MEET THE PROMISE OF CONTENT STANDARDS:

THE ROLE OF COMPREHENSIVE INDUCTION

learningforward

TRANSFORMING PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Learning Forward
504 S. Locust St.
Oxford, OH 45056
513-523-6029
800-727-7288
Fax: 513-523-0638
E-mail: office@learningforward.org
www.learningforward.org

Authors: Kathleen Paliokas and Joellen Killion
Editor: Joyce Pollard
Designers: Jane Thurmond, Brian Deep

© Learning Forward, 2013. All rights reserved.

Paliokas, K. & Killion, J. (2013). *Meet the promise of content standards: The role of comprehensive induction*. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward.

Learning Forward's *Transforming Professional Learning to Prepare College- and Career-Ready Students: Implementing the Common Core* is a multidimensional initiative focused on developing a comprehensive system of professional learning that spans the distance from the statehouse to the classroom. The project will reform policy and practice and apply innovative technology solutions to support and enhance professional learning. With an immediate focus on implementing Common Core State Standards and new assessments, the initiative provides resources and tools to assist states, districts, and schools in providing effective professional learning for current and future education reforms.

This work is supported by Sandler Foundation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and MetLife Foundation. Learn more at www.learningforward.org/publications/implementing-common-core.

Maida Nguyen is a novice secondary mathematics teacher. She graduated from her state's leading university-based teacher preparation program after working in business for six years. She scored high on the state's teacher licensure examinations. Proud of these accomplishments, she confidently submitted applications to three school districts near her home. She interviewed with each, and received contract offers from two of the three districts. Two of her friends accepted positions in the other districts.

Nguyen is eager about the new school year and her new position. She is grateful for the extensive induction program required by the state for novice educators with provisional licenses. Nguyen attended a three-day collaborative planning session with other math teachers at her school to map out the first six-week of each course. Even though she wasn't teaching every course, the teachers in the department worked together to contribute to one other's classroom curriculum. She learned that she had a formal mentor who would work personally with her on a one-on-one basis, and that the entire department considered her a part of the team. They looked forward to learning from her. She felt welcomed and reassured that she was surrounded by a team of teachers who committed to her success.

Nguyen and her two college friends met before their first day of school to celebrate their new beginnings. Nguyen eagerly shared all she had learned and done to prepare for the beginning of the school year with her department colleagues. One of the three friends expressed frustration with not being able to get course syllabi and asked to see what Nguyen and her colleagues planned. They compared notes on the induction programs in each school district and wondered why they were so different. Nguyen was clearly a part of a team of professionals who treated her as a valued member. One friend didn't know anything about the district's induction program and was told that mentors hadn't been assigned yet.

In the two days before students were to arrive, Nguyen met with her mentor and supervising principal to draft professional growth goals. She also wanted to learn about the new Common Core standards and wondered how she would catch up with other teachers in the department who had been engaged in studying the standards, rewriting curriculum, and in modifying their instruction to align with the standards. In her teacher preparation courses, there was no attention to the new standards. She did not want her students to get behind because she did not know everything her colleagues did.

Together with Nguyen, the principal and mentor brainstormed various ways to help her learn what other teachers in the department knew about the standards. Her mentor suggested that she review the previous curricula and syllabi for the course she is teaching so she could see how they had been changed. Her principal suggested that she take time in the first month of school to observe each teacher in the department to study their instructional methodologies and identify those she wanted to learn more about. The principal promised to coordinate with her to arrange class relief for the observations and to identify the sequence of teachers to observe.

Nguyen attended her first district induction meeting the second week of school and met an amazing team of new teachers. Each one joined an action research team on a topic of their choice and learned how they would collaborate on a multi-faceted action research study as a team. Nguyen joined the math secondary curriculum team because it aligned with her desire to learn more about the new standards. She also received an introduction to the district online professional learning resources and instructional support resources available on a pilot basis to several schools and all novice teachers. Nguyen received permission to share these resources with her colleagues even though her school would not be a part of the pilot study.

The syllabi for the year's district induction sessions included opportunities to work collaboratively on their action research projects and to attend a presentation of all the action research projects in the spring. There were various after-school sessions on the new curricula and assessments, instructional practices aligned with the new standards, three full days to meet with in teams and one-on-one with mentors and to visit other schools. They were particularly encouraged to visit classrooms at different levels so they could understand how the district's curriculum aligned vertically.

In the third week of school, Nguyen met with her college friends again. She was bubbling with enthusiasm, overwhelmed with the responsibilities of meeting the needs of very diverse students in her school, working on her action research project and her professional

growth goals, keeping up with student feedback, and contributing to her department's frequent collaborative planning sessions. Because the department was committed to the success of every teacher and every student, she felt a responsibility to be an active contributor to every course and every other teacher's success.

As she shared her excitement, Nguyen observed one of her colleagues turn sullen. This friend had none of the support Nguyen had. She had just learned who her mentor would be that morning, a teacher at another school who didn't even teach math. She felt she was drowning; she was unable to keep up with planning, had two very challenging classes, and received no help. Nguyen felt guilty as she listened to her friend, and promised to give her support and share what Nguyen and her teammates had developed.

Nguyen invited two college friends to form a small informal learning community to study how to implement the Common Core standards and design learning tasks and assessments to align with the new standards. Nguyen thought this might be one way to support her friend and to give her another vehicle for accelerating her own learning about the new standards. After meeting twice, they decided to invite their mentors to join them to give them feedback, share resources, bring sample lessons, and suggest other ways to extend their learning.

By the third month of school, Nguyen was feeling less stressed as a new teacher. She worried about her friend who had a mentor, yet who did not get the same level of support she enjoyed. She was glad that she had taken the initiative to form their small learning community. It gave the three new math teachers a chance to reflect together, contribute to each other's learning, and support each other's growth and development. She couldn't imagine how any teacher working alone could survive in teaching today. Nguyen's induction into the profession as a member of the math department and the district's action research team was filled with collaboration, learning, sharing, and problem solving. By mid-year, Nguyen didn't feel like a new teacher as much as she felt like a valued and contributing member of a team of professionals committed to each other's success and student achievement.

THE CONTEXT

Major education reforms are shifting teaching and learning in schools across the nation. As a result, educators' need for key supports is more important today than ever. This shift is the result of three significant and simultaneous reform efforts, all of which are scheduled to be operational in the near future:

- More rigorous Common Core State Standards for students in math, English language arts, and science;
- Revised student assessments aligned to the new standards; and
- Redesigned educator evaluation and support systems linked to student growth.

These reforms mean that educators must be ready to implement new curricula, instructional practices, assessments, and evaluation systems that will assess their performance. Some characterize these widespread reforms, if implemented successfully, as prompting a near-total overhaul of the education system. Yet not much will change for student learning without increased knowledge, skill, and capacity of teachers and leaders. This policy brief examines how to leverage comprehensive educator induction as an important capacity-building strategy within a larger system of professional learning to ensure successful implementation of new standards, assessments, and educator effectiveness systems. While the primary focus of the brief is on teacher induction, aspects of it are applicable to induction of novice principals as well.

In a time of rapid reform, where changes affect not only what is taught, but how it is taught, examining and revising induction is essential. Current reforms create the potential for a significant gap between preparation programs and classroom practices. And it will be the majority of current classroom teachers, those with one to three years of experience, who may feel the impact most strongly. Novice educators, particularly those graduating in these years of significant change, are unlikely to be fully prepared to meet the demands of new standards and assessments. Undergraduate, graduate, and alternative licensure programs are only now beginning to redesign teacher and leader preparation programs to incorporate new standards, assessments, and educator effectiveness systems. In addition, colleges of arts and sciences, which are responsible for providing deep content preparation and for modeling rich, engaging content-specific pedagogy, are just beginning to address content and pedagogy aligned with the new standards.

When teacher candidates look to the colleges for models by which they can analyze their own pedagogical preparation, they are left with few or no examples. Thus, changes in content standards create gaps for novice educators. Teachers who leave the state in which they completed their preparation programs to teach in other states whose curricula and standards differ, may find another gap. Teachers who move from grade level to grade level or discipline to discipline, particularly in school systems that have implemented professional learning focused on grade-level teaching and discipline-specific pedagogy, may find their transition leaves them unprepared. These gaps result from the tension between the slow pace of institutional and programmatic change and the urgency to ensure educators are prepared for success as well as the pull between the magnitude of change and inadequate or insufficient implementation efforts.

Within school systems mentors, too, are learning what these changes mean in their own classrooms. They have yet to become expert with new standards and instruction required by the standards. They are definitely not ready yet to guide novices who look to them as experts. Novice teachers look to their mentors for guidance, support, coaching, and expertise. When mentors are learning alongside their mentees, the nature of the relationship changes from one of master-novice to peer-colleague in which the mentor and novice are partners in learning. If mentor preparation fails to address this new type of relationship, mentors may be less comfortable in a co-learner role and misrepresent themselves as experts.

WHAT IS COMPREHENSIVE INDUCTION?

Induction in the United States has progressed over time from informal, one-to-one mentoring toward a comprehensive system of support with multiple components (Wood and Stanulis, 2009). This move toward a multi-faceted, multi-year system of planned and structured learning experiences for novice teachers and for some novice principals parallels increased recognition that novice educators grow along a developmental continuum and deepen their knowledge and skill over time.

A number of organizations, led by the New Teacher Center, are promoting a definition of comprehensive high-quality induction based on what we have learned from research and best practice (Goldrick, Zabala & Burn, 2013; Alliance for Excellent Education, 2011; NASBE, 2012). The components of that definition should be closely linked to the major reform initiatives discussed above. With that in mind, high-quality comprehensive induction should include:

- Two to three years of intentional support to new teachers;
- Carefully selected, well-prepared, and systematically supported mentors who focus on content, content-specific pedagogy, and student learning;
- Ongoing standards-based formative assessment of the teacher's practice and student learning to guide learning experiences and professional goal setting toward improvement of instruction;
- Dedicated time for mentors and novice teachers to work together, for mentors to conduct classroom observations, and for novice teachers to observe master teachers;
- Regularly scheduled time for collaborative team planning with school and district colleagues and time to meet with a mentor;
- Professional learning for new teachers focused on state standards and district curriculum and learning goals;
- Engaged principals who know how to create conditions that support teacher development;
- Program leadership collaboratively shared among all stakeholders, including district administration and association leaders;

- Strong alignment with other state and district goals, including those embedded in Common Core standards, new assessments, and educator evaluation systems; and
- Data usage to inform teacher growth and support and inform improvement of preparation and induction programs (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2011; Goldrick et al., 2013; NASBE, 2012).

Research suggests that comprehensive induction can "reduce the rate of teacher attrition, accelerate the professional growth of new teachers, provide a positive return on investment, and improve student learning" (Glazerman et al., 2010). Specifically, bundling together the components of comprehensive induction shows stronger evidence of positive impact on student learning than any one component alone (Goldrick et al., 2013; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

> Comprehensive induction shows greater impact on student learning than any single induction component.

For purposes of this brief, induction refers not only to novice teachers who are new to the profession as they transition into professional employment, but also to experienced teachers who are new to a district, school, grade level, or subject area, or who are new to a schoolwide or districtwide program or initiative such as the reforms under way in schools today. New teachers may also be teachers returning to the classroom after an extended absence. New administrators or those changing roles are also considered novice educators and benefit from induction. Educators may participate in induction at various and multiple times during their career. The type and intensity of supports available in induction, however, should differ based on the magnitude of change that educators experience. Master teachers, for example, who leave their classroom assignments to assume formal teacher leadership roles such as instructional coaches, may participate in intensive induction to receive the supports necessary to lead to success as coaches. The same is true for teachers leaving their classrooms to become school administrators or to assume other roles outside of their classrooms or schools. Teachers moving from school to school without switching grade level or discipline area may need less intensive induction support, yet do benefit from some support during the transition period.

Consistent with the components above are several key assumptions that drive induction:

- Teaching and leading are complex work.
- Induction and mentoring are the responsibility of the entire education community.
- Induction supports are critical components in the continuum of continuous professional learning, and should be utilized in addition to other strategies to support teachers and leaders.
- Learning and the sustainability of learning requires application and continual reinforcement of new knowledge in real contexts.
- A deliberate focus on the professional learning of educators is essential to successful implementation of new school, district, and state initiatives.

Few states have comprehensive induction programs that include the components described above. Most induction programs vary in the components required (Goldrick et al., 2012). Those states that have the existing infrastructure of comprehensive induction will find it easier to scale up the capacity-building strategies needed to successfully implement the new standards, assessments, and educator effectiveness initiatives.

THE CHALLENGES OF IMPLEMENTING NEW CONTENT STANDARDS

New content standards, assessments, and educator effectiveness systems present several potential challenges for induction.

Timing gap. Ideally, education leaders would integrate the knowledge, skills, practices, and dispositions aligned with the reforms into all components of an educator effectiveness system simultaneously (e.g. preparation, ongoing professional learning, and evaluation) and have instant perfect alignment. A key challenge will be a timing gap as the combined reforms roll out on different timetables for different parts of the system. For instance, the speed with which teacher preparation programs in both colleges of education and arts and sciences are able to embed Common Core standards into curricula and pedagogy has implications for how much professional learning districts and schools will need to do during induction.

Maximizing feedback opportunities. As states and districts rush to meet deadlines for designing and implementing new educator evaluation and support systems, evidence indicates their planning is lacking in development of the support component, specifically around creating robust feedback mechanisms. Focus has been on addressing the measurement and evaluative aspects of these systems with insufficient focus on delivery of feedback (quality, frequency, specificity, and depth) to improve performance.

Transformation of professional learning. Another challenge is that districts' professional learning systems fail to meet the standards for effective professional learning, and particularly fail to extend support beyond awareness building to support full implementation of new initiatives. Successful implementation of today's college- and career-readiness reforms requires professional learning that includes engaging teachers in much more than knowing about the standards and the instructional shifts they require. The standards require that educators fully, consistently, and routinely implement content standards and concomitant curricula and pedagogy that ensure that each student

achieves standards. Professional learning that promotes continuous improvement and deep implementation for student success is intensive, sustained, collaborative, and job-embedded. It includes teachers learning together to redesign classroom curricula to integrate Common Core standards, develop authentic student performance tasks aligned to standards, develop formative assessments to assess progress on those tasks, analyze their individual practice, and participate in peer observation, coaching, feedback, and shared reflection to improve practice.

Changing principal role. Amidst the many reforms, expectations for principals are changing, especially with regard to their roles in evaluating and supporting teachers, particularly novice teachers in induction programs. Like teachers, principals must have deep knowledge of Common Core standards so they can recognize and rate effective instruction and provide actionable feedback to teachers for improvement purposes. Secondly, principals need to be ready to lead in providing overall support to teachers as they set the context in a school and help create and induct new teachers into a community of learners. They have a role in selecting and supporting mentors, too.

Addressing unintended consequences. The high stakes of new educator effectiveness systems may limit the willingness of experienced cooperating teachers to work with student and novice teachers because they fear it will have a negative impact on the performance of their students, and ultimately, their evaluation. Creative incentives that emphasize collective responsibility, collaboration, and commitment to the profession without creating unintended consequences will encourage educators to serve as mentors.

Selection and preparation of mentors. Having quality mentors is always critical to successful induction, but never more so than in the current context of multiple reforms. Mentors today must be carefully selected and well prepared if they are to model and guide implementation of new standards, assessments, and educator evaluation systems. They should be knowledgeable and demonstrate some expertise in new content standards and the requisite instructional changes; they must attend more to teaching and learning and less to organization; they must be able to integrate novices into communities of learners and use collaborative approaches for mentoring rather than rely on one-to-one strategies only; they should have demonstrated success in making a positive impact on student learning and implementing new curriculum and standards, assessments, and instruction aligned to the standards; and they should be able to provide constructive, growth-oriented feedback to novice teachers.

THE TASK

To build the capacity of all educators so that all students succeed, schools, districts, and states need to focus concerted, coherent efforts on successful implementation of Common Core standards. Educator preparation programs, mentors, and those who lead and support induction programs need to revamp existing support and services to incorporate programmatic changes that support new standards, assessments, and evaluation systems.

This means that states, districts, and schools must look beyond one-to-one mentoring as the only strategy for inducting novice educators. Master educators in districts and schools need more flexible models of induction that take into account not only individual needs, but also capacity-building strategies that enrich the entire education workforce. Such strategies leverage schoolwide and team-focused approaches, including multiple mentors, peer coaching, and collaborative, job-embedded professional learning. To be successful, though, any approach must occur within a collaborative culture in which educators work together to ensure that every student succeeds. In such cultures colleagues pursue intentional inquiry- and data-based efforts to identify and address the challenges to student learning. Professional learning for novice educators should occur within a community of learners and focus on the real work they experience each day, have a deeper focus on content and instruction, and examine what is and is not working in classrooms and schools. In this way educators hone and model the Common Core standards skills they strive to foster in students (e.g. collaborative problem solving, continuous growth, and exploration).

KEY IDEAS

Induction programs should incorporate professional learning models that complement and enable the goal of continuous improvement for all educators and their students. Following are key ideas that are critical in designing induction and mentoring systems that will prepare and support all educators and lead to successful implementation of new Common Core standards, assessments, and educator effectiveness systems.

Integrate and model Common Core standards. Comprehensive induction is standards-based and driven by a common understanding of effective instruction aligned to Common Core standards. When everyone understands what high-quality performance is, it will be easier to develop a culture of continuous learning, support, and reinforcement of best practice. In schools today educators are still defining that common understanding and acquiring the practices aligned with the new standards. This means that mentors and principals, like new and practicing teachers, may not yet have the standards-based skills or expertise needed to model or coach to those skills. The selection of mentors and the provision of high-quality professional learning are critical, as is the placement of new teachers into settings where Common Core standards content and pedagogy are modeled and embraced. Finally, comprehensive induction should be bolstered by rich frameworks for providing feedback that is aligned to new standards. For example, the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) has developed a new tool that will be useful. The *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0: A Resource for Ongoing Teacher Development* contains both the model core teaching standards released in 2011 and the new learning progressions for teachers. According to InTASC the progressions describe the increasing sophistication of teaching practice for each Model Core Teaching Standard across three developmental levels (CCSSO, 2013).

Ensure a coherent, aligned developmental continuum. Comprehensive induction should be a component of a continuous progression of development that links preparation with continuous inservice professional growth. Emphasizing continuous development is particularly important as states, districts, and schools embed Common Core standards into routine practice. For new teachers this means coordination in the form of a bridge plan that spans the learning and support between the preparation program and the school or district that first employs the teacher. The plan ideally identifies

strengths, areas for growth, and specific actions for improvement and continued development. Groundwork for this kind of bridging is being developed through new preservice performance assessments, such as the edTPA, which generates actionable feedback to both the candidate and preparation program and can serve as the basis for a bridge plan (AACTE, 2013) . Implementing a system of bridge plans requires stronger and more transparent partnerships between preparation providers and schools and districts. Current federal and state policy is moving toward holding preparation programs more accountable for the performance of their graduates. In some cases available incentives raise the stakes for preparation programs to follow their graduates and provide ongoing support in early induction years. For teachers new to a district or school, an expanded expectation is that each arrives with a professional learning plan that incorporates feedback from evaluations and multiple other sources of data (e.g. mentor feedback, peer feedback, and student feedback) and informs induction and mentoring in the new location. For teachers away from the profession for a period of time, induction and mentoring focus on addressing gaps in their knowledge, skills, and practices so that they are current and ready for reentry. Ideal induction programs are flexible enough to address these unique and individual educator needs and enlist the aid of preparation programs if substantive changes are required for reentry.

Integrate evaluation feedback into the comprehensive induction system. As states and districts design and implement new evaluation systems aligned to new performance standards and more rigorous student learning outcomes, they integrate another avenue of feedback to both novice and experienced educators regarding performance related to Common Core standards. High-quality evaluation systems collect evidence of performance using multiple measures that provide multiple perspectives on practice. To support deep implementation of Common Core standards, induction programs integrate feedback from evaluation as another data source on which to base professional learning experiences. Effective evaluation conferences end with a plan for how the evaluator, instructional coaches, mentors, and other supports are levied together to advance teaching quality (Goldrick et al., 2013). This team and systemic approach to support provides an opportunity to build a shared understanding of Common Core standards implementation and serves as an opportunity for scaling both Common Core standards and educator effectiveness initiatives simultaneously. Frequent, timely, and accurate evidence-based feedback serves the formative and developmental needs of new teachers (Coggshall, Rasmussen, Colton, Milton & Jacques, 2012). The system should be flexible enough to adapt support based on new teachers' knowledge of

Common Core standards and use of related instructional strategies, and to recognize and tap the expertise of novice teachers to support others if they demonstrate high levels of knowledge and practice with Common Core standards. Comprehensive induction is aligned to and supports the educator evaluation process (Goldrick et al., 2013). It also adapts to provide needed professional learning with continuous classroom-based support for deep implementation of new state, district, or school initiatives.

Tap teacher leaders to promote formative growth. While principals are given overwhelming responsibility for observing and providing feedback to teachers several times a year under new evaluation and support systems, they cannot be expected to do this alone. Comprehensive induction systems can support principals in this work by leveraging mentors, teacher leaders, and peer coaches to build robust formative feedback processes that move beyond evaluation and observation to focus on collaborative strategies for improving practice such as co-teaching, peer coaching, co-planning, analyzing student work, and using student formative assessment data. These processes can be more frequent than evaluations, more informal, embedded in the workday, and facilitated by other teachers within the school.

Leverage innovative ways to access professional learning. Comprehensive induction models the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and practices embedded in the Common Core standards by leveraging appropriate face-to-face, blended, and virtual learning supports. They tap new technology that opens access to learning experiences that might not otherwise be available. For instance, in rural districts or small schools where access to subject-specific mentors may be limited, programs such as online e-mentoring that connect teachers to online coaches or that offers instructional coaches on-demand support to meet coaching challenges are available. Other innovative tools provide teachers and leadership teams with video-rich strategies to explore best instructional practice. Technologies can also provide educators with opportunities to build customized professional learning experiences. In addition, districts can explore new technology solutions that provide teachers with customized online dashboards that analyze multiple sources of data about a teacher, including professional growth goals, student performance data, evaluation results, and identify personalized online resources linked to identified learning needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

Federal, state, district, and school leaders develop comprehensive induction that supports successful implementation of Common Core standards by taking the following recommended actions.

Federal actions

- Require existing federal investments (Title I, Title II, Race to the Top, etc.) and federally funded agencies and programs (regional centers, comprehensive centers, National Science Foundation Math and Science Partnerships, etc.) to support effective professional learning for implementation of Common Core standards.
- Dedicate new funding to build the capacity of teachers and leaders to implement Common Core standards through development of comprehensive induction that is linked to new educator evaluation and support systems and to the content and pedagogy specified in the standards.
- Support research on and dissemination of best practices to support teachers as they develop expertise in teaching Common Core standards and on the impact of various components of comprehensive induction in improving student learning.
- Provide resources that promote collaboration across states and institutions of higher education to more quickly redesign preparation programs, both schools of education and arts and sciences, so they better prepare educators to implement Common Core standards.

State actions

- Require districts to provide comprehensive induction to all first- and second-year teachers and district and school administrators on the Common Core standards, new assessments, and educator evaluation and support systems.
- Provide dedicated funding to districts to develop and maintain comprehensive induction aligned to Common Core standards and require periodic review of induction to ensure continuous improvement and alignment with new initiatives.
- Provide guidance to districts on how to integrate standards, including the Common Core standards and teacher and leader standards aligned to the Common Core, into

comprehensive induction, including into the selection and preparation of mentors and coaches so they are skilled in observing teaching to the Common Core standards and in offering high-quality feedback aligned to the content and pedagogy embedded in them.

- Set statewide program standards for high-quality comprehensive induction, including a rigorous mentor selection and training process.
- Coordinate and fund development of a statewide, integrated technology system that provides instructional resources, data, and virtual networking for teachers and leaders to collaborate across districts and share best practices in implementing Common Core standards.
- Amend teacher preparation program approval requirements to promote increased collaboration between:
  - Colleges of education and colleges of arts and sciences in preparing educators in the content and pedagogy they need to successfully implement Common Core standards; and among
  - Preparation programs and schools and districts receiving their graduates, including requiring a bridge plan for professional growth for graduates and providing mentoring support during induction based on that growth plan.
- Amend licensure requirements to require successful completion of an induction program aligned to Common Core standards to receive a professional license.

School system/School actions

- Develop and maintain comprehensive induction aligned to Common Core standards for all first- and second-year teachers and leaders.
- Integrate the Common Core standards and teacher and leader standards aligned to the Common Core into comprehensive induction, including into the selection and preparation of mentors and coaches so they are skilled in observing teaching and in offering high-quality feedback aligned to the content and pedagogy embedded in Common Core standards.
- Realign professional learning resources to prioritize preparation of and ongoing support for mentors based on content and pedagogy required by Common Core standards.

- Design mentoring support as a collaborative effort rather than a one-to-one support to expand learning opportunities for novice teachers while building a culture of collective responsibility and collaboration for continuous improvement.
- Reward/recognize teachers and administrators who serve as mentors.
- Collaborate with preparation program providers to specify the content knowledge and pedagogical expertise required for successful implementation of the new standards and to implement seamless professional growth that leverages multiple sources of feedback as teacher candidates transition into novice teachers.
- Encourage and enable teacher leaders to serve as teacher mentors and peer evaluators. Building that capacity will lessen the load on principals and model the value that instructional improvement is a collective responsibility.

CONCLUSION

In today's context of fast-moving multiple reform efforts, states, school systems, and schools must rethink how they support educators and build the capacity needed for successful implementation of Common Core standards, aligned assessments, and educator evaluation and support systems. Educators entering the profession continue to develop over time. Educators who make a significant change in their assignment require time to develop expertise in their new assignments. The first few years in a new position, whether for beginning teachers or those new to a grade, course, discipline, or school, are critical to ultimate success. This development cannot be the sole responsibility of a single mentor or occur in occasional induction meetings throughout a single school year. Continuous improvement of all educators is a collective responsibility and requires high-quality comprehensive induction. As a key element of an overall comprehensive professional learning system, induction plays a dual role within a system of professional learning: It is the initial supportive infrastructure to launch a continuum of ongoing learning in which educators can put into practice and refine the new content and pedagogical skills needed to meet the Common Core standards. Simultaneously, induction can be a rewarding career stage and growth opportunity for those serving as mentors or peer collaborators in such a culture of collaborative support and continuous improvement.

REFERENCES

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2011). *A system approach to building a world-class teaching profession: The role of induction.* Available at www.all4ed.org/files/TeacherInduction.pdf

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2013) About edTPA. Available from www.edtpa.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_AboutEdTPA.html

Coggshall, J.G., Rasmussen, C., Colton, A., Milton, J., & Jacques, C. (2012). *Generating teaching effectiveness: The role of job-embedded professional learning in teacher evaluation*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Available at www.gtlcenter.org/products-resources/generating-teaching-effectiveness-role-job-embedded-professional-development

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2013). *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium InTASC model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0: A resource for ongoing teacher development.* Washington, DC: Author. Available at www.ccsso.org/intasc

Glazerman, S., Isenberg, E., Dolfin, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., & Jacobus, M. (2010). *Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Final results from a randomized controlled study (NCEE 2010-4028).* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Available at http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104027/pdf/20104028.pdf

Goldrick, L., Osta, D., Barlin, D., & Burn, J. (2012). *Review of state policies on teacher induction*. New Teacher Center: Santa Cruz, CA. Available from www.newteachercenter.org/sites/default/files/ntc/main/resources/brf-ntc-policy-state-teacher-induction.pdf

Goldrick, L., Zabala, D., & Burn, J. (2013). *Cultivating effective teachers through evaluation and support: A guide for Illinois policymakers and educational leaders.* Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center. Available at www.newteachercenter.org/products-and-resources/policy-reports/illinois-guide-policy-makers-educational-leaders

Ingersoll, R. & Smith, T. (2004, March). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NAASP Bulletin, 88*(638), 28-40. Available at www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/rmi/DoTeacher-InductionAndMentoringMatter-2004.pdf

Ingersoll, R. & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Education Research, 81*(2), 201-233.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (2012). *Discussion guide: Teacher induction- Improving state systems for supporting new teachers.* Available at www.nasbe.org/project/teacher-induction

Smith, T. & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(3), 681-714. Available at www.gse.upenn.edu/pdf/rmi/Effects-of-Induction-and-Mentoring-RMI-Fall-2004.pdf

Wood, A. L. & Stanulis, R. N. (2009). Quality teacher induction: 'Fourth-wave' (1997-2006) induction programs. *The New Educator, 5*(1), 1-23. Available at www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ868911J&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ868911

learningforward

TRANSFORMING PROFESSIONAL LEARNING