Commentary

The CADRE Project: Looking at the Development of Beginning Teachers

Sheryl McGlamery, Jarene Fluckinger, and Nancy Edick

The CADRE Project is a collaborative teacher induction effort between higher education and K-12 practitioners. The Metropolitan Omaha Educational Consortium (MOEC), comprised of seven metropolitan Omaha public school districts and the University of Nebraska at Omaha College of Education, coordinates this project. This project is a true collaborative effort involving public school superintendents, university administrators, and faculty and staff from both entities. The acronym CADRE refers to the overriding goal of Career Advancement and Development for Recruits and Experienced Teachers, and the project creates a framework of growth and development within the teaching profession, thus building a CADRE of outstanding teachers. The project, which began in 1994, provides a yearlong teaching experience for newly certified teachers who are also completing a specially designed master's degree program. The structured first year teaching experience includes a wide variety of professional learning experiences designed to assist CADRE teachers in reaching a level of professional skill and judgment that characterizes a well-qualified teacher.

This experience provides practical teaching techniques and strategies along with feedback on the classroom application of teaching strategies. The CADRE teacher has access to formal mentoring as well as graduate work focusing on the synthesis of various learning theories. The project also provides opportunities for veteran classroom teachers, CADRE Associates, who are master teachers selected by their respective districts to serve in this role for a two to three year period. They assume alternative responsibilities, which include mentorship of two CADRE teachers, district-designated roles, and university related work. Linking beginning teachers to veteran master teachers while incorporating university coursework specifically targeted to first year teachers' needs, collaborative inquiry, professional conversation with peers and mentors, and reflection about teaching experience has proved to be a powerful combination. It is not enough just to bring a novice and an experienced teacher together. Effective induction of beginning teachers must be linked to a vision of good teaching, guided by an understanding of teacher learning, and supported by a professional culture that favors collaboration and inquiry.

Sheryl McGlamery is Associate Professor of Science Education in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Jarene Fluckinger is Associate Professor of Teacher Education in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Nancy Edick is Director of the Metropolitan Omaha Educational Consortium (MOEC) and Assistant Professor in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Review of Literature

During the 1980s, educators began to regard support and assistance for beginning teachers as a key component of reform in teaching. The high rate of teacher attrition during the first three years of teaching, as well as an awareness of the problems faced by beginning teachers, led to the logic of providing on site support and assistance, such as induction programs, during the first year of teaching. A critical component of effective on-site induction programs is mentoring. Pending teacher shortages and projections of large numbers of new teachers entering U.S. schools in the next decade[1] have led to a rapid increase in mandated mentoring support for beginning teachers as a necessary component of teacher induction.[2]

Teacher induction is the process of supporting the work of beginning teachers so that they adjust successfully to the new teaching environment and social system of the school, understand their responsibilities, and become professionally competent as quickly as possible.[3] For over a decade, reformers and policymakers have called for induction programs. Research supports that quality teacher induction programs include particular components, such as effective mentoring, academic coursework, and peer cohorts.[4]

Effective Mentoring

Effective mentoring is one component of quality teacher induction programs. The mentor is a teacher, advisor, sponsor, guide, coach, and confidante.[5] In the California Mentor Teacher Program, for example, mentors represent an outstanding group of teachers who have the training and expertise necessary to help newcomers.[6] Beginning teacher induction programs with mentors in key roles refer to planned programs intended to provide systematic and sustained assistance to beginning teachers for at least one school year.[7] Investigations into mentoring indicate numerous benefits for the new teacher as well as for the veteran teacher.[8] For example, Fox and Singletary found that successful assistance provides "...new teachers with skills that will assist them in developing methods for problem solving and transferring the theories learned in preservice training to appropriate teaching practices."[9] By promoting observation and conversation about teaching, mentoring is believed to help teachers develop tools for reflection on and continuous improvement of teaching practice.

The variety of mentoring approaches indicates that there is no one best way to mentor. Mentoring involves highly personal interactions that are best defined by those who carry them out. Yet both the research and professional literature on teacher induction supports particular components as being important aspects of effective mentoring programs, such as: (a) mentor preparation; (b) released time for mentors to spend with beginning teachers; (c) reflective seminars on teaching practice during which mentors instruct and debrief beginning teachers; (d) trust between mentor and beginning teacher; and (e) selection of local professional who are already acculturated in the same school or district as mentors.[10]

First, given that the mentoring relationship is very complex, mentor preparation increases the chances of effective mentoring. Preparation includes opportunities for mentors to analyze their own beliefs about learning to teach and to articulate their practical knowledge of teaching.[11] Second, released time is needed to enable mentors to spend time with novice teachers in the classroom and one-on-one before and after school. This time is essential for coaching to occur when the beginning teacher is ready to learn, when the needs, questions, and problems arise. Third, reflective seminars with mentors and beginning teacher peers promote the application of appropriate educational theory to practice. Fourth, trust is seen as the foundation for thoughtful dialogue and coaching that leads to reflective teaching practice.[12] Lastly, acculturated mentors, or those who know the school culture because of having already taught in that setting, are better equipped to coach novices on how to adjust and navigate first year teaching successfully.

Academic Coursework

Another component of quality teacher induction is appropriate academic coursework. Academic coursework provides current research on good teaching practices at a time when beginning teachers need ideas of what to do in the classroom. Knowledge of pedagogy is connected to content and actual classroom practice through discussion, readings, projects, as well as by trial and error. Through knowledge and application of credible teaching theory, novice teachers gain confidence as they question; look for alternatives; and revise and develop their own pedagogical content knowledge,[13] as well as their own personal practical theories of teaching.[14]

Peer Cohorts

Having peer cohorts is a third component of quality teacher induction programs. A peer cohort is a group of novice teachers who participate together in an induction program. As they share stories of their first year tragedies and triumphs, they form a support network for their academic coursework. This network of novice teachers also engages in reflection on practice during and outside formal classes and seminars with peers as well as with mentors. Teachers should engage in reflection on their own actions, actions of their students, and the context of teaching in order to make appropriate decisions.[15]

Purpose and Design of the Study

From the beginning, the CADRE project was designed to make a difference in the induction experience of beginning teachers. The evaluation of the CADRE project was designed to assess whether the needs of the beginning CADRE teachers were being met. In other words, was the CADRE experience giving beginning teachers what they needed to succeed in teaching? In order to assess teaching success, we chose to observe and evaluate the beginning teachers' teaching skill levels in their classroom settings. The research was designed to address two-research questions: (1) What are the skill levels of beginning teachers (strengths and weaknesses)? and (2) Does participation in CADRE make a difference in skill acquisition?

The study focused on beginning teachers having one through five years of experience. Half of the teachers studied completed the CADRE project, and half were selected by researchers in order to achieve a matched pair design to control for years of teaching experience, subjects taught, grade levels taught, and school context. Data presented cover a six- year period 1997-2003, with 38 to 42 teachers were studied each year. Overall, we studied 115 CADRE teachers and 115 non-CADRE teachers, matched pairs, giving our study a total of 230 participants.

The instrument used to evaluate the skill level of beginning teachers was "A Continuum of Effective Teaching Skills," which is based on a prior instrument, "A Developmental Continuum of Teacher Abilities," developed by Moir, Freeman, Petrock, and Brown.[16] The instrument is broken down into three domains of teacher skills: Domain #1= Organizing and Managing the Classroom/Creating a Positive Learning Environment; Domain #2= Delivering Instruction to All Students; and Domain #3= Demonstrating Subject Matter Knowledge. Each domain contains three to four subdomains, for a total of ten subdomains as shown in the textbox below.

A Continuum of Effective Teaching Skills: Domains and Subdomains

Domain #1
Organizing and Managing the Classroom/Creating a Positive Learning Environment

Subdomain A: Managing Student Behavior
Subdomain B: Organizing the Physical Environment
Subdomain C: Establishing Rapport and Relationships with and Between Students
Subdomain D: Whole Group Instruction and Use of Collaborative Activities

Domain #2
Delivering Instruction to All Students

Subdomain A: Using Effective Strategies for Responsive Teaching
Subdomain B: Use of Student Prior Knowledge and Higher Order Thinking Skills
Subdomain C: Selecting and Adapting Materials and Resources

Domain #3
Demonstrating Subject Matter Knowledge

Subdomain A: Understanding Subject Matter
Subdomain B: Using Appropriate Strategies to Teach Subject Matter
Subdomain C: Selecting, Critiquing, and Adapting Learning Materials that Reflect Student Diversity

The subdomains are divided into 27 subskills which are described in the next section on results. Each subskill was scored as follows:

- Beginning Level = skill is not demonstrated; assigned a value of 1;
- Emerging Level = skill is demonstrated in rudimentary form; assigned a value of 2;
- Developing Level= skill is demonstrated; assigned a value of 3;
- Integrating Level= skill is demonstrated frequently; assigned a value of 4;
- Innovating Level= skill is demonstrated consistently with expertise; assigned a value of 5.[17]

The instrument was used by trained observers (CADRE Associates) who were assigned to observe two to three beginning teachers four times over the course of a school year at pre-determined times. The observers did not know if they were observing a CADRE teacher or a non-CADRE teacher. Also, the observers were assigned to participants outside their own school districts in order to minimize personal bias. The classroom visits made by the researchers typically lasted at least one hour, giving the researchers time to see a variety of teaching skills demonstrated.

Results

Domain #1: Organizing and Managing the Classroom/Creating A Positive Learning Environment

For subskills A1 through A5 of subdomain A, researchers observed the skills needed to manage student behavior, such as the pacing of the curriculum and the establishment of routines and procedures. For this subdomain, "Managing Student Behavior", 80.52174% of CADRE teachers demonstrated skill levels of 3 or better compared to 52.34783% of Non-CADRE teachers. Thus, 28.17391% more CADRE Teachers achieved a 3 or better skill level. (See Table 1.1.) For subskills B1 through B4 of subdomain B, researchers observed the skills needed to orchestrate the physical classroom environment, such as room arrangements, grouping, materials accessibility, and movement around the classroom. For this subdomain, "Organizing the Physical Environment", 80.43478% CADRE teachers were rated at 3 or above versus 61.08696 % of non-CADRE teachers, a difference of 19.34782%. (See Table 1.2.)

For subskills C1 through C4 of subdomain C, researchers evaluated the teachers' social interaction patterns and student rapport. For this subdomain, "Establishing Rapport and Relationships with and Between Students", they found 83.91304% of CADRE teachers performing at 3 or better compared to 61.73913% of non-CADRE teachers scoring, a difference of 22.17391%. (See Table 1.3.) For subskills D1 through D2 of subdomain D, researchers evaluated whole group instruction and the use of collaborative activities. For this subdomain, they found 82.17391% of CADRE participants scored 3 or above while the percentage for non-CADRE participants was 51.73913%, a difference of 30.43478%. (See Table 1.4.).

Domain #2: Delivering Instruction to All Students

For subskills A1 through A3 of subdomain A, researchers observed the knowledge and implementation of effective teaching strategies. For this subdomain, "Using Effective Strategies for Responsive Teaching", 89.27536% of CADRE teachers scored 3 or better versus 57.97101% of non-CADRE teachers, a difference of 31.30435%. (See Table 2.1.) For subskills B1 through B2 of subdomain B, researchers evaluated teachers' use of student prior knowledge and higher order thinking skills. For this subdomain, they found 79.56522% of CADRE teachers performing at 3 or better level while the percentage for non-CADRE was 49.13043%, a difference 30.43479%. (See Table 2.2). For subskill C1 of subdomain C, researchers evaluated teachers' use of a variety of resources. For this subdomain, "Selecting and Adapting Materials and Resources", they found 86.95652% of CADRE participants scored 3 or better as compared with 50.43378% of non-CADRE participants, a difference of 36.52174%. (See Table 2.)

Domain #3: Demonstrating Subject Matter Knowledge

For subskills A1 through A3 of subdomain A, the researchers observed subject knowledge, integration, and concept clarification. For this domain, "Understanding Subject Matter", 85.7971% of CADRE teachers scored 3 or better compared with 62.6087% of non-CADRE teachers, a difference of 23.1884%. (See Table 3.1.) For subskills B1 through B2 of subdomain B, the researchers evaluated the teachers' subject matter knowledge and teaching strategies. For this subdomain, "Using Appropriate Strategies to Teach Subject Matter", 93.04348% of CADRE teachers performed at the 3 or better level as compared with 53.91304% of non-CADRE participants, a difference of 39.13044%. (See Table 3.2.) For subskill C1 of subdomain C, researchers evaluated the teachers' use of learning materials that reflect students' diversity. For this subdomain, "Selecting, Critiquing, and Adapting Learning Materials that Reflect Student Diversity", 86.95652% of CADRE teachers performed at the 3 or better level as compared with 45.21739% of non-CADRE teachers, a difference of 41.73913%. (See Table 3.3.)

Analysis and Conclusions

First year teachers, in both the CADRE and non-CADRE groups, began with very similar skill levels. However, the CADRE teachers were able to move beyond their non-CADRE counterparts in all domains of teacher skills over the five-year timeframe. As such, there are skill areas that show differences worth highlighting.

First, CADRE teachers had the largest difference in the percentage of teachers scoring 3 or better in comparison to their non-CADRE teacher matches in the following areas, in rank order:

- Selecting, Critiquing, and Adapting Learning Materials that Reflect Student Diversity (41.73913%)
- Using Appropriate Strategies to Teach Subject Matter (39.13044%)
- Selecting and Adapting Materials and Resources (36.52174%)

These skill areas represented the top three skills mastered by 86% or more of the CADRE teachers.

Second, the skill areas that represented the highest percentage of CADRE teachers scoring 3 or better were, in rank order:

- Using Appropriate Strategies to Teach Subject Matter (93.04348%)
- Using Effective Strategies for Responsive Teaching (89.27536%)
- Selecting, Critiquing, and Adapting Learning Materials that Reflect Student Diversity (86.95652%)

It is important to note that two of the teaching skills showed up in both categories, emphasizing their importance, and netting four skill areas of CADRE teachers' greatest strength and growth.

Table 1
Domain #1 Results:
Organizing and Managing the Classroom/Creating a Positive Learning Environment

Table 1.1
Subdomain A: Managing Student Behavior
Subskills A1 through A5

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	35	77	198	181	84
	6.086957%	13.3913%	34.43478%	31.47826%	14.6087%
Non-CADRE Participants	98	176	190	88	23
	17.04348%	30.6087%	33.04348%	15.30435%	4%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			80.52174%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			52.34783%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			28.17391%

Table 1.2
Subdomain B: Organizing the Physical Environment
Subskills B1 through B4

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	30	60	152	125	93
	6.521739%	13.04348%	33.04348%	27.17391%	20.21739%
Non-CADRE Participants	61	118	159	93	29
	13.26087%	25.65217%	34.56522%	20.21739%	6.304348%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			80.43478%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			61.08696%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			19.34782%

Table 1.3
Subdomain C: Establishing Rapport and Relationships With and Between Students
Subskills C1 through C4

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	23	51	162	128	96
	5%	11.08696%	35.21739%	27.82609%	20.86957%
Non-CADRE Participants	63	113	151	106	27
	13.69565%	24.56522%	32.82609%	23.04348%	5.869565%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			83.91304%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			61.73913%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			22.17391%

Table 1
Domain #1 Results Continued

Table 1.4
Subdomain D: Whole Group Instruction and Use of Collaborative Activities
Subskills D1 through D2

SCORE	*1 - Beginning*	*2 - Emerging*	*3 - Developing*	*4 - Integrating*	*5 - Innovating*
CADRE Participants	11	30	77	68	44
	4.782609%	13.04348%	33.47826%	29.56522%	19.13043%
Non-CADRE Participants	38	73	70	27	22
	16.52174%	31.73913%	30.43478%	11.73913%	9.565217%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			82.17391%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			51.73913%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			30.43478%

The CADRE teachers' scores exceeded those of their non-CADRE counterparts for all twenty-seven teaching subskills. What follows is an explanation of how the CADRE teachers' four strongest teaching skill areas related to the CADRE induction program:

- Using Appropriate Strategies to Teach Subject Matter
- Using Effective Strategies for Responsive Teaching
- Selecting, Critiquing, and Adapting Learning Materials that Reflect Student Diversity
- Selecting and Adapting Materials and Resources

These findings can be tied to the content and scope of the induction program. First, the skill of "Using Appropriate Strategies to Teach Subject Matter" includes not only knowledge of subject content but also knowledge of strategies specific to effective teaching of particular content. The connection between the CADRE project and the positive development of subject matter knowledge and teaching strategies can be found in the emphasis on the academic coursework and, perhaps most clearly, in mentoring relationships. For example, the beginning teacher often has an adequate command of the content but is unsure how best to teach the concepts. It is here that the mentor teacher is able to coach the novice toward a strong pedagogical content knowledge that builds the CADRE teacher's efficacy.

In addition, the CADRE teachers' development of a skilled variety in the area of "Using Effective Strategies for Responsive Teaching" can be tied to the aspect that CADRE teachers have multiple opportunities to revisit effective teaching strategies with their mentor as well as during coursework and seminars. CADRE teachers have opportunities to practice the teaching strategies presented and to debrief with peers about their results. Reflection is strongly correlated with teacher growth and development, and this is an essential skill that is developed and assessed throughout the CADRE Project.

Finally, the CADRE teachers' enhanced facility in "Selecting, Critiquing, and Adapting Learning Materials that Reflect Student Diversity" and the high proportion demonstrating the skill, "Selecting and Adapting Materials and Resources" may also be related to the induction program. During coursework and through mentors, the CADRE project introduces the beginning teacher to a plethora of resources and ways to differentiate instruction to meet individual students' needs. The mentors are adept at accessing district level resources and help the new teachers to do so as well. Beginning teachers are continually introduced to new and better resources in timely ways during seminars and coursework, and through mentoring. This encourages the use of and experimentation with a variety resources to meet students' learning needs.

The CADRE project promotes competence and growth in teaching skills through mentoring, coursework, and cohort /peer support group. The new teacher has the opportunity to reflect on practice and theory with the help of a veteran teacher. These components have proven to be a powerful combination, primarily because they are experienced simultaneously during the first year of teaching. It is during the first years of practice that the beginning teacher is most receptive to assistance and support. While progress and growth in teaching can occur at anytime, it is perhaps most useful in the early stages. This induction program is making a difference in the ability of new teachers to crack the code of teaching and remain in a solid professional growth mode. Further, our research demonstrated that teacher growth continued five years following the CADRE induction experience. Our goal is to help beginning teachers make timely progress as successful teachers. Based on our data, we believe that CADRE has made an important contribution to the overall success of our novice teachers.

Table 2
Domain #2 Results: Delivering Instruction to All Students

Table 2.1
Subdomain A: Using Effective Strategies for Responsive Teaching
Subskills A1 through A3

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	12	25	97	120	91
	3.478261%	7.246377%	28.11594%	34.78261%	26.37681%
Non-CADRE Participants	55	90	120	75	5
	15.94203%	26.08696%	34.78261%	21.73913%	1.449275%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			89.27536%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			57.97101%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			31.30435%

Table 2.2
Subdomain B: Use of Student Prior Knowledge and Higher Order Thinking Skills
Subskills B1 through B2

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	8	39	59	82	42
	3.478261%	16.95652%	25.65217%	35.65217%	18.26087%
Non-CADRE Participants	42	75	85	21	7
	18.26087%	32.6087%	36.95652%	9.130435%	3.043478%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			79.56522%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			49.13043%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			30.43479%

Table 2.3
Subdomain C: Selecting and Adapting Materials and Resources
Subskill C1

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	0	15	46	36	18
	0%	13.04348%	40%	31.30435%	15.65217%
Non-CADRE Participants	13	44	30	18	10
	11.30435%	38.26087%	26.08696%	15.65217%	8.695652%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			86.95652%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			50.43378%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			36.52174%

Table 3
Domain #3 Results: Demonstrating Subject Matter Knowledge

Table 3.1
Subdomain A: Understanding Subject Matter
Subskills A1 through A3

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	7	42	115	127	54
	2.028986%	12.17391%	33.33333%	36.81159%	15.65217%
Non-CADRE Participants	28	101	135	66	15
	8.115942%	29.27536%	39.13043%	19.13043%	4.347826%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			85.7971%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			62.6087%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			23.1884%

Table 3.2
Subdomain B: Using Appropriate Strategies to Teach Subject Matter
Subskills B1 through B2

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	5	11	104	92	18
	2.173913%	4.782609%	45.21739%	40%	7.826087%
Non-CADRE Participants	34	72	80	32	12
	14.78261%	31.30435%	34.78261%	13.91304%	5.217391%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			93.04348%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			53.91304%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			39.13044%

Table 3.3
Subdomain C: Selecting, Critiquing, and Adapting Learning Materials that Reflect Student Diversity
Subskill C1

SCORE	***1 - Beginning***	***2 - Emerging***	***3 - Developing***	***4 - Integrating***	***5 - Innovating***
CADRE Participants	6	9	47	44	9
	5.217391%	7.826087%	40.86957%	38.26087%	7.826087%
Non-CADRE Participants	16	47	42	8	2
	13.91304%	40.86957%	36.52174%	6.956522%	1.73913%
		% of CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			86.95652%
		% of non-CADRE participants scoring 3-5:			45.21739%
		% Difference between CADRE & non-CADRE:			41.73913%

Endnotes

[1] Susan Yasin, "Teacher Shortages Across the Nation: Implications for SCDEs," *AACTE Briefs* 19 (December 1998): 1.

[2] Sharon Feiman-Nemser, "Teacher Mentoring: A Critical Review," *ERIC Digest* (1996), ED 397060.

[3] Adam Gregory, "In Through the Out Door?" *Works Management* 51 (Winter 1998): 16-19; Richard P. Tisher, "Teacher Induction: An International Perspective on Research and Programs, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY, 1982; Frederick J. McDonald, "The Teaching Internship and Teacher Induction," in *Assuring Qualified Educational Personnel in the Eighties*, in Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Convention of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, C. C. Mackey, Jr., Ed. (Boston, MA: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification 1980); G.G. Evey, *The New Teacher Comes to School* (New York: Harper, 1956).

[4] Sandra J. Odell and Leslie Huling, *Quality Mentoring for Teachers* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 2000); Marge Brooks, "Mentors Matter," in *A Better Beginning*, M. Scherer, Ed. (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1999), 53-59; Linda Darling-Hammond, "The Quality of Teaching Matters Most," *Journal of Staff Development* 18 (Winter 1997): 38-41; Gerald J. Adams and Micah Dial, "The Effects of Education in Teacher Retention," *Education* 114 (Spring 1994): 358-365; Arthur L. Costa and Robert J. Garmston, *Cognitive Coaching: A Foundation for Renaissance Schools* (Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc., 1994); Edward G. Plutorak, "Facilitating Reflective Thought in Novice Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education* 4 (September-October 1993): 288-295; Leslie Huling-Austin, "Teacher Induction Programs and Internships," in *Handbook of Research in Teacher Education*, W. Robert Houston, Ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1990), 535-548; Virginia Richardson, "Significant and Worthwhile Change in Teaching Practice," *Educational Researcher* 19 (October 1990): 41-45; David C. Berliner, *The Development of Expertise in Pedagogy* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Education, 1988); Lee S. Shulman, "Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform," *Harvard Educational Review* 57 (February 1987): 1-22.

[5] Laurent Daloz, *Effective Teaching and Mentoring* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986); Kathy E. Kram, "Phases of Mentor Relationship," *Administrative Science Quarterly* (December 1983): 26; Cheri Ostroff and Steve Kozlowski, "The Role of Mentoring in the Information Gathering Processes of Newcomers During Early Organizational Socialization," *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 42 (April 1993): 170-183.

[6] Judith H. Schulman and Joel A. Colbert, *The Mentor Teacher Casebook* (San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1985).

[7] Huling-Austin, "Teacher Induction."

[8] Marilyn Cochran-Smith, "Learning to Teach Against the Grain," *Harvard Education Review* 610 (August 1991): 279-310; Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Michelle B. Parker, and Kenneth Zeichner, "Are Mentor Teachers Teacher Educators?" in *Mentoring: Perspectives on School-Based Teacher Education*, Donald McIntyre, H. Hagger and M. Wilkin, Ed. (London: Kogan Page, 1993); Mari Koerner, "The Cooperating Teacher: An Ambivalent Participant in Student Teaching," *Journal of Teacher Education* 43 (January-February 1992): 46-56; Ann Q. Staton and Sandra L. Hunt, "Teacher Socialization: Review and Conceptualization," *Communication Education* 41 (April 1992): 109-137.

[9] Sandra M. Fox and Ted J. Singletary, "Deductions About Supportive Induction," *Journal of Teacher Education* 17 (January-February 1986): 14.

[10] Yvonne Gold and Robert A. Roth, *The Transforming Helping Professional: Mentoring and Supervising Reconsidered* (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1999); Feiman-Nemser, "Teacher Mentoring"; Costa and Garmston, *Cognitive Coaching*; Huling-Austin, "Teacher Induction."

[11] Kate Hawkey, "Roles, Responsibilities, and Relationships in Mentoring: A Literature Review and Agenda for Research," *Journal of Teacher Education* 48 (November-December 1997): 325-335.

[12] Brent Kilbourn and Geoffrey Roberts, "May's First Year: Conversations with a Mentor," *Teachers College Record* 23 (Winter 1991): 252-264; David Lambert and Linda Lambert, "Mentor Teachers as Change Facilitators," *Thrust* (April-May 1985): 28-32; Judith Ponticell and Sally Zepeda, "Using Problem Solving in Mentoring to Assist a First Year Teacher in Working with Diverse Learners," a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Atlanta, GA, February 12-16, 1994.

[13] Shulman, "Knowledge and Teaching."

[14] D. Jean Clandinin and F. Michael Connely, *Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1995).

[15] Kenneth Zeichner and Daniel Liston, "Teaching Student Teacher to Reflect," *Harvard Educational Review* 5 (February 1987): 23-48.

[16] Ellen Moir, Susan Freeman, Lynne Petrock, and Wendy Baron, *A Developmental Continuum of Teacher Abilities* (University of California at Santa Cruz, 1997).

[17] See the Appendix for a sample page of the instrument.

Appendix
Sample Page of Instrument: A Continuum of Effective Teaching Skills

Domain #1: ***Organizing and Managing the Classroom/Creating a Positive Learning Environment***
Sub Domain A: ***Managing Student Behavior***

	Beginning	***Emerging***	***Developing***	***Integrating***	***Innovating***
A - 1	May establish expectations for student behavior without modeling or reinforcing them.	Occasionally states and reinforces expectations for student behavior.	Regularly states, models, and reinforces expectations for student behavior.	When necessary, reinforces expectations through a variety of strategies to assist students in taking responsibility for their own behavior.	Expectations are clearly demonstrated through consistently internalized student behavior.
A - 2	Recognizes some disruptive student behavior; may respond only to negative behaviors. Focuses attention on presenting lesson.	Responds using limited strategies to reinforce positive behavior. Occasionally monitors behavior while teaching.	Uses some prevention or intervention strategies to reinforce positive and alter negative behavior. Monitors behavior while teaching.	Frequently uses prevention and intervention strategies to foster student responsibility. Encourages students to monitor their own behavior.	Consistently uses prevention and intervention strategies to foster student responsibility. Teacher and students consistently monitor behavior.
A - 3	Recognizes the need for routines and procedures to accomplish regular classroom activities, but does not have them in place.	May use some routines and procedures to facilitate classroom activities.	Use some routines, procedures, and transitions to facilitate classroom activities.	Frequently uses routines, procedures, and transitions to facilitate classroom activities.	Consistently uses routines, procedures, and transitions to facilitate classroom activities.
A - 4	Teaches or manages activities from one place in the classroom without circulating among students.	Occasionally establishes proximity to students during some activities.	Establishes some proximity to students during instruction and activities to facilitate student engagement.	Frequently establishes proximity to students during instruction and activities to facilitate student engagement.	Consistently establishes proximity to students during all instruction and activities to facilitate student engagement.