432 student prototypical middle school
- 1.1 FTE facilitators for a 600 student prototypical high school

The dollar allocation will be based on the average staff mix for each school district as determined by the salary allocation model for certificated instructional staff. Costs include salaries, health and other benefits, and substitute allocation.

**Exhibit 72: Estimated Annual Cost of Instructional Coach Recommendation**

| <b>Annual Cost of Instructional Coach Recommendation</b>   |              |                              |   |
|--|--------------|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Prototypical School</b>   | <b>FTE</b>   | <b>Estimated Annual Cost</b> | <b>Estimated Annual Cost Including Benefits and Substitute Allocation</b> |
| Elementary School  | 1,427        | \$98,610,000                 | \$128,501,000   |
| Middle School  | 391          | \$26,993,000                 | \$35,175,000  |
| High School  | 455          | \$31,426,000                 | \$40,951,000  |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>2,273</b> | <b>\$157,029,000</b>         | <b>\$204,627,000</b>  |
| <i>Note: Estimated number of prototypical schools based on June 2012 OSPI apportionment. Each CIS FTE is allocated 4 substitute days. Additional FTE include health care and other benefits.</i> |              |                              |   |

## Mentors

During the 2011-12 school year, \$1,000,000 was appropriated for the Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST) program, which was only sufficient to minimally fund programs in 28 districts serving only 173 of the 1,973 first year teachers in the state. Between 1987 and 2008, the Legislature funded the Teacher Assistance Program (TAP) for mentoring beginning teachers and teachers who were having difficulties and the allocation was distributed to all school districts that applied. From 2004 through 2009, the average allocation per teacher was \$832. This amount was not adequate to carry out the directives of the legislation, let alone offer a high-quality induction program to address the retention issue and increase student learning in novice teachers' classrooms. As a result, the 2009 Legislature re-purposed TAP resources into the BEST program, and limited the number of participating districts to permit the implementation of effective programs. The BEST program was designed to accelerate new teacher growth in instructional effectiveness and keep novice instructors invested in Washington's public schools. All other districts have used local resources when available to provide any mentoring or induction support to their novice teachers. Local funding resources are not regular and reliable as required for basic education funding.

After the first year of implementation, school districts that received funding for the BEST program were required to provide data on the effectiveness of the program. The Renton School District reported that teachers in years two and three of the mentor program out-performed the total population of Renton teachers through the measure of attributes of teaching that have been correlated to student achievement gains (from Classroom Observation Study by the BERC Group). Federal Way Public Schools reported that the average scores of novice teachers' students on the Gates-McGinite reading assessment administered in kindergarten through tenth grade was comparable to the district average of all students meeting standard in spring 2010; the beginning educators matched the success of experienced peers. BEST program grantee districts also reported that 84 percent of participating teachers remained at the same school and 90 percent remained in the same school district. Less than one percent of participating educators left the teaching profession. Grandview School District reported retention of 87.5 percent of all first and second year teachers after implementation of the BEST program, compared to a historical 70 percent retention standard. An ancillary benefit of the BEST program is the development of key attributes of effective instructional leadership in veteran teachers serving as mentors that leads to professional rejuvenation, new learning, and enhanced professional practices.

### Past Policy Recommendations for Mentors

**Quality Education Council (QEC) 2010 Report:** The QEC recommended that the Legislature should phase-in funding beginning in school year 2011-12 to cover support for all first year teachers. The recommendation was to extend access to the BEST program, or an improved program design, to beginning educators across the state. Funding in subsequent years should be sufficient to support new teachers in their second and third years of teaching.

**Basic Education Finance Taskforce (BEFTF):** In 2008, the BEFTF recommended that Washington State should have a mentoring-based professional development program for new and early career teachers. The aim of these early mentoring efforts would be for expert teachers to provide intensive support to new teachers during their first year in the classroom, with additional support thereafter dependent on need. The Task Force recommended that mentoring be provided for up to five years at reduced levels each subsequent year.

**Washington Learns:** In 2006, Picus and Odden, in a report prepared for the K-12 Advisory Committee of Washington Learns,<sup>15</sup> recommended that an elementary school of 432 students be allocated 2.2 FTE instructional facilitators/coaches/mentors; a middle school of 450 be allocated 2.25 FTE facilitators, and a high school of 600 be allocated 3 FTE facilitators.

Research data from Washington State sheds some light on the mobility patterns of new teachers in the state. A study from the University of Washington College of Education showed that one quarter of teachers in Washington exit teaching (and are not employed by any Washington public school) five years after entering the profession.<sup>16</sup> In addition to documenting the number of novice teachers leaving the profession, policy makers in Washington State have raised concerns over whether a disproportionate number of beginning teachers leave high poverty schools. An analysis of teacher retention indicated that beginning teachers did not disproportionately leave high poverty schools. Roughly the same percentage of beginning teachers exited from low, medium and high poverty schools relative to the overall proportion of teachers employed at those schools.<sup>17</sup> This suggests that retaining novice teachers is an issue for all Washington schools regardless of their poverty demographics.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) conducted a meta-analysis of 15 high-quality studies and found that teacher effectiveness, as measured by gains in student test scores, increases rapidly in the first five years of an educator's career. Research suggests that high-quality induction programs can greatly enhance teaching practice during the most formative years of a teacher's career. New teachers develop effective teaching strategies and knowledge more quickly by learning from the experience of other teachers.<sup>18</sup> Teachers who receive induction are more likely to stay, and in addition are also able to move more quickly beyond issues of classroom management to focus on instruction.<sup>19</sup> WSIPP also conducted a meta-analysis of four empirically sound studies that compare high-quality mentoring programs to induction as usual. Although not statistically significant, they found that the average effect of high-quality induction on student test scores was 0.07 standard deviation units, which is twice as large as the average gain in the first five years of a teacher's career (0.03).

27 states currently require some form of teacher induction, although only 11 states require mentoring for two or more years. 22 of these states require participation or completion of a mentoring or induction program to advance to a professional teaching license. In 2010-2011, 17 states provided dedicated funding for these programs.<sup>20</sup>

The financial benefits of induction programs are estimated in a cost-benefit analysis prepared by Villar and Strong, which calculates that school districts receive an approximate return of \$1.66 for every \$1.00 spent on mentoring and induction.<sup>21</sup> While it is difficult to measure the



exact cost of turnover, studies estimate that the cost to replace a teacher who leaves the profession may range from one third<sup>22</sup> to nearly 2.5 times the initial salary in recruitment, personnel costs, and lost productivity.<sup>23</sup> In 2007, The Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP) estimated the cost to replace a Washington teacher was at least \$45,000.<sup>24</sup> The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future reports that hiring well-prepared teachers, which includes those exposed to induction programs, reduced attrition in the first year of teaching by 50 percent.<sup>25</sup> These statistics appear to indicate that implementation of a high-quality induction program will save money for the state and school districts while advancing the legislature's goal of providing all students with access to world-class educators and retaining these educators in Washington's K-12 public schools.

A preponderance of research indicates that the single most important factor in student learning is the quality of classroom educators. In fact, Armour-Thomas, Clay, et al found that differences in teacher capability can account for up to 90 percent of the variation in student learning in schools with similar student characteristics.<sup>26</sup> In order for the state to provide a basic education to public school students, every student must be provided an effective teacher. Mentor support provides assistance to novice teachers to positively affect student learning. Induction assists with the state's goal of retaining high-quality educators and providing a world-class education system to all students. Per Liam Goldrick et al, "Research evidence suggests that comprehensive, multi-year induction programs accelerate the professional growth of new teachers, reduce the rate of new teacher attrition, provide a positive return on investment, and improve student learning."<sup>27</sup> The state must invest early and often in beginning educators in order to allow students to receive dividends from this investment over the course of an educator's career.

#### **Arguments For Funding Mentors**

- Mentoring is proven to increase effectiveness and accelerate the professional growth of new teachers.
- Mentoring support will decrease turnover of new teachers.
- Mentoring will provide a positive return on investment when comparing the financial benefits of decreased turnover and increased effectiveness to the cost of the mentor programs.
- Mentoring by an experienced teacher leads to professional rejuvenation, new learning, and enhanced professional practices for the mentor.

#### **Arguments Against Funding Mentors**

- Effective teachers should remain in the classroom teaching students and not be pulled out to mentor new teachers.
- There are various mentor teacher models and there is a need for training and professional development for mentors in order to offer effective programs.

#### **Mentor/Mentee Allocation Recommendation**



In addition to funding instructional coaches in every prototypical school, the Compensation TWG recommends providing a separate mentor categorical allocation for school districts based on the number of first, second, and third year teachers as reported in the S275. An additional allocation should be provided for probationary teachers in accordance with ESSB 5895, Section 1 (4b), which states, “the evaluator may authorize one additional certificated employee to evaluate the probationer and to aid the employee in improving his or her areas of deficiency.” This recommendation will ensure that every Washington school district will have sufficient resources through reliable and regular state funds to support the need to mentor novice teachers. As a categorical allocation, the funding provided must be used for the mentor program; however, school districts can determine the appropriate use of the funding to best support the needs of their teachers and students. The Compensation TWG recommends the estimated annual levels of funding shown in Exhibit 73 for a robust mentor program.

**Exhibit 73: Estimated Annual Cost of Mentor Recommendation**

| <b>Annual Cost of Mentor Recommendation</b>   |                            |   |                              |   |
|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
|   | <b>Mentor FTE Required</b> | <b>Average Number of Teachers 2007-2012</b> | <b>Estimated Annual Cost</b> | <b>Estimated Annual Cost Including Benefits</b> |
| First year teacher  | .088                       | 2,333                                       | \$14,107,000                 | \$18,397,000                                    |
| Second year teacher   | .061                       | 2,208                                       | \$9,180,000                  | \$11,972,000                                    |
| Third year teacher  | .042                       | 2,359                                       | \$6,785,000                  | \$8,847,000                                     |
| Probationary teacher  | .088                       | 459   | \$2,794,000                  | \$3,641,000                                     |
| <b>Total</b>  |                            | <b>7,359</b>                                | <b>\$32,866,000</b>          | <b>\$42,857,000</b>                             |
| <i>Note: Average number of new teachers based on 2007-2012 average of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers as reported in OSPI S275 Personnel Reports plus average number of probationary teachers. Each CIS FTE is allocated 4 substitute days. Additional FTE include health care and other benefits.</i> |                            |   |                              |   |

Allocation of dollar amounts will be contingent on the number of personnel reported in these categories to OSPI on the S275 Personnel Reports October 1 snapshots and the number of teachers placed on probationary status after completion of the evaluation process. Apportionment should be provided to school districts although smaller districts may have the opportunity to leverage capacity and infrastructure through partnerships with educational service districts. Implementation of this recommendation will assist the state in its paramount duty to provide a basic education to public school students through a stable funding source. While many school districts deliver beneficial mentor support to novice teachers through the use of local funds, the Compensation TWG believes that it is vital for the state to categorically fund these programs in order to provide regular and reliable funding to ensure the long-term viability of induction programs.

The allocation amounts in Exhibit 73 provide funding for an average of two hours of mentor support per week<sup>28</sup> for first year and probationary teachers and an average caseload of not greater than 15 novice teachers for a full-time mentor.<sup>29</sup> Mentor support is decreased to an average of 1.5 hours per week for 2<sup>nd</sup> year teachers and an average of one hour per week for

3<sup>rd</sup> year teachers, with the mentor caseload adjusted accordingly. This caseload is not cumulative. The allocation includes three additional professional development days for mentees in the first year and one professional development day in subsequent years, while probationary teachers also receive three additional professional development days. The FTE allocation also includes eight percent of the salary costs to cover district administrative costs. The total salary cost is calculated using each districts average salary allocation for certificated instructional staff based on the salary allocation model recommended in this report, as the Compensation TWG recommends that a mentor must be on a teaching contract. Additionally, supplementary certificated instructional staff hired generate costs for health and mandatory benefits, as well as an OSPI allocation of four substitute days per 1.0 FTE.

# ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved March 19, 2012 from [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL\\_2007033.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_2007033.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Pennucci, A. (2012) *Teacher compensation and training policies: Impacts on student outcomes*. (Document No. 12-05-2201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. P.3

<sup>3</sup> Quality Education Council 2012 Report to the Legislature. Retrieved June 20, 2012 from <http://www.k12.wa.us/LegisGov/2012documents/QEC2012.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> QEC, Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Policy Recommendations About Educator Compensation: Past & Present. Prepared for the Compensation Technical Working Group. Retrieved June 20, 2012 from <http://www.k12.wa.us/Compensation/pubdocs/PolicyRecommendationsAboutEducatorCompensation.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> "Classified Adequacy Staffing Reports" (December 2010). Prepared for the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Page 66.

<sup>9</sup> Joyce, Bruce, & Calhoun, E. (1996). *Learning experiences in school renewal: An exploration of five successful programs*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

<sup>10</sup> Joyce, Bruce & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

<sup>11</sup> Kowal, J. & Steiner, J. Instructional Coaching (2007) The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. Washington D.C. pg. 2

<sup>12</sup> Kowal, Ibid, pg. 3

<sup>13</sup> Improving Instruction Through Coaching. (2007) Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. P. 2

<sup>14</sup> Washington State University. 2008 Mathematics Instructional Coaching: Interim Report. Puget Sound Division, Olympia, WA

<sup>15</sup> Odden, A., Picus, O., Goetz, M., Mangan, M. & Fermanich, M. (2006). An Evidence-Based Approach to School Finance Adequacy in Washington. Prepared for the K-12 Advisory Committee of Washington Learns.

- 
- <sup>16</sup> Plecki, M., Elfers, A., & Knapp, M. (2006). *Who's Teaching Washington's Children? A 2006 Update*. A report prepared for the Center for Strengthening the Teaching profession. Seattle, Washington.
- <sup>17</sup> Plecki, M., Elfers, A., & Knapp, M. (2006). *Who's Teaching Washington's Children? A 2006 Update*. A report prepared for the Center for Strengthening the Teaching profession. Seattle, Washington.
- <sup>18</sup> Conley, D.T., & Rooney, K.C. (2007). *Washington Adequacy Funding Study*. Educational Policy Improvement Center. Eugene, Oregon.
- <sup>19</sup> *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. (1996). New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- <sup>20</sup> Goldrick, Liam, Osta, David, Barlin, Dara, and Jennifer Burn; "Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction." (February 2012) New Teacher Center. Page 25-26.
- <sup>21</sup> Villar, Anthony and Michael Strong, (November 2007). "Is Mentoring Worth the Money?", New Teacher Center, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- <sup>22</sup> *The Cost of Teacher Turnover*. (Austin: Texas Center for Educational Research, 2000).
- <sup>23</sup> Fulton, Kathleen, Yoon, Irene and Christine Lee, "Induction Into Learning Communities." Prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (August 2005) Page 9.
- <sup>24</sup> "More Swimming, Less Sinking," Prepared for the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (January 2007).
- <sup>25</sup> National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2003). "No Dream Denied: A Pledge To America's Children," page 84.
- <sup>26</sup> "Effective Support for New Teachers in Washington State," Prepared by the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession. (2008).
- <sup>27</sup> Goldrick, Liam, Osta, David, Barlin, Dara, and Jennifer Burn; "Review of State Policies on Teacher Induction." (February 2012) New Teacher Center. Page v.
- <sup>28</sup> "Beginning Educator Support Team Program," Prepared by Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (February 2011).
- <sup>29</sup> "Summary Lessons and Implications from the New Teacher Alliance of the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession," prepared by Inverness Research (May 2010).