

LEGAL LANGUAGE SERVICES

TRANSCRIPTION OF TAPE

DESIGNATED AS

DC

June 23rd

Tape A

Susan Frost: Good morning. If I could ask everybody to be seated, and those of you who are here we'd love to have you towards the front, so folks, when they come in they'll have seats in the back. That never works but we can try and we will be joined shortly, if anybody sees Dr. Ingersoll, he's here. We just need him up front, okay? Good morning again. My name is Susan Frost, and as the President of the Alliance for Excellent Education, I want to welcome all of you to what we hope will be a very informative morning discussion, and one that is action oriented as well. The issues that we hope to address this morning could be summarized in four parts: first of all, high quality teachers – once we recruit them, why can't we keep them in our classrooms – especially the classrooms where they're most needed? Question two: Is teacher attrition really so much of a problem that we need national attention focused on it? And if so, where do we begin? Three, if the research is telling us that high quality induction of new teachers can cut teacher attrition in half – and that it is much more cost effective than continuing to replace the teachers who leave – how can we make sure that every new teacher gets this high quality induction? What does it look like? And how can we start using the savings from that action to increase student achievement? And finally, since we are in Dirksen 106, we are in Washington, D.C., what is the federal role in partnering with states, local districts and universities, in making sure that every new teacher – especially teachers in high needs areas – gets the quality induction he or she needs. With us today are the people who can help us

answer those questions, and we're delighted to be able to bring them together this morning to address this very important topic. They will be introduced individually as they speak this morning, and I'd like to refer you to the agenda in your packages so you know what's coming next. At the center of this discussion will be the report the Alliance is releasing today. It looks like this [holds up report] and it's called *Tapping the Potential, Retaining and Developing High Quality New Teachers*. I want to thank the long list and very esteemed list of individuals and organizations that we have listed in the Acknowledgements page of this report, who contributed to the report – especially to the framing of it and the review of it – and to make sure that we covered everything that was important in the field of research and practice on quality induction. These folks are not just listed because of their name; they're listed because of their contribution, and we want to acknowledge that. And in particular, we want to acknowledge our Teacher Quality Advisory Group when we do any issue that we consider of great importance to the agenda of transforming America's high schools and middle schools, and making sure that every child has the chance to graduate, which is the mission of the Alliance. Whenever we look at an important component of that mission, we put together a group of advisory folks from around the country who are the top people in the field. That helps us become informed about what we need to look at, but it also brings together a conversation that wouldn't have happened otherwise. Our Teacher Quality Advisory Group came in and spent an entire day with us, discussed the issues before us today,

and a wide range of teacher quality issues, and will continue to work with us. In particular, I want to thank Dan [Fallon] at the Carnegie Corporation of New York for setting the context of this discussion. He has a great history of the federal role in teaching and, in particular, induction, as part of the Foreword to this paper. We hope you will use this report, not only as a document to help you make the case for teacher induction, and not only here at the federal level, but at the state and local level. But also as a way to help practitioners who want to strengthen their programs – that are already in place – and to start new ones as a base on which to put the best research and the best practice into those efforts. We think it can be used by policymakers and practitioners alike, and we urge you to contact us for more copies. We urge you to go to our website [<http://www.all4ed.org>] where we will have the report in full text, and to link to this report if you find it useful, so that we can disseminate it more widely to people who can use it. The Alliance is especially used to being joined by two partners in making the federal recommendations outlined in this report, and specifically, in the document in your folders, *New Teacher Induction: The Federal Role*. Joined with us in this effort is the New Teacher Center at the University of California-Santa Cruz and the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, better known as NCTAF. The joint recommendations by these three organizations are on a piece of paper that have three logos on the top, symbolizing the partnership in making those recommendations. Together, we are recommending the following: first that states and local school districts prioritize quality induction as they use

their current Title II NCLB funds. The U.S. Department of Education has estimated that of the \$2.9 billion in Title II currently appropriated for Title II, approximately \$1.3 billion of that is currently spent on teacher-professional development, including induction. The rest of the money is spent on its antecedent purpose: reducing class size, which is also an important component of the work that we are promoting in our Smaller Learning Communities Initiative. But that \$1.3 billion is not going to high quality induction programs around this country in the concentration it needs to be. Although 79% of all new teachers say they are offered induction, only 1% of our new teachers participate in the kind of high quality induction that you'll be hearing about this morning. So, mentoring, as Sue Lusi [former vice president of policy at the Alliance] has told me any number of times, is not enough. Assigning a mentor to a teacher may be considered induction by the 79% of the teachers who believe they have it, but often that is a very weak program. Mentors will see their new teachers when they can, they have little or no release time in order to observe them in the classroom, they have no structured program of how to be a mentor, and young, new, and middle-career teachers, who are entering the buildings, are sorely disappointed in the amount of effort and support that their mentor can provide them with. That is not the kind of induction we're talking about. The kind of induction that we want to see happening across the country is the kind that you'll hear about this morning. Second recommendation: that Congress require all future grant recipients of the Teacher Quality Enhancement grants created by Title II of

the other act, the Higher Education Act be required to provide high quality induction programs. These are competitive grant programs. They'll be reauthorized in this realm of the Higher Education Act, and we are recommending that in order to receive one of those grants that a high quality induction program be part of that application. That way we will have national models of good practice in place across the country to add to the models that you will hear from today. And finally, that Congress allocate \$500 million in new funds to support high quality induction in our highest need schools – where attrition rates are the highest, induction is usually the weakest, and the challenge is the greatest. It has always been the federal role to put our resources into the highest needs districts in the country, at the same time that we are calling for the principles that work across all schools for every student. This recommendation follows that path. You will have the opportunity of hearing one of our partners, Ellen MoirMoir, who is representing the New Teachers Project as she moderates the panel of practitioners later this morning. I just want to recognize her here today. Ellen, would you just stand? As helping to lead this effort – not only in the State of California – but now at the national level, and working with us. Now I'd like to introduce Tom Carroll, President of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Tom and his organization really broke ground on this issue at the national level, and we're very pleased to be working with him and with all the people that represent his commission. Tom?

Tom Carroll: Thank you, Susan. We're pleased that you've given us this opportunity to join with you. The Commission is deeply committed to the idea of quality teaching – for every child – in a school organized for success, and we're pleased to be partners with you and with Ellen on this initiative. We think that induction is really the key to meeting this goal of a highly qualified teacher for every child. We issued a report at the Commission about a year and a half ago now called *No Dream Denied*. In that report, we concluded that the real school staffing crisis was not a teacher shortage; it was high turnover and attrition among teachers. When we looked around the country we found an average teacher turnover rate that was 15%, which is higher than in other fields. But in low-income school districts and low-performing schools, the attrition rate is well over 20%. We are finding schools where there was not a single teacher in the school who had been there for more than three years. Schools, in some districts, where the average tenure was 1.9 years. There are small, rural school districts in South Carolina where the entire teacher workforce turns over every four years. So when you have that kind of turnover rate you simply are not able to establish the continuity, that community, academic rigor, and strong teacher-student relationships that you need for successful teaching and learning. So we've concluded that teacher retention and reducing this turnover rate is the key to moving forward on a highly qualified teacher for every child. What we really found was that too many schools were treating new teachers like cannon fodder. We're basically throwing them in – sink or swim – into the most challenging circumstances in

the district, with the least experience, and when they leave in frustration – having been overwhelmed by really unacceptable teaching conditions – our solution is simply to throw more in behind it. And we have this constant churning stream of teachers moving through the system. It's time to break that cycle. Instead of putting teachers in a sink or swim placement, it's time to give them a strong start, and that's what induction is about. The costs for this, of course, are tremendous. The cost to the teachers that we've invested huge public resources in, in terms of higher education, subsidies from states for tuition, is phenomenal. When those teachers leave, we lose that investment in their education. But we also lose the dream that that teacher had of making a difference in a child's life. The cost to school districts is also staggering. We estimate that, at a minimum, in the first year, you lose half of the teacher's salary when you lost that teacher, along with expenditures on recruitment and hiring costs if you lose a teacher whose been in your school system for three years or more. You may be losing as much as a \$50,000 investment in that teacher that went into recruiting, hiring, training, and the professional development of that teacher, which is lost. The financial costs are staggering but the real cost to the students is the bottom line. We find that low-income schools and low-performing schools have the highest number of inexperienced teachers, the highest number of teachers teaching outside their field [of expertise], the highest number of uncertified teachers, the lowest average teacher's salary, and the highest turnover rates. We can break that cycle if we start to intervene in the process with strong, mentored induction

support for those teachers. It's particularly appropriate that the recommendations that are being made here involve both Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Act and Title II of the Higher Education Act, because higher education has a real stake in this. A teacher is not a finished product when he or she leaves the campus and graduates. Higher education, just as medical schools do, needs to be part of the bridge into successful practice. We need to establish residencies and internships that sustain new teachers in their early years. We've begun to work on these kinds of strategies in school districts around the country. We have several initiatives going on in the east coast here. In Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia. We're beginning work in Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin. Milwaukee, Chicago, and Cleveland are particular districts that have made a strong commitment to this movement. So I would encourage all of you to begin to rethink your sense of the crisis as being a teacher shortage. The crisis is not a teacher shortage. The crisis is that we prepare these teachers, and we can't retain them in our schools because they're telling us that they don't have the support they need to succeed, and they walk away in large numbers at a great expense. So thank you for this opportunity. Thank you, Susan, for the chance to join with you on this initiative.

Susan Frost: Well, we are very pleased that our timing worked out perfectly. I'm very pleased to introduce a Senator from Rhode Island that has been at the forefront of the issue of teacher quality, of teacher induction in particular, and the issue of education as a whole, for his Senate career. Senator Reed has

made great efforts to prepare, retain, and develop new teachers, and he's going to talk to us briefly about his work this morning and, in particular, the bill that he has introduced called the PRREP Act, Preparing, Recruiting and Retaining Education Professionals Act. We think the PRREP Act is a terrific start to creating a federal partnership with states and with local school districts in making sure that quality induction is there for every teacher in this country – especially in our highest needs districts. So without further ado I'm going to turn over the podium to Senator Reed.

Senator Reed: Thank you.

[Applause]

Senator Reed: Well thank you very much Susan. It's a pleasure to be here today and to welcome you, and to say a few words about what is a vital topic of importance throughout the country. And that is high quality teachers in every classroom. First let me thank Susan for the kind introduction and also to recognize Susan LusiLusi who was formally from Providence in the Rhode Island Department of Education. Good to see you again. And Tom Carroll and Richard Ingersoll and Ellen MoirMoir and all the administrators and teachers that are here today. The No Child Left Behind Act set a very ambitious standard: higher qualified teachers in every classroom in the United States by the year 2005 and 2006. We all know that that is something we have to aspire to and indeed achieve because teachers, in my view, are the most important lever in education– children, parents, and teachers – but teachers are that vital component, and we can't accept anything less than the highest quality

teachers. But we also recognize that in the school year 2000, there were only about 54% of our high school teachers, who were rated by the Department of Education as highly qualified. So we have a long way to go. We also understand that one of the problems we see is that so many people who train for teaching very quickly decide they don't want to do it – that they need the support and they're not getting it. Thirty-three percent of beginning teachers leave, and after five years, 46% of those who trained to be teachers entered a school system have left the field of teaching. So we have to do much, much more. And that's why I have, together with my staff, prepared the PRREP Act. Like everything in Washington, it has an acronym: it's the Preparing, Recruiting and Retaining Education Professionals Act, the PRREP Act. We hope we can use this legislation to continue this dialogue that you have done so well in your report to talk about: how do we achieve this goal of highly qualified teachers in our classrooms? We had, we thought, a great opportunity through the Higher Education Reauthorization Act to work on that basis, use the PRREP Act as the template, and try to improve our support for improving educational quality and teacher quality. Regrettably, the Higher Education Act is bogged down in the morass of politics and procedure here at the moment, but that shouldn't stop us from thinking about this and advocating for it. We want to build upon the teacher quality enhancement grants in Title II of the Higher Education Act. The PRREP Act would build on these grants, which are competitive grants awarded to states, to partnerships, and also recruitment grants to states. This grant program is, first of all, we think,

under-funded, so we'd like to increase the funding and also we'd like to build them on the model to ensure that we can provide better pre-service, clinical field and practicum components in education programs. We want to make sure we can emphasize mentoring and, indeed, we want to continue to develop partnerships between colleges, local education agencies, and the high needs K through 12 schools. One of the ways we hope to do that is to expand these grants to schools and departments of psychology and education on our college campuses, which are an important component of teaching. We hope that if we can develop this type of clinical approach – this practicum approach – then we can give the skills to the young teachers in classroom management and those issues that sometimes are not covered as thoroughly as some of the more academic subjects in school. Indeed, in my mind there's a model, and that model is medical residency. We would never send a doctor on his own into an operating room without extensive practical experience under close supervision and mentoring by other physicians. We should aspire, I think, to the same type of model for education. The PRREP Act has several goals: obviously we want to promote these strong teaching skills. We want to improve the ability of teachers to assess student achievement and use such assessment to improve instructions – a type feedback if you will. We want to provide the mentoring, the team teaching, and the reduced class schedule that is so necessary for the planning and for discussion and the strategizing, which is an important part of effective teaching. We want to encourage the integration of technology into the curriculum. We also want to inform research and practice

techniques for teacher preparation. And in addition, we want to provide opportunities for teachers to rotate in and out of schools, participating in partnerships. There's nothing like leaving your classroom and going to another classroom, and getting an idea of what is working there and bringing those lessons back. Also, what we'd like to do is recognize that education doesn't begin in kindergarten and the first grade. It begins very, very early. So we'd like to see some improved enhancement for early child educators – the type of professional training they need, and also, principles and teacher education and preparation program faculty. One of the, I think, neglected resources in our school systems, are principals. They're so harassed, worrying about milk money, bus schedules and everything else, that they're not out there being mentors and advisors to the teachers. And if we can get that going I think we can make real progress. Ultimately though, like so many things in Washington, it might be about money. The current authorization for these grants is \$89 million a year. We'd like to increase that to \$500 million. And if we did, and if we could appropriate even a portion of that money, I think you'd begin to see the support you need to make the goals of No Child Left Behind real in our schools and in the lives of our children throughout America. One of the great debates we're having here is not moving away from these lofty goals, but being realistic to admit to ourselves that we have to pay for them, that we have to have the resources. It's in a whole range of things, but one important area has to be teacher preparation. It is, to me, something of a hoax to talk about a highly qualified teacher in every

classroom by 2005, 2006 and then not pay to do that. We have to match our rhetoric with resources, and I hope we can – both in the appropriations process and in legislation like the PRREP Act. Well, let me stop right there and again commend you all for your work, for your advocacy, and for your commitment to the children of America. Thank you very, very much.

[Applause]

Susan Frost: The Senator has a few minutes for questions so I'm going to turn the podium back to him and ask away.

Senator Reed: I think Susan was very wise in putting that out. I have time for questions. I don't know about answers but go ahead and ask them.

Question: [Inaudible]

Senator Reed: I believe there are. I mean one of the skill sets that we recognize is that reaching all parents is an important part of the educational process, and one of the areas where we fall down repeatedly [is in reaching out to] those parents who are not fluent in English. And part of our hope is that when we enhance the professional skills of these teachers, it's not just the academic skills – it's also the ability to communicate with parents and obviously language is one of those key aspects. Anything else? Well let me thank you all. You've been most kind. Enjoy the morning. Thank you so much. Thank you, Susan.

[Applause]

Susan Frost: Okay. You will notice on the agenda that the next speaker is Ralph Regula, [Republican] Representative from the State of Ohio and he is going to make every effort to be here. That's why it says in parenthesis: 'invited'. But I

think he's going to be able to do it later in the morning. So we're going to turn to him as soon as he comes in. Our panelists and our speakers have agreed to interrupt their session for that when he comes. As you know, Congress is in a very busy hearing schedule, if not legislative schedule, okay? And so there's a lot going on. I want to now introduce the team at the Alliance that actually created this report and this event. That team has been led by Dr. Sue Lusi, whom Senator Reed just mentioned hails from the State of Rhode Island, was in the State Department in Rhode Island, as well as in the Providence school district leading efforts to reform education in that state. She also has been working with us, directing our work on teacher quality for the last several months, and we've had the benefit of her expertise. She will actually be added as one of the newest members of our International Advisory Board so she can continue to advise us in this area and in state and local policy as she returns to Rhode Island. And we're going to be very, very pleased to have her as part of that dialogue. So I want her to introduce her team and folks and we'll talk about the report.

Dr. Susan Lusi: Thank you Susan. We're going to now move into the portion of the report where we present the Alliance report, *Tapping the Potential*, and I'll introduce the two presenters in a moment. We will then – I will introduce – and we'll hear from Dr. Richard Ingersoll from the University of Pennsylvania on the research involving induction, and then we'll have some time for questions and answers for the panelists for this portion of the program and then move into our second panel. Before we do that, though, I want to again acknowledge

some very important people. Susan mentioned all the wonderful people in the Acknowledgement section of the report. I just want to highlight particularly those members of our Teacher and Principal Quality Advisory Group who were instrumental in shaping this particular report. They are Kevin Carey and Russ Weiner from the Education Trust. Tom Carroll from NCTAF who you've heard from, Dan Fallon from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, who, as Susan mentioned, also was gracious enough to write the Foreword to the report. Gaynor McCown from the Teaching Commission, Ellen Moir, who you'll hear from a little later this morning, and Catherine Fisk Natale from the Connecticut State Department of Education who you will also hear from. We want to thank all of them for the substantial time and energy – and I do mean substantial – that they spent reviewing and advising us on this report. Now without further ado, I want to introduce my two colleagues, Robin Gelinias and Jeremy Ayers. Robin Gelinias is a Policy Associate with the Alliance for Excellent Education, and prior to joining the Alliance, she did management consulting and received her masters degree in Public Policy from Duke University. Jeremy Ayers is a Research Assistant with the Alliance, and prior to joining us worked for a family service provider focusing on advocacy for low-income students, and he received his masters in Divinity also from Duke University. You may be hearing a pattern here. I want to refer you to the bios in your packet for more detail on their backgrounds. But what I most want to say is what a privilege it has been for me to work with both Jeremy and Robin on this report, as well as on other education policy issues over the

past few months. They are just stellar colleagues. They are the most that anyone could wish for, as are the other members of our policy team on the Alliance staff. Thank you so much and I turn it over to Robin.

Robin Gelinas: Thank you, Sue, it's truly a privilege to work with you as well. Good morning and thank you to all of you for coming this morning. When we began thinking about this report we came at it with two goals. The first was to shine a spotlight on what good comprehensive new teacher induction looks like, and Jeremy is going to talk about that in a moment. The second was to look at the cost to our nation of new teacher attrition, and I'd like to talk a little about that right now because when we were doing our research, it became so clear to us that teacher attrition is a problem that, not only has huge monetary consequences, but one that also cripples teacher quality and student achievement. So when we talk about the shortage of highly qualified teachers that we have right now, typically we talk about it in terms of recruitment. Few people are aware that our teacher shortage is also often a problem of retaining the teachers that we've already had. There are certain regions, of course, that really do have problems recruiting teachers, but more often than not, when we're talking about teacher shortage, it's a problem less about supply and more about hanging onto the new teachers that we already have. Schools today are losing teachers faster than they're hiring them. We refer to this as the leaky bucket. So let's look at the facts. We know that 14% of new teachers are leaving the profession in their first year. And we know that almost 50% of new teachers leave the profession in their first five years. We

also know that attrition rates in poor schools are roughly 50% higher than in wealthy ones. This has grave consequences for student achievement. We also know that experience does matter. Studies estimate that it takes three to seven years for a new teacher to become an experienced, highly skilled teacher. If we are losing almost half of our new teachers in five years, it is no wonder that it's more difficult for schools to develop a highly skilled core of experienced teachers. When you think about the fact that if education really is a civil right, as Secretary [of Education] Rod Paige is saying, and that teacher quality has a strong – if not the strongest – impact on student achievement, then attrition becomes a problem of equity. Every student should have a highly skilled experienced teacher regardless of the wealth of their school, because every student should have the opportunity for high achievement. So when you look at the cost of teacher attrition, we estimated it to be about \$2.6 billion annually. We came to this number using 30% of average teacher salary (30% being the percentage that the Department of Labor uses). This cost includes hiring and training costs, lost productivity, lost investment in professional development and financial incentives, but it is important to note that this cost does not reflect our two biggest costs, which Tom Carroll also referred to, which are diminished teacher quality and the hampering of student achievement. If we were to add those costs into this \$2.6 billion, the figure would be much, much higher – there's no doubt. So let's talk about the problem. Why are we having such a hard time hanging on to our new teachers? The primary reason teachers cite for leaving the profession is lack

of support. New teachers are most likely to be assigned to the most difficult students and the most challenging work environments. They're offered little guidance and support, especially in poor schools. So it's not a wonder that we're having such a hard time hanging onto them. There's an analogy in this paper that I particularly like, which likens putting new teachers in the most difficult teaching situations to putting a newly licensed driver in a NASCAR race. The good news is that there's a solution. Comprehensive induction has been proven to reduce the rate of new teacher attrition by 50%. It keeps our new teachers in the classroom. So what is comprehensive induction? Comprehensive induction is a set of supports and assessments that creates a bridge, to take new teachers from being novice teachers, and develops them into experienced, highly skilled teachers. It has been proven to advance teacher skills – in less time – from those of new teachers to those of experienced teachers. Of course, when we're talking about induction there are some key components that it needs to include, and Jeremy's going to talk about those now.

Jeremy Ayers: Thank you. This section of the report really centers on two fundamental questions for us around induction. The first is, what works, what is most effective, what gives us the greatest impact? And secondly, what will give us the greatest return on our investment? So we spent quite a bit of time talking with researchers like Professor Ingersoll about the top programs – as you'll hear about later – to really examine what components or essential ingredients make up comprehensive induction, and what gives us the greatest impact in

terms of retaining our teachers and developing them into highly quality professionals. I would like to run through each of these ingredients or components with you now. First of all, often as you think about induction you think about mentoring, but what we mean is high quality mentoring, and I think Ellen will talk a little bit about that with you. Basically it's that structured relationship between a novice teacher and a more experienced teacher. It can be a group, or one where they basically coach and observe them, give them feedback, assess their skills, and help them improve. But we know it is very important that mentors must be qualified. That is, they're exemplary teachers, and they know how to teach adults – not just kids – and that they receive some additional training in how to mentor. Secondly, we know that induction must contain a common planning time or collaboration. I think this is sort of the element that often gets left out. We don't think of it very much but it's important for new teachers not just to strategize with their mentors, but with all teachers across all levels of experience. Basically, it's structured meeting time where teachers hook up on instruction, how to improve their teaching, and how it leads to achievement. Examples of that might include developing lesson plans, or curriculum, or using student achievement data to link your teaching to what your students are actually learning. Thirdly, we know because teachers learn over time it's important for them to engage in ongoing professional development, and it starts from the very beginning. Now many of you in this room have told us, and we have read what you have told us, that professional development can no longer be

these one day lecture workshops that are disconnected and do not actually translate into teacher practice. But instead, professional development that is high quality, it is collaborative, it is long-term, and it is content driven. That is, professional development activities that help teachers to expand and update their content knowledge. We know that disciplines change over time, and we know that teachers have to be continuous learners. [Professional development] begins in the very first years, but it's important that teachers continue to update and expand the knowledge of their content or their discipline, especially at the high school level. Secondly, we know that new teachers routinely say their biggest needs are learning how to manage student behavior, and so from the very early days, that means learning how to manage behavior. But that also, as you develop as a teacher, it's about learning how to engage your students and keep them interested in what you're teaching. And then thirdly, we know – especially at the secondary level – it is important for all new teachers to learn how to teach literacy and numeracy in all subjects and across the curriculum. Now many folks don't. Often we don't think about teaching reading, writing, and math in the later grades, unless you are an English or a math teacher. But we know that from the work of the Alliance, one in four eighth and twelfth graders reads below basic levels, and they have math skills below basic levels. We also know that adolescents are developing skills over time, so even those who are now behind still need that ongoing support. So it's important that through professional development, teachers be given the opportunity to learn how to teach literacy and numeracy in all of

their courses. Fourthly, we know that it's important for induction to contain networking that is basically grouping teachers together for social and emotional support, but also to learn from their successes and their failures. Now ideally, when you think about networks, it's important for teachers to have a confidential lifeline and that may mean grouping them with teachers outside the local school. Think about it – if you're a new teacher, who do you want to share and voice your frustrations with most? It's going to be those folks who don't have immediate decisions over your hiring and your employment status. Lastly, at the end of the induction period, is a standards-based assessment and evaluation. This really helps to guard the quality of teaching and ensures that by the end of the induction period, teachers can demonstrate that they have made the transition from novice to high quality professional, where they're consistently improving student achievement. This really is sort of a benchmark or a bell weather event where we determine whether or not that teacher should continue in teaching. As we know, some teachers should transition into another career. So that's the standards-based assessment and evaluation, and it's important that throughout the process of induction, teachers are given all five components of comprehensive induction, so that they're adequately prepared to demonstrate their skill and to be assessed. Now what I'd also like to share with you is what induction looks like at the high school level. Because the Alliance works particularly on middle schools and high schools, we asked ourselves this question: what does induction look like in high schools and what do folks need to know about this?

What we found, much to our dismay, (as is common in many areas) is that there is very little research on induction in high schools. Practitioners often have certain issues that they raise, but it's not a well-known subject, so we'd like to talk with you briefly about a few issues that are important at the high school level. First of all, one is that mentors teach in the same subject area. That is, at the high school level, if you're teaching your content, and you are a math teacher, it makes sense for you to have a mentor who also knows math, so that your mentor can help you – not just with how to teach, but what to teach. We also know that it's important for high school teachers to have adequate time whether that's common planning time or release time to work with their mentors. Often scheduling difficulties at the high school level make that difficult, so it's important that principals and school leaders and department chairs make time for their teachers to engage and work together. Thirdly, we know that it's important to have supportive working conditions. As many of you at the high school level say, a new math teacher may not just teach algebra, but they teach Algebra One and Algebra Two, geometry, maybe even calculus. They have a large number of preparations that they have to get ready for, and often some new teachers may not even have their own classrooms. So it's important that we have supportive working conditions in place that can support the work that they're doing through induction. Fourthly, literacy and numeracy, I've already touched on. And lastly, English language skills. As we've already pointed out this morning, our student population is changing, and if we are going to educate all of our children to

high standards, we have to give our teachers the tools they need to be able to help their high school students – who are still developing their English language skills across the board. And this is a sort of a beginning picture at least for us to present to you about what induction looks like in high schools, and we certainly welcome your thoughts and your feedback, and your future work on this issue. I want to turn it now back to Robin who will tell us where do we go from here with all this information.

Robin Gelinias: And that's exactly right: so what? So we know what good comprehensive induction should look like. Now how do we get induction to new teachers? Like Susan [Frost] said, only 1% of new teachers today are receiving comprehensive induction, and we know induction matters. We know that it has a strong impact on teacher quality and student achievement, and we know that high needs high schools in particular have the least experienced teachers, the highest attrition rates, and most often, the lowest student achievement. The federal government must partner with state and local governments to provide comprehensive induction to new teachers. We have a three-part recommendation. The first is to, as Susan [Frost] alluded to, amend the title to the Higher Education Act to require grant recipients to provide comprehensive induction. Now this would serve two purposes: the first is to get induction out there to new teachers. The second is that these grantees can become models for the nation. We can do additional research; we can establish more best practices. Second, provide \$500 million in new funding to ensure that new teachers in our nation's neediest schools receive comprehensive

induction. These are the schools that have the highest attrition rates, and these are more often than not the teachers who need new teacher induction more than anybody. Finally, encourage states and districts to target their funds from Title II of ESEA [the Elementary and Secondary Education Act] so that every teacher can have high quality induction. It's clear that the time is now. Today our nation is focused on improving teacher quality and on holding schools more accountable. Well, at the same time we have approximately 3,000 kids dropping out every school day. There's a little bit of a contradiction here. Clearly we have a problem. Comprehensive induction is a key part of that solution. We need to empower our teachers to lead the transformation of our schools. One study found that every dollar invested in a comprehensive induction program resulted in a payoff of \$1.37. That's a 37% return on investment. That's only one estimate, but it's clear that induction works, and it's clear that our nation can no longer afford not to provide comprehensive induction to new teachers. Thank you, and we'll welcome questions.

Dr. Susan Lusi: Thank you Robin and Jeremy. I now have the privilege of introducing Dr. Richard Ingersoll from the University of Pennsylvania. Again, I'll refer you to your packet for a more detailed bio of Dr. Ingersoll, but I do want to highlight that Richard has done extensive and widely cited research on the problem of teacher shortages and under-qualified teachers. And most importantly, for our purposes today on teacher induction. Dr. Ingersoll is one of the foremost authorities in this area, and I will now turn the podium over to

him to discuss the induction research and its implications for our *Tapping the Potential* report.

Dr. R. Ingersoll: Thank you. Well I do, as Sue [Lusi] mentioned, I do research on teacher supply, demand and quality issues and have been over the last decade and a half or so. Sue asked me if I'd come and respond to the report and its recommendations and set a little context and particularly talk about the data and what the data tell us about these issues. And before I forget, I brought some copies of some short things I've written, if any of you want to take away some copies of the data when you leave. Well what's the context? As we've been told many, many times, we have this teacher shortage crisis. And the arguments, which I'm sure are very familiar to everyone, go like this: we have this increase in student enrollments. We have this increase in teacher retirements. These two demographic trends are colliding, and lots of schools simply can't find sufficient numbers of teachers to fill other positions, which, after all, is the mandate of the No Child Left Behind Act – that every classroom is staffed by a qualified teacher. The anecdotes are straightforward. Let's bring more people into the occupation. So we have dozens of very interesting initiatives all designed with that purpose in mind. We have Troops to Teachers and we have Teach for America and we have alternative certification programs. Some states are using signing bonuses and housing assistance and student loan forgiveness. Some districts are recruiting overseas, et cetera – all, perhaps, very worthwhile things. But I've come to the unfortunate conclusion that none of these will really work to solve the

problem that we want to solve, and that the conventional wisdom here is something of a wrong diagnosis with a wrong prescription. What do the data tell us? Well the data tell us that yes, it's true student enrollments are going up. Yes, it's true teacher retirement's going up, has been going up, and yes, it's true: large numbers of schools have difficulty filling all their positions with qualified people. But the data also tell us, as was mentioned earlier, that the problem really isn't – the root of the problem really isn't – that we have teacher shortages in the sense that we're producing, recruiting too few people. Rather, the problem is we have too many people prematurely leaving. That is, leaving long before retirement. That the problem isn't so much shortages as it is turnover. And when we look closely at the data, they suggest that teaching has been, and continues to be, something of what we call a revolving door occupation, which I've tried to capture in this next slide, which I hope you can see. These are national data collected by the U.S. Department of Education and the Census Bureau. They're from a couple of years ago, and they show us that in the '99-2000 school year, we had about three million teachers in our teaching force. At the beginning of that school year, you had about 535,000 people come into schools – something over half a million came into schools. Less than 12 months later a slightly larger number, 540,000, left schools. So the data tell us that we have over a million teachers in job transition every year, almost a third of this large – relatively large – workforce teaching. It's a large number. It's what we call labor dependent. We've never been able to automate it and there's over five times as many teachers as either lawyers or

professors. We have this great deal of job transition in a relatively large workforce: a revolving door. Now, of course, we need to recognize that some of this turnover is good. There's nothing wrong with fresh blood. Some people shouldn't be teaching and we want them to turnover. On the other hand, we need to recognize that this revolving door is not cost-free. Now the data also tell us something else: that the rate in which the revolving door revolves varies amongst different types of teachers and amongst different types of schools. It's particularly high in low-income, urban, poor, disadvantaged schools, and it's also particularly high amongst new teachers. Teaching's an occupation that has very heavy losses in the first few years and I've tried to capture that with this slide. It shows us that after one year – and again these are national data – after one year, about 14% of those who have come into the occupation are gone. After two years it's about a quarter. After three years it's about a third. After five years you've lost 40 to 50% of your people. The image – and I think this was mentioned earlier – that always comes to my mind is the leaky bucket. Note that this is the newcomers. This has little, if anything, to do with gray hair and retirement. So of course, the important question here is why? Why are there such high losses going on here? The data tell us that one of the leading factors, not the only one but one of the leading ones, is lack of support – particularly for these new teachers. But this is a difficult job to learn the ropes, and you lose a lot of people in the first few years. In fact, people that have traditionally studied this occupation use the term 'sink or swim'. I'm a former high school teacher myself, and

certainly, this is the way it was. You got the job, the principal then handed the keys to you and gave you a pat on the back and said, good luck, you're on your own. A very lonely situation. All kinds of things come up that you have no idea how to cope with. In my case I was teaching senior high school. Some swim, some sink. Now to be sure, there's been recognition of this need and problem in the last few years. A growing recognition of the importance of trying to fill this void and provide some support orientation, induction mentoring for new teachers. And we have some data here showing that this support has gone up over the last decade – and again, national data. This is first year teachers: a decade ago, less than half, 41% of the new teachers – first year teachers – indicated that they got any kind of mentoring or induction support. In ten years that's almost doubled. So we have 79% in the '99-2000 years who got it. So there's some recognition and there's some increase in this issue. Does it matter? That of course, is the important question. Do these programs really make any difference whatsoever? This has been a question I've tried to tackle the last several years and do a lot of statistical analyses on what's the impact of new teachers receiving induction, mentoring, support, et cetera, and what I've found is yes, it does have an effect. In this case, on retention, and my last slide here tries to capture this. The top bar represents those first year teachers – and again, national data – first year teachers who got nothing. This is the old sink or swim model, and we see that after just one year, 40% of them have left that school. About half went to another school. About half left the occupation altogether. Forty percent loss

in one year – it's kind of stunning. The next bar down, the middle bar: these are first year teachers that got some induction and mentoring. And by that I mean they got a mentor, which is very important, and the school provided some structured time for them to do some collaboration, some communication, some planning with other teachers in their field. You can see it makes a difference: both their moving, the blue part that's moving between one school and another. And they're leaving the occupation altogether: the dark part of the bar. Both significantly decline. Finally, we have the full comprehensive model, which is very close, almost identical to what was discussed earlier. This is first year teachers who got a whole range of things. They got a mentor, they had structured time to talk to their principal. They were provided with orientation seminars at the beginning of the year. They're hooked up with some kind of external network with teachers elsewhere, they're – very importantly – provided some reduced teaching and workload, et cetera. What a dramatic effect we see that teachers, first year teachers, that got that full comprehensive package, less than half of them – it dropped from 44% to 18%. And of those who left the occupation altogether, it's less than 10%. So what do the data tell us? They tell us that yes, it works, and to some extent we seem to get what we pay for. The more comprehensive the package we offer to new teachers the more likely they are to stick around for further years. But there's a big 'but' here. The data also tell us that what these new teachers get is a very mixed quality and quantity: that often what they get is very, very superficial. And often what they get is not very much. There's a

growing trend towards supplying some kind of induction mentoring, but just what is supplied and how often it's supplied varies dramatically. The data tell us that of this middle bar, the some mentoring induction, which, of course, gets some induction, that only a quarter of the new teachers in the country got an equivalent package to that. And this full comprehensive package at the bottom – less than 1% of the new teachers in the country got that. So yes, it works, but at this point, it's clearly under-funded, under-supported, and hence, this brings us to the whole point of this session and these kinds of recommendations of the report. That is, there's clearly a great interest here. There's some recognition in this problem of high beginning teacher attrition and there's some recognition over the last decade across the states that we need to supply something but there seems to be less insight into just what and how much we should supply and where's the funding going to come from and that really is – that's where the report here and the organization could do real good, I think. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Dr. Susan Lusi: I want to thank Richard and also everyone on the panel, in addition to Senator Reed, for really very rich and wonderful presentations. I want to mention again also the resource table at the back of the room. On that table you'll find a number of additional publications put out by the Alliance, and by some of the other organizations and individuals represented here. They will really help to fill out the level of information on this topic as well as others, so I recommend that you visit the table on your way out. For now, though, I

would like to open the floor for approximately 15 minutes of questions and answers. I would like to ask that when you're called upon, if you would stand, give your name and the name of your organization and speak loudly and clearly and then I will repeat your question so that everyone has the benefit of knowing what it is before we call on the panelists.

Question: [Inaudible]

Dr. Susan Lusi: Okay. The question is how long should the induction period be?

Jeremy Ayers: I think it depends on who you talk to sometimes. Our report argues that at least for the first two years that teachers need that support. Some programs will go three, and I believe that Senator Reed's bill actually calls for three years of induction. The general aim is that if it takes around three to seven years for a teacher to maximize their students' achievement, we need to give them at least a minimum amount of time with supports and assessments so generally, as you talk to folks, around two to three years. Although some state programs are about one year. We argue for at least two.

Question: [Inaudible]

Dr. Susan Lusi: Okay. The question is – let me make sure I get this right – has there been research that compares the rate of new teacher attrition to attrition of new professionals in other sectors? And what might be the ideal that we're shooting for in terms of attrition levels?

Dr. R. Ingersoll: Well no, there has not been much cross occupational, cross professional research on employee turnover. There is one study that's gotten a certain amount of attention, which has compared beginning teachers to others sort of

fresh-out-of-college graduates in those early years, and it turns out that there's lots of job transition in the first few years out of college. Of course, these are people that have not yet gotten into any other traditional professions, so teaching really doesn't seem to have higher turnover than other sorts of lower salary entry level types of occupation. That's true. I've been trying to answer this very question: what is the turnover rate in teaching compared to others and it's difficult to find such data. Here's the kind of things I've been finding and you won't be surprised. It turns out that the turnover in teaching is higher than some occupations and lower than others. So we find that teaching has far higher turnover than many of the traditional professions, like professors. It has double the rate of turnover of professors. Scientists, engineers, et cetera. But teaching has similar turnover rates to some of the other female dominated, sort of middle status occupations like social work and nursing, but it has lower turnover than some other things. I found it has a lower turnover, for instance, than federal clerical workers. So all right, it's higher and lower than others and that's interesting, but to me that's not really the important question here. The important question isn't what's the turnover... [Transcription interrupted.]

Dr. R. Ingersoll: [Transcription continued.] Having three good teachers in a row makes a tremendous difference versus three inexperienced or poor teachers in a row. The research that you probably all know of [William] Sanders [at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville] shows that there can be a 50 or 60% difference in scores between students who have had three good teachers in a

row versus three low performing teachers in a row. Once you take that data and you look at schools that have very high teacher turnover rates, what you've done in those schools where there's very high turnover rates, is you've greatly increased the odds that students are going to have a series of unprepared teachers in a sequence. And if you've got students in a low turnover school, the odds are much higher that they're going to have a series of teachers who are well prepared. So again, induction, by stabilizing the teaching force in the school, is going to improve teaching quality.

Dr. Susan Lusi: Okay. I got the sign that we have about five more minutes. Would you like to add to this? Okay go ahead.

Question: [Inaudible]

Comment: [Inaudible]

Dr. Susan Lusi: Fritz [Edelstein] represents the U.S. Conference of Mayors. There is a meeting coming up this week of the Mayors' Conference at which they will be considering a resolution regarding the mayoral role in teacher induction, retention, recruitment, et cetera. And so the question was asked: what have we found regarding partnership in this area?

Jeremy Ayers: To take the best stab at your question, Fritz, what folks are telling us about principals is the principal, as the leader in the school, sets the tone and the climate when it comes to induction, and they make it a priority. I think that's incredibly similar to elected officials who often will have an influence in schools. Think about [Mayor] Bob Corker in Chattanooga who made an incredible difference in some low-performing schools. I think that similarly

strong mayors, who take an active involvement in working with their local schools, can make induction a priority and can make the outcomes for new teachers a priority. We need all the support we can get, and I know all these program folks who will talk in a minute will tell you that, and would love to talk with you about working further.

Dr. Susan Lusi: Okay, last question.

Question: The point that you just made about principals is in keeping with my thoughts, and the discussion about management in corporate settings in which the manager and the corporate culture are extremely important. I just want to suggest that we also look at the culture of the school, the management of the school as being extremely important.

Dr. Susan Lusi: The question and the comment were expressing a concern as to when this discussion takes place regarding the importance of induction focused only on the individual teacher and not to the exclusion of the surrounding leadership and cultural context of schools. I'm going to take the liberty as moderator of addressing this and then moving us forward. I think you'll be very pleased when you read the report, and that is because the report also talks about the elements in a school and in a system of induction that need to surround that relationship with the individual teacher in order for the program to be effective. I'm just going to very briefly list the bullet points in that area, and then I think you'll hear more about it from our upcoming panelists from the actual programs we featured. Also, you can read more about it in the report, but the first is strong principal leadership, dedicated staff resources, and high

quality providers. Going to your point, that if the mentor never has time to be a mentor, it doesn't work very well. Additional support for new teachers with little to no preparation, incentives for teacher participation in induction – we need to acknowledge that mentoring and being a member of an induction team is a real job with real time requirements, and consequently, compensation and other incentives [are necessary]. Alignment between the induction program, the needs in the classroom and also professional standards in the given state or district, and then finally adequate and stable funding, which Senator Reed, among others, have addressed. So we completely agree with you. I want to say, in light of that, when you look in your packet you will see that our current Teacher and Principal Quality Advisory Group is larger than the participants I mentioned, as those who have particularly helped us with the framing of this report. As these discussions have evolved at the Alliance, and with the Advisory Group, we were very strongly counseled not to separate out and have a teacher quality group and a principal or leadership quality group and so in light of that discussion, which links to some of your points about the surrounding context and the importance of leadership overall, we have expanded our group. We have another member of our advisory group here today: that's Carol Kennedy from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and there are other members of the group listed. They are also playing a very key role in helping us shape our upcoming conference from October 3rd to 5th, which is focused on the issue of leadership and preparing today's leaders for tomorrow's high schools. It's now my privilege

to turn the podium over to Ellen Moir. Ellen is the Executive Director of the New Teacher Center and she will moderate our next panel of representatives from all of our case study sites. Ellen and the Center have not only joined the Alliance in the common recommendations that have been put forward at this meeting, but are also featured as one of the case studies in this report. Once again, you have a more complete bio in your packet, but I do want you to know that Ellen and the work of her Center have become so well known and well regarded, that they are now called upon across the country – I believe 31 states, to be exact – to conduct research, develop and administer induction programs, and consult with organizations, education leaders and policymakers on issues related to new teacher educator support. I really want to thank Ellen and all of our panelists here today.

Ellen Moir: I'd like to welcome all of you today and thank you for joining us for this important event. I particularly would like to acknowledge the Alliance and Susan Frost. They've been a catalyst for doing fantastic work to bring to the attention the importance of not only recruiting teachers, because we realize that's the leaky bucket issue, but how do we really retain them. And it's a privilege today to moderate this panel of which I'm going to join in a moment. I think you will see that each of us represents a different state. We have California, Louisiana, Ohio, and Connecticut represented here. Each of us is in a different political context. Some of us have funded mandates and others have less funded mandates and each of us has configured our own programs, but they're all comprehensive in nature. So I'd like to join the panel and we'll

begin. Each of us will first introduce ourselves and then we will have about seven minutes to talk specifically about our [respective] programs. Once that's over there will be ample time for questions. I'll begin by saying that I'm Ellen Moir. I'm the Executive Director of the New Teacher Center at UC-Santa Cruz. I've been involved in the development of the Santa Cruz New Teacher project, which is now beginning its 17th year.

Cynthia Foster: I'm Cynthia Foster. I'm principal of Ponchatoula High School, which is located in Tangipahoa Parish in Louisiana. I have served as a mentor for new teachers, a mentor for assistant principals, and currently function as a state trainer for mentors and assessors for our state assessment program, and I'm still working as a principal even now.

Jackie O'Bryant: I'm Jackie O'Bryant. I'm from the Toledo Public Schools, Toledo, Ohio, and I'm representing the Toledo Plan, which is the first new teacher induction program, started in 1981. I'll tell you more about it later and more about Dal Lawrence [former president of the Toledo Federation of Teachers and founder of the Toledo Plan] later. But I'm most comfortable in my classroom where I am a French teacher. I served as a consulting teacher for three years in the program, and believe with my heart that it is the way to induct new teachers.

Caty F. Natale: I'm Caty Fisk Natale with the Connecticut State Department of Education. I'm currently Director of our Education or Educator Preparation Assessment Induction Programs, which for the past 17 years has certainly focused on teachers but more recently on school leaders, which are aspiring teacher leaders and principals.

Ellen Moir: Great. Then let me begin, please, with sharing the California context for a moment and the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project. In California we're quite fortunate. You hear a lot of things about us, but we have \$80 million in the budget right now – even in this tough time – to support new teachers in a statewide effort that's called The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program. It's acronym is BTSA. Some of you may have heard of it. Although we have a lot of resources in California –we get \$3,434 per beginning teacher each year for a two-year program – we have itsy bitsy bits of two powerful comprehensive induction models. And I've come to believe over these 16 years working with new teachers, that itsy bitsy anything – especially induction – is a waste of taxpayers' money. The way we have chosen to organize our program is to release exemplary teachers on a full-time basis to support new teachers. They have a caseload of 15 beginning teachers. Now let me share with you first the vision of this program. The vision is not only to retain teachers but to accelerate their development and to support them at the very beginning of their career to develop the norms and beliefs and expectations that we want for veteran teachers in our profession. We believe that if you can catch a new teacher at the beginning, regardless of what pathway they've come in through, and support them intensely for two years, we can, indeed, both retain and support student achievement. Now not just everybody can be a mentor. One of the things we've come to see is that it's really important to have a rigorous selection process for these mentors. Now regardless of whether new teachers have come from an excellent teacher

preparation program or an average teacher preparation program, every new teacher that we've worked with – up to 14,000 of them thus far – needs high quality intensive mentoring. When you use an incredibly rigorous approach to selecting mentors you wind up not only getting the best teachers to support novices, to share their expertise, you're tapping their potential as well as tapping the potential of new teachers. Kind of think of this as quality teachers squared. Now these veteran teachers have to have exemplary teaching practices, but they also have to have exemplary interpersonal communication skills and they have to also be exemplary leaders in their school communities. Teachers that are isolated in their own classrooms are not the ones that we want to build this high quality, ambitious mentoring program. They need to be referred by their principal and they need an additional two letters of recommendation from colleagues. We also strive to find those teachers who have had the most diverse experience in working with students. We want teachers that come out of high poverty schools, who've been successful in working with English language learners. Our content focus, K-12, is English language development and literacy. Secondary students are not having access to the curriculum content that they need. And our mentors, particularly the secondary level, are not only biology teachers, but they also know how to teach literacy and how to make the content accessible to all students. So the mentors, once we select them, go through what we call a rigorous training to become a mentor because, after all, these exemplary teachers are going to be teaching other teachers how to teach. So we want to be able to offer them

more or less a study of what good classroom teaching looks like. Although I'm sure many of you have been teachers and you know as teachers we're isolated in our classroom. We rarely get to see anyone else teach but ourselves. In this case we're going to give mentors an opportunity to see teachers teaching in many different classrooms. They're going to calibrate observation data, they're going to use standards to assess teacher growth and development, and they're going to have outstanding coaching skills, so that they can help a novice move from being a beginner to more ambitious levels of teaching. Another important component of this program is that it's part of a system. I want to go back to a comment made earlier: this isn't just between a mentor and a mentee, this is built into a district system, in which the district office and the principals at school sites are union leaders. I want to re-emphasize that this is a partnership between all of us to build a community of practice where new teachers, veteran teachers, and site leaders can thrive, because, after all, students are the primary beneficiaries. I want to talk for a moment about high poverty schools. It's really hard to quantify what that turnover effect is for poor kids, right? We know that student achievement gains are problematic, but we also know that those teachers left behind suffer as they see their colleagues leaving continually. We must figure out how to build high quality professional communities in the poorer schools in this country. We think induction is a lever for bringing about that kind of systematic change. In addition, as we look at induction, it's really historically been in nobody's venue or purview to work with new teachers. Universities

wash their hands, traditionally, of new teachers as they leave, because it's really not their responsibility. They have a new crop of new teachers coming in and school districts traditionally have done the old hazing ritual in the sink or swim method that we heard about earlier. So here we are. Now we have a chance to do this kind of work differently. Yes, we need money, but we also need a set of program standards that can guide the kind of development that we want for high quality support to new teachers. In addition, it's really important that these programs focus – that these mentors focus – on teacher learning and teacher development. We cannot have random acts of mentoring. We need to have a designated individual who's well regarded by their peers, whose exemplary status will mobilize these programs and have them in classrooms, on a weekly basis, supporting the development of new teachers. To conclude, let me say that our work is guided by the New Teacher Center's Formative Assessment System, which helps a mentor and their new teacher assess and collect baseline data and help these new teachers move to high levels of teaching. Anything short of high quality, comprehensive induction programs across this country will not reach the levels that we want – to support all students in having a high quality education. Thank you.

Cynthia Foster: I'm going to direct my comments to what our state provides, and then at a school level, how I function in our induction program. First of all, Louisiana provides two programs to support new teachers. The first program being LTAAP, the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program. This is basically a two-year assessment program, during which a new teacher is

provided a mentor who helps the teacher become competent, as far as standards based assessment strategies are concerned. The new teacher will, at the end of two years, have to go through an assessment process conducted by the principal and an external assessor. All the mentors for the state assessment program are trained. I have been fortunate enough to be one of the state trainers for assessors and mentors, so I am keenly aware of what their responsibilities are. These mentors are matched as closely as possible with a new teacher in either grade level or content level, when, as I said, it's possible to do that, according to your trained staff. As far as mentors go, these assessment mentors – being on-staff people – can visit with the new teacher on a daily basis or a weekly basis. But there's continual support. And even though the focus of it is the standards based assessment process, this assessment mentor provides much, much induction support as well as assessment information. The other program is called Louisiana FIRST [Framework for Inducting, Retaining, and Supporting Teachers]. This initiative was set forth by the state department of education. It is less structured, as the assessment program is. It was just some directives set forth, and then each parish was directed to go out and set up and implement an induction program. I am very proud to say that my parish picked up the acronym first, Tangipahoa FIRST. The program is very well developed. It has all the components set forth in the Alliance's report as effective components for an induction program. The Louisiana Tangipahoa FIRST model has a mentor, which is external to the teachers' school setting. This

mentor, whether it be high school or elementary or middle school, visits with a new teacher at least once a week, assisting the new teacher with whatever her observed weaknesses are – what the new teacher has indicated she needs help with. The Tangipahoa FIRST mentor has also been trained through the state assessment process, so both mentors can help the new teacher achieve standards based assessment and ultimately certification. I'd like to say, for a moment, I was one of those teachers that was thrown the keys and told to 'sink or swim,' and I keenly remember what that was like – and I'm proud to say I did some fast swimming, and here I still am. So I do remember what it was like and that really has served me very well. I was fortunate enough to be a mentor for a number of years and then fortunate again to become a state trainer for assessors, administrators, external assessors, and teachers who want to become assessors and/or mentors. As a principal I have the role of assigning mentors to new teachers. I have a faculty of about 90 teachers, and I consistently recruit those teachers on my faculty that I think will be effective mentors because I know what it takes. I know the successful personality type – those nurturing people who really believe in what they're doing. I encourage these people to go seek this training – this mentor training – either through the induction program or through the assessment program. So through assigning these mentors and creating a mentor induction program team, my new teachers and the new teacher being part of this four-person team, receive a lot of support. Our induction program, Tangipahoa FIRST, lasts for three years. This year was the third year of the program. Funding for

this program is minimal from the state. Parishes can apply for grants. We received a \$10,000 grant for the third year, which is not very much when you're inducting new teachers. And then we – our parish – has had to rely on creative funding through Title I and Title II resources. But they've done a very commendable job. But again, as principal, my main role has been to create that environment through which the new teachers can thrive, depending on the mentor, providing what those new teachers need, but also providing what the mentor needs to be successful – that release time from class to go in conference with the new teacher. So I feel like I strongly believe in what I'm doing and I've – my school – has been very successful in retaining new teachers because of it.

Jackie O'Bryant: I am here to share with you the success that we've had in Toledo, Ohio. We call our plan the Toledo Plan and it has been around for a very long time. The initial founder of our plan, Dal Lawrence, as I mentioned before, is an inspiration. And if any of you ever have the chance to listen to him speak on teacher professionalism, school reform, or new teacher induction, he truly is an inspiration. That's why I'm here today from my classroom where I prefer to be, actually, with 30 students speaking French. But I'm happy to explain our program anyway. We have two ingredients that we feel are very important to our program. The first is that there is one consulting teacher who is responsible for the mentoring and the evaluation – in the first year of our induction program – of the new teacher. That consulting teacher is the one who spends all the time mentoring, all the time observing, and, in fact, finally

then will make an employment recommendation at the end of that time. The second ingredient that we feel is very important is that there is nowhere on that evaluation form for that consulting teacher to mark 'needs improvement.' In other words, at the end of the induction process our teachers – our new teachers – are either rated satisfactory or unsatisfactory, and they are not retained. Let's see. What else can I tell you? I have lots to tell you, and I have such a short time. We have done this, as I said, for 23 years, and we believe very strongly in it. In fact, in Toledo, it is in our contract that all new teachers will go through this process. It is also funded at our local level now, which is big because when we started 23 years ago, it was a state-funded process. But that state funding kept disappearing. And therefore, we had to make some big decisions and we feel that it is that important. So we funded at the local level. We would hardly accept anything from the federal government to help us fund this because it is a struggle in our district to pick and choose what we can and cannot do. As I said before, the new teacher's assigned a veteran teacher, and as Ellen said, the choosing of the consulting teacher is very, very important. The consulting teacher then will spend hours and hours in one-on-one mentoring and professional development in such things as classroom management. We feel very strongly that it needs to be meaningful professional development and not that one-hour seminar that you all talked about – and also observing in the classroom. There are reports made at the end of each of the observations, and I can't go into great detail, but if you look on page 48 you're going to see a real nice summary of our program.

Later you can read about how we go through our steps, but then at the end, as I said, it's very important that our consulting teachers then get up in front of a board of review and present each and every new teacher as satisfactory and unsatisfactory. I think that's one of the most important times in our program, and that is when high management and high union officials sit at a table – similar to this – and listen to each new teacher being presented in our school system. Things get done there. It's a very positive working relationship between union and management. They're not quibbling over employment issues. Here we're discussing quality teachers. And that is one of the positive results of our program. We have 10 to 15% of the teachers in our school system who are not retained after the first year based on our standards evaluation. Now you can ask why did our principals give up their authority to be the evaluators? Well they did it kicking and screaming at first, but now in our system, principals overwhelmingly endorse this new teacher induction program and then they're lucky enough to be able to be in the second phase of the new teacher induction program. They do the second year evaluation but not the kind of intensive mentoring that goes on with the consulting teacher. Again, like I said, we take this very seriously. Management and union work very hard together to support this. I also didn't mention that the consulting teacher is the advocate for the new teachers. The relationship between the new teacher and the consulting teacher is extremely important: when we go into our training to be a consulting teacher, when we talk mentor, mentor, mentor, develop that relationship, help this teacher get from point A to point B

as fast as possible. I am a product of sink or swim and I know how hard that is. It's not the way to do it. We need to have comprehensive induction for each and every new teacher. We are an urban district. We have been in academic emergency. We struggle with our Ohio proficiency test passing levels but I do have some preliminary good news to tell you about Toledo schools. That is the preliminary results are out, and our proficiency testing has passed us to out of academic emergency. In August we will have that in stone. So please cheer for us in August when we move from academic emergency, because I believe it means more money. It does not make sense, but I think that's how it works. We're happy about that, and I'm proud to have any of you contact us. You can go to our website, Toledo Federation of Teachers, or I'm sure there are phone numbers and what not in the back of the booklet. We love to have people come visit us and see our product at work. Thank you for having me.

Caty F. Natale: Well, I'm going to give you a brief overview of Connecticut's Beginning Educators Support and Training Program, infamously known as BEST. I'm not sure after listening to all of these wonderful models, but Connecticut's model is a little different. The BEST program was actually first implemented in 1989 as an out-growth of the Education Enhancement Act, which was in an era of a lot of education reform. But what made Connecticut's education reform initiatives, I think, unique, at that time, was that it placed the importance of a high quality teaching force as essential to improving student achievement and reducing the achievement gap. It started off as a one-year

mentoring program with a classroom observation assessment, and then over the years has evolved into a two to three-year program of comprehensive support and assessment, as I'll briefly describe to you now. The support component really has three levels: it starts at the school, where schools assign a pre-selected – through the district – mentor, who's received a minimum of 20 hours of training from the state in effective instruction and coaching, and the mentoring is required for a minimum of one year. However, about 80% of districts have extended that mentoring period to two years. Many districts have used BEST as an impetus to develop their own district-based induction programs, and large numbers of districts – particularly our larger districts – have comprehensive, basically, beginning teacher training, professional development programs, monthly meetings of mentors, interaction with principals, working on such things as classroom management, literacy strategies, working with English language learners and other district priorities. And thirdly, there's a state-based component to the support, and that is, we provide regionally based content-specific workshops. Part of that is an external network of teachers, where we bring the teachers together regionally – over a series of workshops – to discuss what essentially is effective teaching practice within their discipline, how to think about preparing for the assessment – which I shall describe. And on the back, there's a sheet that – actually, accompanying this on the ground, in-person set of workshops we have a web-based set of beginning teacher seminars, and I invite you to go to our website, click on and visit. The part that makes Connecticut's assessment,

I think, unique, is the assessment component, which consists of a content-specific teaching portfolio that beginning teachers put together in their second year of teaching. And this content specific teaching portfolio documents generally a five to eight day unit of instruction, with one of their classes and includes such things as lesson plans, videotapes of teaching, student work and an analysis of teaching and learning based upon those artifacts of teaching and student learning in the portfolio. The consequence of this assessment is that unlike Toledo, which is involved in making hiring decisions this leads to a decision whether the beginning teacher is eligible for continuing licensing. If the teacher is not successful –about 15% don't meet the standard after the end of their second year – they get a third year in the program, additional support – both from the local district and the state to make them successful. Some of the things that I think make Connecticut's induction program unique is, first of all, it is part of a larger comprehensive approach looking at high standards for teachers. We obviously have rigorous standards for initial entry into the profession from – you know – essential skills and content knowledge, as well as really supporting teachers through those critical induction years. I think our success – how interesting, looking at Richard Ingersoll's statistics – our studies have indicated that after the first two to three years of teaching, about 6 to 7% of teachers annually leave the profession in Connecticut. Now again, we don't know whether they moved to Massachusetts, but basically that, again, seems to coincide with the data that suggests that a comprehensive induction program does reduce attrition. Although I will say that when you

separate all but our five or seven neediest districts, we do see that – and our large urban districts – that the attrition levels are higher. Secondly, I think the unique thing is that because the portfolio becomes a focus of standards-based assessment, and training for, not only the beginning teachers, but their mentors, and also for those teachers who are trained to evaluate the teaching portfolios. Basically this brings about, not only a language of what effective teaching instruction is, but basically has essentially trained – right now – 40% of Connecticut’s educator workforce, and that’s teachers and administrators, who have been trained as BEST mentors or assessors, and another 25% of our current teaching force actually went through the BEST program. So when you have a program that’s been sustained through as many years as BEST has, which is close to 15 years, you really begin to see that this has a huge impact, and this has an impact also on our preparation programs because we do report the results of the portfolio assessment to those institutions as part of their accreditation. It also impacts local evaluation practices as many principals are actually encouraged to go through this training so that essentially we’re aligning what the state’s expecting for beginning teacher licensure, to what local districts are expecting for ongoing performance of their teachers. I think the third component is that we talked about the importance: it isn’t just the mentor working in isolation with the beginning teacher, it’s really about building, learning communities, and, I think, BEST has been an impetus by not only looking at individual mentors but mentor teams and again, promoting teachers as leaders. We’re very proud that BEST was developed by teachers,

administered by teachers, for teachers, and that this provides leadership opportunities, not only directly through the BEST program, but also, we've seen many trained mentors or assessors go on to be instructional coaches and assuming different types of leadership roles in the district. We see that also as leading to this whole issue of teacher leadership and leadership aspirance that again the more you can offer opportunities for teachers to be leaders, that they may step one day into the shoes of school leaders and administrators where we need them. So again, I think that's important to this larger mission of promoting teacher career paths and reducing migration out of the district or the profession. That migration sometimes occurs after even those critical induction years.

Ellen Moir: Great. Thank you. Thank you to all of you. I think you can hear whether it's the last example that we just heard about the BEST program, which has a state infrastructure for assessment and licensing. Or we're looking at a plan, in the Toledo Plan in Ohio, where you have the union leadership and district management together building this kind of infrastructure within the system. Or you have the Louisiana model in which Cindy [Foster] clearly can show what it looks like both at the school level and then more at the district and State level and her district of course is really gone way out there to build a high intensity program called First or our model, which is a regional model led by the University of California Santa Cruz and working in 30 districts where we have itinerant mentors who work across these districts. Our program had not been a licensure program 16 years of what we would call a

professional development model where teachers could participate or not but as of fall, coming up here induction will be part of the licensure plan in California. So we'd like to now open this up to questions from you all and you can either address them to individuals or we'll just chime in, as it seems like we have the answers. Go ahead.

Question: [UI]

Ellen Moir: Great thank you I'm going to repeat your question so everybody can hear. I'll abbreviate it I believe the main part of the question is as we think about these comprehensive induction programs what role do parents have and how do we as leaders of programs help new teachers better understand the relationship with parents and how to work with parents so I'll turn to my colleagues and see if one of them would like to respond.

Caty F. Natale: All right I'll try. I've referred when I was talking about standards based assessment standards based training let me elaborate what that is. Connecticut has something called the Connecticut Common Corp of Teaching where we essentially define the standards that we expect teachers to exhibit and one of the things that's unique is there's a domain called Professional Responsibility and that responsibility consists of A) teachers be ongoing, paying attention to their own professional development; secondly, being engaged with a community and parents and thirdly, being leaders and so what does that really mean? Well that means that we train our mentors to understand those standards and to work with beginning teachers to think about how they – speaking about that domain of Professional Responsibility, it's not just what

you're doing daily in the classroom yes, that's important but learning has to take into account that larger environment so we train our mentors to work with their beginning teachers in that regard. We don't actually assess it because it's very difficult to get data but one of the things that we do use is we encourage districts to take this portfolio of documentation of teaching of the novice teacher and then surround it with those other elements like and how is the teacher actually interacting with the school community, with the community at large and parents so again we use our Common Corp of teaching and those articulated teaching standards that specifically talk about the importance of you know understanding the community and parental involvement.

Cynthia Foster: In Louisiana we have a similar situation too. The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching set forth that part of the attributes of good teaching are the abilities to communicate with parents, caregivers, colleagues and it is part of the principal's responsibility to assess the new teacher's ability to do this in the assessment cycle. The mentors have the ability to sit with new teachers and model conferencing skills, help them direct, set up communication situations with parents so it is a very deliberate situation in our assessment model.

Ellen Moir: Shall we go on to another question? Yes, if you wouldn't mind coming up and using the microphone it's right here then we won't have to repeat your questions. Yes, please.

Question: Hi, I'm Kristina [inaudible] I'm with the Institute [inaudible] Leadership I wondered if someone or more than one person could speak to induction as it gets sent to your larger teacher professional development and career path strategies. Speaking as a teacher who was in a high need district for three years the sink or swim component was definitely a challenge but also sometimes the message that you send as a teacher is that the best way to proceed in the profession is to leave the classrooms so do you have – has your teacher development program or ability to be a mentor teacher or consultant teacher allow teachers to take on more teacher leadership that would potentially allow them to stay in the profession longer and take on more responsibilities?

Jackie O'Bryant: One of the components of our consulting teacher program is that consulting teachers are not being released from the classroom for three years to become a mentor or assessor or then to move on to become a principal or other administrative in fact our consulting teachers are all required to go back to the classroom where they are needed most after the three years that they spend as consulting teachers and that is a real important part of it and yes, as you can see here I am speaking to you in Washington, D.C. you know a French teacher from Toledo, Ohio because I did go through the consulting training program and I became a leader and I have become real active in school reform in Ohio so those opportunities opened to me because I did choose to go out on a limb and become a consulting teacher and so I would say for me that was the biggest professional growth of my entire career and so yes, our consulting

teachers are not on a pathway to become administrators they are teachers, teacher leaders, instruction leaders.

Ellen Moir: And I'll just chime in for a moment to say that ours are very similar. We have a rotating model we started with a two-year rotational strategy but we realized it wasn't enough time to really learn to be an exemplary mentor so we have it on a three-year rotational basis. 90% of all the teachers that work with us after their three years continue to teach and that really has been the main goal of our work so really to create another role in the profession for you know tapping the expertise of exemplary teachers, teaching teachers how to teach and in recent years we've seen a new trend starting with a group of educators who are interested – mentors are interested in becoming principals after their three years and although at first I was wondering if this was really the right pathway toward that I realize at this point that we are developing a new kind of principal. When we talk about instructional leaders unfortunately most principals don't know what that really can look like and so these mentors also offer us another possibility for supporting building the capacity across a whole system.

Cynthia Foster: I can add validation to that as one who was a mentor and who became an administrator. It gave me a greater basis of understanding, a kind of been there, done that situation and it makes me much more attuned to the needs of my mentors and the needs of my new teachers so it has served me very well.

Ellen Moir: Another question? Go ahead. I know this fellow he's my Research Director, Michael.

Michael Strong: Yeah Michael Strong from the New Teacher Center. I just wanted to ask you how important do you feel research is in informing your program what steps you take to incorporate research findings into the development of your programs?

Caty F. Natale: I would say research has been the foundation of our work in Connecticut from day one. In fact I have to sort of chuckle and look back to 1989 when Connecticut and California came together under a grant from the National Governors' Association to take a look at what the research was out there about teacher induction and teacher assessment and that we began a collaboration and now I think it's kind of the lion and the mouse with respect to funding since we only have about \$3 million in funding but very much the – we've used – in terms of research on effective teaching in terms of developing the portfolio assessment we work closely with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and their evolution of assessments so that from the purposes of looking at assessing teacher effectiveness, what the literature says in each content area as to what attributes, behaviors, teaching strategies most correlate with higher levels of student achievement. Certainly when it comes to looking at the mentoring and support side we have – you know I mean I think – I'm a researcher we're staffed with a lot of researchers over the years who really have looked to the literature to help guide us and then evaluate it. We have collaborated with the National Science Foundation to look at for example, the impact of the beginning teacher induction program on the practice of both the mentors, the assessors who are trained and the beginning

teachers so I think it's a work in progress. I think it's critical that anybody engaged in this and fortunately at the State level we have perhaps more resources than at the local level but even at the local level it's a matter of action research. I mean I think a good induction, solid induction program has to be one in which you are examining what you're doing, collecting data, re-evaluating what you're doing and going back and having it constantly evolve and I think Connecticut's BEST program for anyone whose known it has been a constant evolution as we learn more and I do think some of the research these days on from Sanders and really looking at the importance of an individual teacher or a series of teachers and student achievement and then being able now to employ some of the value added research in measuring student achievement gains is really a worth a cusp I think of a revolution in being able to quantify the benefits of teacher induction and I hope Connecticut can be contributing to that.

Ellen Moir: I'm going to actually echo a lot of what Caty just said but I want to tell you that 16 years we've been at this and one of my greatest anxieties over the early years was that we didn't have the capability to do the kind of research that Caty's describing and really it's only been through having the opportunity to have the New Teacher Center that we've been able to do that but we've now looked at two different studies of retention. I mean retention is important to study in that you know if we're ever going to really support the development of exemplary teachers it's going to take more than two, three, four, five years so you want your teachers to stay and you want them to be

good. You want them to be excellent and our retention data now is showing looking six and seven years out at two different studies. The first one's small was 72 new teachers and the second one much larger with about 350 that out six and seven years we're retaining upwards of 94% of the teachers still in the profession and about 88% are still teaching and you know from our perspective wherever we land in the profession doing really good work is what's most important and then we have done some other value added work to look at gain scores and you know although I think there's some fear on the part of educators to get involved in this, a little tight linkage to standardize test score data it is important to begin to uncover what practices are going to be most effective in raising student achievement.. I'd like to take another question go ahead? Sure.

Question: From the panelists' earliest responses I appreciated the attention that you all do give to parental involvement. My concern is this in Connecticut I guess you don't do assessment of parental involvement results and outcomes my concern is unless a subject of that topic can be – the outcomes of that can be quantified by research the teachers of color in particular and those who deal with parents with limited English proficiency they're expected to do one more of those things that just fit with your job description and not enough remuneration can go their way in order to reinforce the need for parental involvement. Can you comment on what the future is for evaluation and research in that regard?

Caty F. Natale: Let me first comment that your remarks actually highlight the importance in many ways of evaluation and assessment in articulating our values so in many ways what you choose to assess is in many ways a value statement about how important you think things are. I won't get into the details of it but I do think we're a ways away from having what we would feel for purposes of a licensure a valid and reliable way of quantifying a dimension of a teacher's relationship and work with parents. I think it's very important there's no denial. I think for purposes of evaluating for licensure I don't think we've come up with yet where we feel to be a reliable way to do so, so that we can defend – essentially taking a teacher out of the profession although we did develop a module where we were looking more for formative assessment in which teachers would go through the process of having to document what they were doing so I think the point you are making is we make through assessment, a statement of values of what we think is important and I think that focusing is very critical.

Ellen Moir: Great. I'll just comment quickly and then go ahead, come on up and be ready there's somebody behind you that's going to ask another question. You know beginning teachers who come into the profession think they're going to do it better than any of us they're not going to have student management problems and they're not going to have parental complaints and truthfully they don't really know how to deal with parents and I don't know about any of you but in the early 70s the way that you were introduced to a diverse community is they'd put you on a bus on your first day of school and they took you around

the neighborhood to see the district I mean come on we've come way further than that and our assessment tools must articulate how to better support student learning and the parent connection is indeed critical. Like Katy I don't think any of us have come far enough but we are clearly organizing our work with beginning teachers around that area of need. Yes?

Question: Good morning I'm Nicky Barnes with the National Education Association and I'm also a National Board certified teacher and I'm think about the Connecticut model and I wonder if anyone has looked at those teachers who go through a strong induction program how many of them go through National Board certification or it doesn't seem as daunting. It's more of a natural progression. Is anyone looking at that to see if there would be a trend or anything of that nature?

Caty F. Natale: Excellent question and let me just say that Connecticut was involved with working with the National Board in its early years of developing some of the early middle level English language [inaudible] portfolio and that work informed our work. I think it's a complex nature. We certainly encourage teachers and many of the teachers and residents we've had about 60 or 70 teachers and residents working whether it's at the State developing this and we have pulled from National Board certified teachers because of their expertise and we encourage our novice teachers cause they've already really done a good chunk of it. They've had to look – you know collect those artifacts of their practice and think about it, look at student work and so forth. What we're missing in Connecticut maybe it leads me into another comment

is we do not have adequate incentives for teachers to recognize the value of National Board certification. We have a number of school districts that do provide stipends of I can think of one that provides an additional \$5,000 a year for National Board teachers but we do not yet have a comprehensive State policy that recognizes the value of National Board certification and I think if I may say the flaw in Connecticut's model is that – and this maybe leads back to the importance of maybe a federal role here is that we've been subject to the vagaries of State budget deficits and what I would really call inadequate funding and our local districts have had to pick up a lot of the tab of induction. In our most affluent districts are the ones that can negotiate in their contracts. Stipends for National Board teachers, stipends for mentoring and other districts that are less affluent don't have necessarily the bargaining power. If you go to the report actually you will see where I break down costs in Connecticut and one of the ones that I see product as the greatest inequity is that stipends for mentors range from nothing to \$2,000 a year depending on what district you're in and that's not really what our goal was and I do hope that through the work of the Alliance that we can encourage stronger partnerships between the local district, the State and the federal government because it is really about saying we need – if we really, really believe that teachers are important and make a difference particularly in high need district we got to put our money where our mouth is and to try to ensure that it's not just our more affluent districts that are able to provide the tangible recognitions and incentives whether it's for National Board certification or for

working as a trained BEST mentor but that in essence we're able to help turn the scales to its more equitable across all of our districts.

Ellen Moir: Great let me just add one comment to that. I think Nicky's question's really important if we're really organizing our induction programs with the kind of comprehensive mentoring and teacher development that we're talking about new teachers are ready prepared, already being prepared for National Board certification and in fact we've had three of our mentors actually go through Board certification their classes or their new teachers. I think that there's a great partnership between the National Board and the kind of work that all of us are doing. I've gotten the – we're over, we're done time. I want to acknowledge the panel members and thank all of you for joining us. I want to really acknowledge the Alliance again for their great and the National Commission for Teaching in America's Future and Richard Ingersoll staying so focused on this important issue as well as Senator Reed. To all of you whether you're working in large urban settings or small rural districts or anywhere across this country teacher induction, high quality, high intensive comprehensive induction will make a huge difference in building better opportunities for students to achieve. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Susan Frost: Okay there is no more to be said this morning than what Ellen just said I think and her terrific panel and all the people who preceded her. I do want to say that I was very glad that we decided that since we had such a terrific group that we would tape all of this and make it available on a CD along with the

report so that since we have the privilege here of being presenting to the presenters, so to speak and know that all of you have your own networks and your own way of working to spread the word that we not only want to make our reports available but also these kinds of conversations so that CD will be available within about two weeks of you would like to show parts of this or all of it to other audiences. Finally I want to say that there are very few things that we talk about at the federal level that are so clear as the conversation this morning. As Ellen put it an itsy bitsy anything is a waste of taxpayers' dollars okay? I think that says something about the financial support that we are going to need, not only at the state and local level, which is much more subject in some ways to the yearly budget to deficits at the State level than even the federal government is and there is also not much more that we could do that is clearly so cost effective in terms of improving, not only teachers but student achievement. So I would offer again as we did for the last couple of weeks we reached out to many of you national organizations to join us in our recommendations to the federal government in order to really put in place requirements and funding for high quality induction across the country. We will be asking once again for your support for those recommendations.