



May 2007

## Mentoring Programs for Special Education Teachers: State Approaches

by *Eve Müller and Paula Burdette*

### INTRODUCTION

Teacher shortages have been steadily increasing across the nation, particularly in the field of special education. According to analyses conducted by the Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education (COPSSE), reasons for this include the fact that veteran special education teachers are retiring at a faster rate than new teachers are being prepared (2004) as well as the fact that attrition rates among new special educators are extremely high—with new teachers frequently leaving the field after only one or two years in the classroom (2005). Teacher mentoring programs represent one possible solution to high teacher attrition rates and many states have passed legislation requiring mentoring for all first year teachers, including special education teachers.

This document includes an overview of existing research on teacher mentoring, especially mentoring for special educators; identification of best practices in developing and implementing mentoring programs; and descriptions of several state-level special education mentoring programs based on interviews with program staff.<sup>1</sup> This activity was completed as part of Project Forum at the National Association of Special Education Director's (NASDSE) cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

### Research Background

Evidence shows that teacher mentoring improves teacher retention. For example, Smith and Ingersoll (2004) analyzed data from the national Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and found that seven induction components for new teachers are related to reduced teacher turnover. One of these components was having a mentor in the same field (i.e., special education), which reduced the risk of leaving at the end of the first year by 30%. Similarly, a meta-analysis of 10 empirical studies provides further support for the assertion that mentoring programs have a positive impact

---

<sup>1</sup> Although this document focuses exclusively on mentoring programs that specifically target special education teachers, many states include special education teachers in their statewide mentoring programs for *all* new teachers.

on teacher retention (Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004). It remains unclear, however, as to which specific features of mentorship programs are directly linked to the retention of new teachers.

Results from the limited research on special education teacher mentoring are also encouraging. The majority of research in this area shows that strong teacher mentoring programs supported by other teacher induction processes result in significantly higher retention rates for special education teachers than induction programs without mentoring. Some mentoring programs achieved a five-year teacher retention rate as high as 80% (White and Mason, 2001; Whitaker, 2000).

A second outcome of teacher mentoring programs is increased student achievement. Two studies reviewed by Strong (2006) suggest that beginning teachers who receive comprehensive induction support for two years, including mentoring, are more likely to have classes that achieve reading gains similar to the gains achieved by veteran teachers than teachers who do not receive this support.

### **Best Practices**

To provide support to states that have begun implementing special education mentoring programs, the Northeast Regional Resource Center—in collaboration with the New York State Department of Education, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), and NASDSE's Personnel Center—developed *Keeping Quality Teachers: The Art of Retaining General and Special Education Teachers* (2004), a document that includes a section on mentoring and induction. This section highlights six key steps that a state should take in developing and implementing a mentoring program for general and special educators (Villani, 2004). These steps include the following:

- Include key stakeholders.
- Identify the selection criteria and selection process for mentor teachers.
- Match mentors and new teachers based on geographic proximity and same grade/level and/or subject area.
- Provide training and support.
- Develop supporting policies and procedures (e.g., stipends for mentors and joint release time for mentors and mentees).
- Conduct ongoing program evaluation.

### **DATA COLLECTION**

During November 2006, Project Forum conducted a mini-survey of all 50 states to identify which ones offer a mentoring program for new special education teachers. Thirty-eight states responded to the survey, and of these, 16 reported that they do have some type of state-level special education mentoring program—although not necessarily statewide. Six of these states—*Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Oklahoma* and *Washington*—were randomly selected for follow-up interviews and, in collaboration with staff from the Personnel Center and the

Center for Teacher Quality, Project Forum developed an interview protocol. Interviews were conducted during December 2006 and January 2007, in most cases with state education agency (SEA) representatives.<sup>2</sup> They were transcribed and analyzed using Atlas.ti, a software program designed to aid in the analysis of qualitative data. Findings are reported in the following section and an overview of program characteristics is provided in the Appendix.

## FINDINGS

### Implementation History

#### *Background and Related Legislation*

All six of the states interviewed described special education mentoring programs first implemented within the past six years: *Florida's* program (known as Mentor-Link)<sup>3</sup> was first implemented in 2001; *Hawaii's* in 2002; *Arkansas'* (known as Pathwise) and *Washington's* in 2004; *Massachusetts'* in 2005; and *Oklahoma's* in 2006. Interviewees from *Hawaii* and *Oklahoma* noted that their states had sponsored special education mentoring programs in the past—with *Hawaii's* available as far back as the 1980s—but that funding for these earlier programs had been terminated.

The primary reason interviewees cited for implementing a special education mentoring program was the difficulty recruiting and retaining special education teachers. Several also noted that programs had been developed as “extensions” of state-wide mentoring programs for all new teachers in response to the need for more specialized mentoring services for special educators. The interviewees from *Hawaii* noted that a lawsuit related to the state’s lack of certified special education teachers also served as a motivating factor.

The interviewees from *Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Massachusetts* and *Washington* all described state legislation supporting mentoring programs for *all* new teachers in the state, both general and special educators. The interviewee from *Oklahoma* described statewide mentoring for all new teachers, but reported that there is no state legislation specifically tied to this program. Legislation authorizing statewide mentorship programs was passed as long ago as 1987 in *Washington* and as recently as 2006 in *Hawaii*. The extent of legislative support also varies. For

---

<sup>2</sup> Project Forum gratefully acknowledges the following persons for participating in interviews and reviewing an earlier version of this document: Cindy O’Riley, Personnel Development Coordinator, Arkansas Department of Education; Susan Branon, Administrator, State Program Development, Arkansas Department of Education; Kathryn Krudwig, Regional Coordinator for the North Florida Professional Development Partnership, University of North Florida; Amy Shimamoto, Personnel Specialist, Office of Human Resources, Personnel Development Branch, Hawaii Department of Education; Colleen Robinson, State Office Teacher, Office of Human Resources, Personnel Development Branch, Hawaii Department of Education; Madeline Levine, Assistant Director, Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office, Massachusetts Department of Education; Kim Nickerson, SPDG Coordinator, Oklahoma State Department of Education; and Sue Anderson, Teacher Assistance Program Coordinator, Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.

<sup>3</sup> *Florida* funds a variety of special education mentoring programs, but Mentor-Link is currently the most widely used by local education agencies (LEAs).

instance, *Hawaii's* legislation includes no funding or program guidelines, whereas legislation in *Arkansas*, *Massachusetts* and *Washington* includes funding for mentoring programs as well as training for mentors; directives regarding the structure and content of local education agency (LEA)-level mentoring programs; and/or requirements for the designation of LEA-level mentoring program directors.

### *Stakeholder Involvement and Technical Support*

Most interviewees described a variety of stakeholders involved in the development and/or oversight of the implementation of their states' special education mentoring programs, e.g., SEA representatives (including the departments of special education, licensing, and professional development), special education teachers, representatives from institutions of higher education (IHEs) and principals. *Arkansas's* mentoring program was originally developed by a subgroup of its recruitment and retention taskforce. *Florida's* program receives input from its quarterly regional council meetings, originally established through the state's Comprehensive System of Professional Development. *Massachusetts's* program receives input from its Comprehensive System of Professional Development (CSPD) advisory committee and *Oklahoma's* input comes from its State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)<sup>4</sup> advisory group. *Washington's* program receives input from the Washington Education Association (an affiliate of the National Education Association [NEA]) and *Hawaii's* program receives input from representatives of the SEA and the University of Hawaii (which operates the program).

Interviewees from three states reported having accessed technical support from resources such as the Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC) (*Arkansas*), the Personnel Center (*Massachusetts*), and the Center for Teacher Quality (*Oklahoma*). The other three states reported that their programs had been developed "independently."

### *Number of Teachers Receiving Mentoring*

The total number of new special education teachers receiving mentoring services varies from state to state. Significantly, the interviewees from *Arkansas*, *Florida* and *Hawaii* distinguished between the number of new special education teachers receiving mentoring services as part of a state-wide mentoring program for *all* new teachers (both general education and special education teachers) and the number of new special education teachers receiving mentoring as part of a program specifically targeting special education teachers. In these cases, the statewide program serves an estimated 90% to 100% of new special education teachers, whereas the state's targeted special education monitoring program serves only a small fraction of the overall total.

Interviewees reported the following number of teachers served annually by mentoring programs:

---

<sup>4</sup> State Improvement Grants were renamed State Professional Development Grants in 2003. The funds come from IDEA Part D.

- *Arkansas's* special education mentoring program serves 50 new special education teachers from high need districts;
- *Hawaii's* program currently serves 48 University of *Hawaii* teacher licensure candidates;
- *Florida's* Mentor-Link program serves an average of 50 special and general education teachers over the past five years, with 56 currently enrolled; and
- *Oklahoma's* program serves approximately 25 new special education teachers (but provides mentoring services for a total of three years per participant).

Because *Massachusetts's* program is in its first year and LEA-level reports have not yet been filed, the interviewee was unsure how many new special education teachers are currently receiving mentoring services. *Washington's* program does not keep count of how many special education teachers are indirectly served by its program.

### Program Features

Mentoring programs differ considerably in terms of overall approach. The following list briefly summarizes the varied structures of the six mentoring programs included in this analysis:

- *Arkansas's* and *Hawaii's* programs are extensions of statewide mentoring programs for *all* new teachers and provide additional mentor training and support services each year to a small cohort of new special education teachers.
- *Oklahoma* sponsors an annual academy for new special education teachers. A small group of these new teachers is then selected randomly each year to receive mentoring services for a three-year period.
- *Massachusetts* supports, via grant awards and technical assistance, LEA-level special education mentoring programs throughout the state. Although the SEA has developed a number of guidelines, the extent and type of mentoring services provided to new special education teachers varies from LEA to LEA.
- *Florida* also supports, via grant awards, a number of LEA-level special education mentoring programs throughout the state. One of the most promising models uses “mentoring pods”—building-based groups of veteran and new special education teachers and related services personnel in addition to general education teachers serving students with disabilities across a variety of settings.
- *Washington's* program provides mentor training, but does not deliver specific mentoring services. The state holds an annual academy for *all* mentors throughout the state (both general and special education) and has offered several optional training sessions specifically targeting special education mentors.

The following subsections describe in greater detail the various components of these six state-sponsored special education mentoring programs.

### *Mentoring Services*

Mentoring services received by new special education teachers participating in state-sponsored programs most commonly include a minimum number of contact hours between mentors and mentees. For example, *Oklahoma* requires a minimum of six contacts per month (two of which must be face-to-face); *Hawaii* requires a minimum of one hour of face-to-face time per week between mentors and mentees and *Arkansas's* state-wide program (known as Pathwise) requires two hours each week, in addition to two hours per month as a part of the state's special education mentoring program (although interviewees report that special education mentors often provide as many as 20-25 hours of support each month). *Massachusetts* allows individual LEAs to develop their own special education mentoring programs. However, *Massachusetts* is currently in the process of setting some basic requirements, including contact hours, that participating LEAs will be expected to meet.

*Florida* is unique in providing a group-based model—i.e., mentoring pods. These building-based pods are made up of between four and nine teachers who come together on a weekly basis to familiarize themselves with their school's unique "culture," develop problem-solving skills, and combat the isolation that is frequently cited by new teachers as a reason for leaving the field. Participating teachers can remain in the pod for as many years as they choose. Eschewing a top-down model, pod mentors guide the group's pursuit of resources to increase student-centered teaching skills. The state is now in the process of "scaling up" the use of mentoring pods throughout the state.

*Arkansas, Florida* and *Oklahoma* also require that mentors keep mentoring logs where they record information about the length and frequency of time spent with mentees, as well as the types of activities in which they engage (e.g., observation and/or discussion of topics such as participating in and leading the IEP process, discipline, behavior and classroom management, compliance with IDEA, parent communication, consultation and collaboration, and data reporting).

### *Mentor Eligibility Criteria*

Special education mentors are most commonly required to submit a formal application, hold a teaching license, have completed a minimum number of years teaching special education, have completed one or more training modules pertaining specifically to mentoring new special education teachers, be working within the same school as the mentee, and/or be recommended by a local principal or special education supervisor. Several interviewees noted that individuals are ineligible to serve as mentors if they are also required, as part of their jobs, to evaluate the performance of mentees. The interviewee from *Florida* described the mentor selection process as "very labor intensive," but added that, by taking the time to select "expert, experienced, passionate special education teachers," the quality of mentorship is enhanced and less time and resources are required for training mentors. Eligibility criteria for special education mentors in *Massachusetts* are determined LEA by LEA.



### *Matching Mentors and Mentees*

*Arkansas* and *Oklahoma* make one-to-one matches between mentors and mentees, whereas mentors in *Hawaii* each receive a full-time salary in exchange for providing individualized mentoring services to an entire cohort of mentees. In *Florida*, one or two mentors assume responsibility for facilitating each mentoring pod.

The mentoring programs in *Arkansas*, *Florida*, *Hawaii* and *Oklahoma* all match veteran special education teachers with new special education teachers, and in *Florida*, mentors and mentees are also matched by school building. In *Massachusetts*, criteria for matching of mentors and mentees are up to each LEA.

Several interviewees mentioned that, for their statewide mentoring programs for *all* teachers, it is not always possible to match new special education teachers with veteran special education teachers—resulting in occasional matches between new special education teachers and mentors who are general education teachers or related services professionals (e.g., speech language pathologists, physical therapists and occupational therapists). To prevent these types of matches, the director of *Arkansas's* special education mentoring program works with many local-level mentoring project directors throughout the state and encourages them to adopt the program's training and service requirements for special education mentors. As a result of these efforts, new special education teachers throughout the state will continue to receive some degree of specialized mentoring even after funding for the state's special education mentoring program comes to an end.

### *Related Training*

*Arkansas*, *Hawaii* and *Oklahoma* described mandatory training for mentors and/or mentees participating in special education mentoring programs and *Washington* described voluntary training opportunities for special education mentors. *Massachusetts* noted that training requirements for mentors were determined at the LEA level, although the original request for proposals (RFP) stipulated that all LEA-level programs must include training of mentors in areas such as peer coaching. *Florida's* program does not include a training component, although recruitment of pod mentors is based on demonstrated mentoring experience and expertise. The Mentor-Link director facilitates an annual session for mentors to evaluate and refine the model. In addition, mentors receive written materials to support their mentoring efforts. The following are examples of states' training requirements:

- *Hawaii*—Mentors received 12 days of training during the initial year of the University of Hawaii special education mentoring program, another 12 days of training during the second year, and three days during the third year. Mentors are also expected to meet together on a monthly basis in order to nurture a sense of community and collegial support.

- *Arkansas*—In addition to the basic three-day Pathwise Mentor Training required of all mentors in the state, special education mentors receive an extra half day training specifically tailored to address the needs of new special education teachers. Special education mentors are also required to take part in four web-based trainings each year as well as a spring “rejuvenation” retreat designed for both mentors and mentees.
- *Oklahoma*—Mentors are required to participate in one half-day training each year, as well as accompanying their mentees to several statewide academies held each year for new special education teachers.
- *Washington*—The state sponsors a mentor training academy, and for the last few years has offered a special half-day pre-academy session specifically for veteran teachers who will be mentoring new special education teachers. Last year this session was offered at an alternate venue, but was not well attended. The state will possibly reintroduce the pre-academy session this year in order to attract a larger audience. However, because the session is optional, there is no way of guaranteeing that special education mentors take advantage of this training opportunity.

As far as training of mentees, *Hawaii* requires all mentees to attend weekly seminars with their mentors that address topics such as developing lesson plans, adapting curriculum and conducting assessments; and *Oklahoma* requires all new special education teachers (whether they have a mentor or not) to participate in five special education teacher academies as a prerequisite to participating in its mentoring program.

### *Program Supports*

Interviewees from *Arkansas*, *Florida* and *Oklahoma* reported that mentors receive stipends for their services. In *Arkansas*, mentors receive \$1,200 for their first year of mentoring via the statewide Pathwise program and an additional \$1,200 for the second year via the state’s special education mentoring program. The mentees receive \$800 to use for professional development activities. In *Florida’s* program, pod mentors accrue a \$100 honorarium per month, for a total of \$1,000 at the end of the 10-month academic year. Mentors participating in *Oklahoma’s* special education mentoring program receive \$500 stipends annually. Because they receive full-time mentoring salaries, mentors participating in *Hawaii’s* mentoring program do not receive stipends. *Massachusetts* permits LEAs to use their grant awards to pay for mentor stipends, but whether or not LEAs choose to do this, and the amount LEAs choose to spend, is up to each LEA.

Other types of program supports include the following:

- *Florida*—The director of the special education mentoring program provides technical assistance on an as-needed basis to each of the mentoring pods and some participating schools have built in release time for mentoring pods to meet. The project director also supports pods by providing monthly packets of research-based strategy books to mentors



and mentees. Participating teachers can also accrue recertification points through their work in the pods. In order to reach rural special education teachers, a new web-based pod is about to be launched that will include a cadre of 14 mentors and approximately 40 new special education teachers from around the state.

- *Oklahoma*—The special education mentoring program provides funds for educational materials (e.g., books on co-teaching, inclusion and providing access to core curriculum), as well as sponsoring an online “chat room” and message board for mentors and mentees. Mentees also receive support in developing personal professional development plans and receive a small stipend for participating.
- *Massachusetts*—In addition to stipends, individual LEAs are permitted to use their special education mentoring grant funds for tuition costs for IHE courses, conference registration fees, supplies, and books for training materials. Furthermore, the SEA has provided technical assistance to approximately 300 LEAs in developing their grant proposals for local special education mentoring programs.

Although its special education mentoring program does not pay for release time, transportation costs or materials, the interviewee from *Arkansas* noted that the statewide Pathwise program provides \$800 annually to each mentor/mentee pair to be used for any of these purposes.

#### *Fiscal and Human Resources*

Interviewees reported receiving funding for their special education mentoring programs from a variety of sources. *Arkansas*' funding comes from its State Improvement Grant (SIG) and Florida is scaling up Mentor-Link with a new, five-year SPDG. *Oklahoma*'s program is funded via the SPDG and IDEA discretionary dollars. *Hawaii*'s program is funded via the SEA and the University of *Hawaii* (which share a memorandum of agreement). *Massachusetts* sets aside a portion of IDEA discretionary money each year for LEAs to use towards induction/mentoring activities relating to the education of students with disabilities. *Washington*'s pre-academy sessions have received some funding from the Washington Education Association, but are primarily financed by the state legislature.

*Florida* also dedicates 0.5 full-time equivalency (FTE) to staffing its special education mentoring project; *Arkansas* dedicates a minimum of 0.3 FTE; and *Oklahoma* dedicates approximately 0.1 FTE. The other interviewees agreed it would not be possible to determine how much staff time is dedicated specifically to their states' special education mentoring programs.

#### *Program Administration*

Four of the six programs are administered by the state's departments of special education: *Arkansas*' program is administered by the Professional Development Coordinator (part of the SIG); *Oklahoma*'s is administered by the SPDG coordinator; *Florida*'s by the North *Florida* Professional Development Partnership (a subsidiary of the SEA's Bureau of Exceptional

Education and Student Services); and *Massachusetts*' is administered by the Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office. *Hawaii*'s program is administered by the SEA (it is considered a general rather than special education initiative), as well as the University of Hawaii; and *Washington*'s is administered by the coordinator of the SEA's Teacher Assistance Program (TAP).

### *Program Evaluation*

All five of the states that offer some type of special education mentoring services described efforts to evaluate these services. For example:

- *Arkansas*' evaluation procedures include a baseline survey of mentors and mentees at the beginning of each year, a second survey at the spring retreat and a follow-up survey at the beginning of the next academic year in order to ascertain whether former mentees are still teaching in special education classrooms.
- *Hawaii* conducts an annual satisfaction survey of mentors, mentees and school administrators participating in the University of Hawaii special education mentoring program.
- *Oklahoma*'s program, which started in Fall 2006, will conduct pre- and post-program assessments of participants in its special education mentoring program. The external evaluator has been involved in the program since its inception.
- *Florida*'s mentoring pods were first implemented as part of a pilot project for new special education teachers. Feedback from participants resulted in the expansion of the pods to include general educators and related services personnel in inclusive classrooms. To assess program effectiveness, two types of evaluations are conducted annually. First, mentors and mentees complete an anonymous, written survey. Second, both groups are invited to participate in a focus group to gather feedback on how effectively their mentoring pods met their needs.
- *Massachusetts* will be requiring LEAS to report back to the SEA on the outcomes of their local special education mentoring programs. Reports will include information on the number of new teachers served and what types of mentoring services were offered. LEA-level special education administrators will be responsible for filing the reports.

### **Outcomes**

Total numbers of mentees served so far by the six states' special education mentoring programs include 250 in *Florida* (Mentor-Link "mentoring pods" program only), 128 in *Arkansas*, 81 in *Hawaii* and 25 in *Oklahoma*. As far as mentors participating in the states' special education mentoring programs (receiving mentor training and/or serving as mentors), there have been approximately 100 in *Arkansas*, 100 in *Washington*, 50 in *Florida*, 25 in *Oklahoma* and six in

*Hawaii*. *Massachusetts* will not know the total number of mentees served or mentors participating until the first round of LEA reports due in spring 2007.

Interviewees from *Arkansas* and *Florida* reported gathering retention data for program participants who remain in special education classrooms. *Arkansas*' and *Florida*'s programs have retention rates of 78% and 83% respectively.<sup>5</sup> *Florida*'s rate compares with approximate retention rates of 57% statewide. None of the states interviewed described efforts to link their special education mentoring programs to improved student outcomes.

Findings suggest that there is clearly a demand for high quality special education mentoring programs. According to one interviewee, feedback from program participants has been "overwhelmingly positive." Another interviewee claimed that her state's mentoring program had helped form a culture of mentorship and "improved collegiality" within individual school buildings such that new teachers are automatically "taken care of." Several interviewees noted that, although their programs specified a minimum number of contact hours between mentors and mentees, many pairs were spending more time together than required. In the words of one interviewee, "They build relationships between themselves that are phenomenal." Also, mentoring programs that offer some type of mentor training (i.e., *Arkansas* and *Oklahoma*) have found that special education mentors from around the state, even those who are not formally participating in the special education mentoring program (and receiving stipends), are requesting permission to participate in the trainings. Interviewees also stressed that it is much more cost-effective to retain teachers via mentoring programs than to recruit and hire new teachers.

Barriers to the successful implementation of mentoring programs mentioned by one or more interviewees include the following:

- securing LEA- and building-level administrative support for special education mentoring programs (e.g., provision of release time);
- finding special education mentors within the same building;
- identifying appropriate mentors for special educators in small or remote LEAs; and
- tracking retention rates for program participants beyond their first year of teaching.

Interviewees from several states described efforts to scale up their special education mentoring programs. For example, *Florida* plans to start using mentoring pods throughout the state's 67 counties over the next three-to-five years (originally, the program was operating in only nine counties). These efforts will require state-level support, as well as extensive collaboration among counties. *Arkansas*, which depends on SIG funding, has worked to ensure that the specially tailored Pathwise training modules for special education mentors will be used routinely as part of the statewide mentoring program for *all* new teachers once the SIG money is spent. *Washington* is in the process of requesting increased funding for its statewide mentoring program for *all* new teachers, and plans to use some of this money for enhanced training of special education mentors. *Oklahoma* would also like to scale up, but at this point, plans remain tentative.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Arkansas*' retention rates are based on retention of 2004-2005 program participants only.

Some states are also making efforts to share successful special education mentoring models via presentations at national and/or regional conferences. For example, the interviewee from *Florida* has presented her work with the mentoring pods at the national OSEP conference and a number of other venues throughout the nation. *Massachusetts* is planning to invite LEAs with promising special education mentoring programs to present at a series of conferences on induction and mentoring held at different locations throughout the state.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Special education mentoring programs appear to offer one possible solution to the growing problem of special education teacher shortages. The six states interviewed described a variety of models for supporting special education mentoring programs, including training of mentors, orientation of mentees, one-on-one mentoring services, mentoring pods and/or web-based “chat rooms” for mentors and mentees. Collection of retention data remains a challenge for most programs, as does securing ongoing funding. Also, none of the programs included in this study is currently able to serve more than a small percentage of new special education teachers within the state each year. Based on existing research, as well as anecdotal report, states should seriously consider supporting efforts to implement statewide programs for new special education teachers.

This report was supported by the U.S. Department of Education (Cooperative Agreement No. H326F050001). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the U.S. Department of Education and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

*Note: There are no copyright restrictions on this document; however, please credit the source and support of federal funds when copying all or part of this material.*



This document, along with many other Forum publications, can be downloaded from the Project Forum at NASDSE:

<http://www.projectforum.org>

To order a hard copy of this document or any other Forum publications, please contact Nancy Tucker at NASDSE, 1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320, Alexandria, VA 22314  
Ph: 703-519-3800 ext. 326 or Email: [nancy.tucker@nasde.org](mailto:nancy.tucker@nasde.org)

## REFERENCES

- Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education. (February 2004). *An insufficient supply and a growing demand for qualified special education personnel: What state policymakers should know*. Gainesville, FL: Author. Retrieved January 26, 2007 from <http://www.coe.ufl.edu/copsse/research-focus-areas/supply-demand.php>
- Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education. (February 2005). *Growing and improving the special education teacher workforce: A focus on beginning teachers can help*. Gainesville, FL: Author. Retrieved January 26, 2007 from <http://www.coe.ufl.edu/copsse/research-focus-areas/supply-demand.php>
- Council for Exceptional Children. (2001). *Bright futures for exceptional learners*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Ingersoll, R., & Kralik, J.M. (2004). *The impact of mentoring on teacher retention: What the research says*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved January 12, 2007 from [www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/50/36/5036.htm](http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/50/36/5036.htm)
- 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.
- Strong, M., (January 2006). *Does new teacher support affect student achievement?* Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center, U.C. Santa Cruz. Retrieved January 12, 2007 from [www.newteachercenter.org](http://www.newteachercenter.org)
- Villani, S. (2004). Building a framework: Induction and mentoring programs that work. In *Keeping quality teachers: The art of retaining general and special education teachers*, (pp. 4.1-4.47). New York, NY: New York State Education Department.
- Whitaker, S.D. (2000). What do first-year special education teachers need? *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33(1), 28-36.
- White, M., & Mason, C. 2001. *New teacher supports*. *Teaching Exceptional Children* 33(3), 91.

**Appendix—Matrix Showing Characteristics of States’ Mentoring Programs**

<b>State</b>	<b>Date Program First Implemented</b>	<b>Approximate # of Teachers Receiving Mentoring Each Year</b>	<b>Program Funding Source</b>	<b>Stakeholder Involvement</b>	<b>Mentor Eligibility Requirements</b>	<b>Mentors and Mentees Matched by Location &amp; Subject</b>	<b>Mentor Training Provided</b>	<b>Mentor Supports Provided</b>	<b>Program Evaluated Regularly</b>
<i>Arkansas</i>	2004	50	SIG	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Florida</i>	2001	50	SPDG	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Hawaii</i>	2002	48	SEA/IHE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Massachusetts</i>	2005	Data not yet available	IDEA Discretionary	Yes	Determined at LEA level	Determined at LEA level	Determined at LEA level	Determined at LEA level	Yes
<i>Oklahoma</i>	2006	25	SPDG/IDEA Discretionary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Washington</i>	2004	N/A	WEA/State Legislature	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A