



**Report on the  
Schools Mentoring  
Schools Regional  
Sites Program for  
2006-07**

**January 2008**

**Report  
To the  
Legislature**

**As required by  
Minn. Stat. §  
122A.628**

**COMMISSIONER:**  
**Alica Seagren**

**Schools  
Mentoring  
Schools  
Regional Sites  
Program**

**Assistant Commissioner:**  
**Christy Hovanetz-Lassila**  
**Office of School Improvement and Accountability**

**January 2008**

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:**

**Patricia K. King**  
**Minnesota Department of Education**  
**T: (651) 582-8655**  
**E-MAIL: [patricia.k.king@state.mn.us](mailto:patricia.k.king@state.mn.us)**

**Report  
to the  
Legislature**

**Deborah Luedtke, Teacher Quality Supervisor**  
**Minnesota Department of Education**  
**T: (651) 582-8440**  
**FAX: (651) 582-8517**  
**E-MAIL: [deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us](mailto:deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us)**

**Minnesota Department of Education**  
**1500 Highway 36 West**  
**Roseville, MN 55113-4266**  
**TTY: (800) 627-3529 OR (651) 582-8201**

**As required by  
Minnesota  
Statute §  
122A.628**

Upon request, this report can be made available in alternative formats.

**FY 2008 LEGISLATIVE REPORT  
ON  
Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Program**

**Estimated Cost of Preparing This Report**

This report provides information that is maintained and published by the Department of Education as a part of its normal business functions. Therefore, the cost information reported below does not include the cost of gathering the data but rather is limited to the estimated cost of actually analyzing the data, determining recommendations and preparing this report document.

Special funding was not appropriated for the costs of preparing this report.

The estimated cost incurred by the Minnesota Department of Education in preparing this report is \$1925.

**Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Program**

This 2008 Legislative Report has been prepared as required by Minnesota Statutes, 122A.628, subdivision 1 that directs the commissioner to select and grant funding for up to four school districts, or partnerships of school districts, for the purpose of assisting other school districts in the region with the development of thorough and effective teacher mentoring programs by offering coaching/mentoring training, in-class observation training, and train-the-trainer opportunities. This report describes the process the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) has established to carry forward the identification of Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites and provide \$50,000 for this program.

Table of Contents

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Executive Summary  | Page 3  |
| Part I: Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Report              | Page 4  |
| Part II: Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Site Activities 2005-06  | Page 5  |
| Part III: Schools Mentoring Schools Survey Results                   | Page 7  |
| Part IV: Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Expenditure Report | Page 14 |

Appendices

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| A. Application for 2005-07 Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Site                 | Page 16 |
| B. Review Process for 2005-07 Schools Mentoring Schools Program Grant Applications | Page 23 |
| C. Schools Mentoring Schools Sites – Report 1 Form                                 | Page 27 |
| D. Schools Mentoring Schools Sites – Report 2 Form                                 | Page 32 |
| E. Schools Mentoring Schools Survey  | Page 37 |
| F. Minnesota Statutes  | Page 41 |

(MDE Website maintains electronic version of full report)



**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Program**  
**2008 Legislative Report**

“A comprehensive induction program is one of the most effective methods for retaining quality teachers. While mentoring is often equated with induction, it is actually only one piece of a comprehensive induction program, which provides an extensive framework of support and guidance for new teachers. A growing body of research demonstrates that comprehensive induction can cut attrition rates by 50 percent. Well-crafted induction programs can improve teaching quality, stem high rates of teacher attrition and, in doing so, decrease the overall costs of teacher recruitment and retention” (The Southeast Center for Teacher Quality). Minnesota’s establishment of Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Program has been an initiative to provide assistance to schools in developing comprehensive induction programs for new teachers that promote collaboration with colleagues and a shared commitment for novice teachers to become highly effective teachers.

MDE provided \$50,000 for the fiscal years 2005-07 available for up to four school districts or partnerships of schools to be designated as Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites. In October 2005, four applications to become regional sites were received (see Appendix A for application packet). In November 2005, a MDE-directed review panel using application scoring guidelines awarded grants to one school district and two school district partnerships (see Appendix B for scoring criteria).

The 2006-07 Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Program Report to the Legislature provides information regarding the implementation during year two of the grant. The regional sites provided assistance to other school districts in their geographic area in developing effective teacher mentoring/induction programs. Each site reported activities using the annual report form (Appendix C and D).

MDE funds were provided for approved activities for FY 2006 and FY 2007. Once the activities were completed, MDE designed and distributed a survey to training participants to monitor the effects of the Schools Mentoring Schools grant program, (Appendix E). The results of that survey have been analyzed and summarized and included in this report.

**PART I**  
**Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Program**

Directed by Minnesota Statute 122A.628, MDE established an application and review process to award up to four Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites Program grants. The funded sites implemented a program to provide assistance to nearby school districts in developing their own effective system of support for new teachers. The regional sites offered: (1) coaching/mentor training, (2) in-class observation, and (3) train-the-trainer opportunities.

A memorandum announcing the grant program was sent out via a superintendent mailing to school administrators and staff development specialists from Deborah Luedtke, Schools Mentoring Schools Grant Coordinator at MDE. The application was included with the memorandum (Appendix A).

The review process was conducted by a panel of education specialists from the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE). Each reviewer independently examined and scored each application using scoring criteria (Appendix B) that identified the required program components including:

- Signature page with signature of the superintendent
- Regional Site Information including grant contact name and position
- Grant Proposal including timelines, activities and process for evaluating the grant's impact on the development of mentorship programs of participating districts/schools
- Proposed Budget for the Grant Form

Three applicants were selected (considering factors including geographic balance) as Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites: Brainerd School District, Lakes Country Service Cooperative and Minnesota State University–Mankato. As required in the legislation, one of the regional site grants was to be awarded Brainerd Public Schools. The review panel did not approve a fourth application due to an absence of required components.

- A total of \$50,000 was available for two years (December 1, 2005-June 30, 2007). Brainerd School District and Minnesota State University – Mankato each were awarded \$18,000. Lakes Country Service Cooperative was awarded \$13,000. Any balance left after FY 2006 was available for use in the FY 2007.
- These sites provided mentoring assistance and service to participating districts.

Each grantee implemented action plans and provided reports (Appendix C and D). Year-one grant reports provided evidence of grant activities completed and, if necessary, revisions to their 2006-07 action plan and budget. Year-two grant reports documented grant results and final expenditures.

## **Part II**

### **Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Program Activities**

MDE established a process and timeline for identifying sites as Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites. Information inviting districts or partnerships of schools to apply to become Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites was distributed on September 22, 2005 (Appendix A). Grant applications were received by MDE on October 26, 2005, and reviewed by a panel of education specialists on November 14, 2005 (Appendix B). The commissioner of education reviewed recommendations of the panel and selected three sites as Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites: Brainerd School District, Lakes Country Service Cooperative and Minnesota State University – Mankato. On November 29, 2006, three grantees were notified as being Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites with grant work to begin December 2005 and continue through June 2007.

The amount awarded was a two-year grant. (Brainerd School District and Minnesota State University–Mankato each were awarded \$18,000. Lakes Country Service Cooperative was awarded \$13,000.) The three Schools Mentoring School Regional Sites provided assistance to participating districts in their geographic area. Regional sites provided grant-funded activities unique to the structures of their programs aligned with grant action plans. Planning and implementation activity program reports were required for events held during both FY 2006 and FY 2007. All sites reported providing the option of train-the-trainer sessions to build leadership and training capacity of the local school district (Appendix C and D).

#### **Brainerd School District**

**Year 1:** Brainerd School District invited districts in their geographic area to participate in Brainerd’s Beginning Teacher Support System activities. Neighboring districts accepted invitations for training in instructional mentoring, mentoring/coaching for the special education teacher and cognitive coaching skills. Four (4) districts participated in training for an instructional and special education mentor. Nine (9) districts participated in Cognitive Coaching Training, a foundational mentor training component. The report evidenced that follow-up activities were made available to participants.

**Year 2:** Brainerd School District offered Pathwise Assessor training as well as a Train the Trainer workshop during the summer of 2006, and several districts participated. This would allow the participants to be prepared with the skills to observe colleagues and offer feedback. Other districts sent individuals with experience in observation to receive Cognitive Coaching training. Throughout the 2006-07 school year, several trainings were offered. This included refresher courses for Pathwise and Cognitive Coaching, Mentor for Special Education training, and several New Teacher Seminars.

#### **Minnesota State University-Mankato**

**Year 1:** Minnesota State University-Mankato developed a mentor network advisory committee to support implementation of teacher induction programs within each of their partner districts. Representatives from the nine (9) partnering school districts formed an advisory committee to provide input into network meetings and training sessions. The network met regularly and hosted two training sessions for the partnering districts: Foundations in Mentoring and Meeting the

Needs of New Teachers: Orientation and Ongoing Professional Development. A strength of this program is the ongoing evaluation of program activities and the effect on follow-up, determining future plans, and network sponsored activities.

**Year 2:** Minnesota State University-Mankato offered three different trainings/activities more than once during the 2006-07 school year. The Framework Observation Program Training provided observation techniques and post-observation strategies. Advisory Committee Meetings provided support to program advisors from each district for implementation. In addition, Mentor Network Events offered a variety of face-to-face trainings relating to induction of new teachers.

### **Lakes Country Service Cooperative**

**Year 1:** Lakes Country Service Cooperative instituted a teacher induction consortium in west central Minnesota. District representatives to the consortium assisted one another in establishing district-centered mentoring programs with selected activities provided regionally. Based on the needs of the consortium, training was developed and implemented in the areas of teacher evaluation and instructional coaching. Thirteen (13) schools from five (5) school districts attended the two-day training. Follow-up activities are delivered through the Lake Country Service Cooperative's teacher induction consortium.

**Year 2:** Lakes Country Service Cooperative helped many districts to design their own mentoring programs. They started the 2006-07 implementation year with offering necessary support with a two-day Introduction to Mentoring training and provided a follow-up planning day for those looking to design or refine their new program. During the school year, workshop topics included understanding the Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers and going more in-depth into the role of the mentor.



### **Part III: Schools Mentoring Schools Survey Results**

All three Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites (Brainerd School District, Minnesota State University–Mankato and Lakes Country Service Cooperative) implemented a program to provide assistance to nearby school districts in developing their own effective system of support for new teachers. The regional sites offered: (1) coaching/mentor training, (2) in-class observation, and (3) train-the-trainer opportunities.

In an effort to monitor the effects of the Schools Mentoring Schools grant program, MDE designed and distributed a survey to training participants (Appendix E). The results of that survey have been analyzed and summarized.

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

##### **A. Purpose**

The main purpose of the Schools Mentoring Schools (SMS) Survey was to identify school/district efforts to build exemplary teacher induction/mentorship programs within several components: (1) topics in SMS trainings; (2) topics in your school/district new teacher program; (3) building a new teacher program in our school/district; (4) coaching effectiveness; (5) mentoring; and (6) observation.

##### **B. Methods**

*Participants.* Each regional site identified SMS training participants that included principals, directors, mentor coordinators, and teachers. The number of SMS training participants was 41, and the total number of surveys completed was 33 (80% complete rate). Respondents reported that the average number of years in their present position is 5.47 with a standard deviation of 6.19.

*Schools Mentoring Schools Survey.* The survey consisted of 63 items and was generated by the efforts of project staff at the School Improvement Division of the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE). A set of questions were identified using the literature referenced at the end of this document (i.e., Costa & Garmston, 2002; Guskey, 2000).

The SMS training participants were asked to respond to the SMS survey, which included five sets of questions. The first set of survey questions asked demographic information. A second set of questions asked about mentee groups that each school/district focused on for the new teacher program. A third set of questions included different topics that were delivered in overall SMS training sessions. A fourth set of questions asked the level of focus on the different topics by the school/district. Finally, a set of questions were developed to rate a school's level of progress toward implementing topics and elements during 2006-07.

These questions asked people to indicate their school/district's level of progress using three sets of Likert scales. The first set of categories had three points: Major Focus, Minor Focus, and Not a Focus. A second set of categories had four points: Full Implementation, Early Implementation,

Planning, and Not Applicable. A third set of categories had five points: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Not Applicable.

In addition to Likert scale questions, three open-ended questions at the end of the survey asked to report on the issues and concerns that the school has faced.

*Procedure.* The cover letter including the online survey link was sent to 41 SMS training participants in Minnesota. The cover letter stated the purpose of the project, requested SMS training participants assistance, assured the confidentiality of their responses, and provided instructions for the completion of the survey. The individuals were given a two-week time period to complete the survey. Two reminders were sent one week after the initial mailing.

*Analysis.* Statistical analysis using percents, means, and standard deviations was conducted using SPSS 14.0 for Windows.

## II. FINDINGS

### A. Participants

**Table 1**  
**Number and percentage distribution of respondents**

| Position              | Number (N=33) | %    |
|-----------------------|---------------|------|
| Teacher               | 13            | 39.4 |
| Mentor Coordinator    | 8             | 24.2 |
| Director              | 4             | 12.1 |
| Principal             | 4             | 12.1 |
| Dean                  | 1             | 3    |
| Curriculum Specialist | 1             | 3    |
| Speech Pathologist    | 1             | 3    |
| Professor             | 1             | 3    |

Table 1 indicates the number of respondents in different positions. Among them, the groups that comprise the majority of individuals that completed the survey are the teacher (39.4%), mentor coordinator (24.2%), and director (12.1%). Of the total, 51.5% of respondents participated SMS training sessions at Mankato, while 30.3% and 18.2% of them participated at Brainerd and Lake Country respectively.

**Table 2**  
**Average length of school/district experience in present position**

|                                      | Minimum | Maximum  | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------------|---------|----------|------|----------------|
| Years and Months in present position | 1 year  | 31 years | 5.47 | 6.19           |

The total number of surveys completed was 33 (80.5% completion rate). Respondents reported that an average year in their present position was 5.47 with a standard deviation of 6.19 (see Table 2).

## B. Mentees

**Table 3**  
**Percentage distribution of the level of focus on different teacher groups**

|  | Not a Focus | Minor Focus | Major Focus |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Novice Teachers (less than 1 year)           | 3.0         | 9.1         | 84.8        |
| Novice Teachers (1-3 years)                  | 3.0         | 42.4        | 51.5        |
| New teachers to the school (1-3 year)        | 18.2        | 39.4        | 39.4        |
| New teachers to the school (4 or more years) | 33.3        | 48.5        | 15.2        |

As seen in Table 3, the majority of SMS training participants (84.8%) reported that during the school/district new teacher program, his/her school/district put major focus on the novice teacher (less than 1 year experience in the field), while only a few of them (15.2%) indicated major focus on new teacher to the school (4 or more years experience elsewhere).

## C. Topics in Schools Mentoring Schools Trainings

**Table 4**  
**Percentage distribution of the level of focus**

|  | Not a Focus | Minor Focus | Major Focus |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Coaching skills  | 3.0         | 36.4        | 51.5        |
| Formative assessment (Needs Assessment) for new teachers | 12.1        | 36.4        | 42.4        |
| Mentor reflection  | 6.1         | 42.4        | 42.4        |
| Mentoring skills, tools and strategies                   | 3.0         | 15.2        | 72.7        |
| Orientation for new teachers                             | 6.1         | 24.2        | 60.6        |
| Professional growth plan for new teachers                | 6.1         | 48.5        | 36.4        |
| Professional teaching standards                          | 12.1        | 33.3        | 45.5        |
| Teacher observation                                      | 6.1         | 18.2        | 66.7        |
| Train-the-trainer opportunities                          | 12.1        | 48.5        | 30.3        |

Table 4 indicates that the SMS training sessions placed major focus on Mentoring skills, tools, and strategies (72.7%), Teacher observation (66.7%), Orientation for new teachers (60.6%), and Coaching skills (51.5%). While Mentor reflection (42.4%), Professional growth plan for new teachers (48.5%), and Train-the-trainer opportunities (48.5%) are areas that the majority of respondents put minor focus.

## D. Topics in Your School/District New Teacher Program

**Table 5**  
**Percentage distribution of the level of focus and progress toward implementing each element area**

|  | Not a Focus | Minor Focus | Major Focus | Not Applicable | Planning | Early Implementation | Full Implementation |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Coaching skills  | 9.1         | 30.3        | 48.5        | 3.0            | 24.2     | 45.5                 | 15.2                |
| Formative assessment (Needs Assessment) for new teachers | 9.1         | 33.3        | 45.5        | 3.0            | 15.2     | 57.6                 | 12.1                |
| Mentor reflection  | 6.1         | 48.5        | 33.3        | 3.0            | 30.3     | 36.4                 | 18.2                |
| Mentoring skills, tools, and strategies                  | 6.1         | 24.2        | 57.6        | --             | 18.2     | 33.3                 | 36.4                |
| Orientation for new teachers                             | 9.1         | 15.2        | 63.6        | 6.1            | 12.1     | 12.1                 | 57.6                |
| Professional growth plan for new teachers                | 3.0         | 51.5        | 33.3        | 3.0            | 39.4     | 15.2                 | 30.3                |
| Professional teaching standards                          | 12.1        | 30.3        | 45.5        | 6.1            | 15.2     | 42.4                 | 24.2                |
| Teacher observation                                      | 6.1         | 21.2        | 60.6        | 3.0            | 18.2     | 30.3                 | 36.4                |
| Train-the-trainer opportunities                          | 27.3        | 45.5        | 15.2        | 18.2           | 54.5     | 9.1                  | 6.1                 |

Table 5 indicates that the school/district of SMS training participants placed major focus on Orientation for new teachers (63.6%), Teacher observation (60.6%), and Mentoring skills, tools, and strategies (57.6%).

Among the majority of these elements, Mentoring skills, tools, and strategies (36.4%), Orientation for new teachers (57.6%), and Teacher observation (36.4%) reached full implementation at schools after SMS training sessions were delivered.

## E. Schools Mentoring Schools Implementation

**Table 6**  
**Percentage distribution of the level of agreement in different components of SMS**

|   | Not Applicable (%) | Strongly Disagree (%) | Disagree (%) | Agree (%) | Strongly Agree (%) |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------------|
| <b>Building a new teacher program in our school/district</b>  |                    |                       |              |           |                    |
| 1. My school/district regularly evaluates the effectiveness of our new teacher program.                               | --                 | 3.0                   | 15.2         | 45.5      | 18.2               |
| 2. My school/district's new teachers are required to participate in new teacher and mentoring activities.             | 3.0                | 3.0                   | 6.1          | 30.3      | 39.4               |
| 3. There is a sufficient budget to implement a new teacher program.   | --                 | 24.2                  | 24.2         | 6.1       | 27.3               |
| 4. My school/district's new teacher program provides a new teacher with mentoring support throughout the school year. | 3.0                | 9.1                   | 6.1          | 30.3      | 33.3               |

|   |     |     |      |      |      |
|---|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| 5. The new teachers are satisfied with the amount of time that it takes them to participate in mentoring and new teacher program activities.  | 6.1 | 3.0 | 3.0  | 57.6 | 12.1 |
| 6. Mentors are satisfied with the amount of time that it takes them to participate in mentoring activities.                                   | 6.1 | 3.0 | 18.2 | 42.4 | 12.1 |
| 7. My school/district's new teacher program provides mentor training sessions in uses of formative assessments for new teachers' development. | 9.1 | 3.0 | 24.2 | 39.4 | 6.1  |
| 8. The new teacher program requires mentors to work with new teachers to set and implement professional goals and action plans.               | 9.1 | 6.1 | 21.2 | 27.3 | 18.2 |
| 9. The new teacher program provides training to new teachers in effective teaching strategies.  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 15.2 | 39.4 | 21.2 |
| 10. My school/district has the capacity to provide professional development to new teachers and mentors.                                      | 3.0 | 9.1 | 6.1  | 30.3 | 33.3 |
| 11. My school/district requires new teachers to attend sessions specific to new teacher professional development, support and collaboration.  | 3.0 | 6.1 | 21.2 | 24.2 | 24.2 |
| <b>Coaching effectiveness</b>   |     |     |      |      |      |
| 12. My school/district's new teacher program has adopted a coaching model   | 9.1 | --  | 27.3 | 27.3 | 18.2 |
| 13. My school/district's new teacher program provides a content-focused coaching model.   | 9.1 | --  | 33.3 | 24.2 | 15.2 |
| 14. My school/district's new teacher program provides an instruction-focused coaching model.  | 6.1 | --  | 18.2 | 39.4 | 18.2 |
| 15. Mentor coaching practices with a new teacher include a focus on increasing new teacher's content knowledge and delivery of instruction.   | 6.1 | --  | 15.2 | 45.5 | 15.2 |
| 16. Mentor coaching practices with a new teacher include a focus on classroom environment for student learning.                               | 6.1 | --  | 6.1  | 54.5 | 15.2 |
| 17. Mentor coaching practices with a new teacher include a focus on differentiated instruction to meet student needs.                         | 6.1 | --  | 9.1  | 51.5 | 12.1 |
| 18. Mentor coaching practices with a new teacher include a focus on teacher practice reflection for professional growth.                      | 6.1 | --  | 12.1 | 54.5 | 9.1  |
| <b>Mentoring</b>  |     |     |      |      |      |
| 19. My school/district's administrators fully support the mentoring process.  | --  | 3.0 | 18.2 | 24.2 | 36.4 |
| 20. My school/district developed selection criteria for choosing the mentors.   | 6.1 | 6.1 | 15.2 | 42.4 | 12.1 |
| 21. The new teacher program leadership meets regularly and frequently with the mentors/mentees.   | 6.1 | 3.0 | 27.3 | 21.2 | 24.2 |
| 22. Training and support have been adequately provided to the new teachers to apply best practices.   | 3.0 | 3.0 | 18.2 | 33.3 | 24.2 |

| <b>Observation</b>   |     |     |      |      |      |
|--|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| 23. Mentors are required to observe mentees' classrooms to provide feedback.   | 6.1 | 3.0 | 24.2 | 27.3 | 18.2 |
| 24. Mentors and mentees use observations to inform the new teacher professional growth process.  | 9.1 | 3.0 | 21.2 | 30.3 | 15.2 |
| 25. Mentors and mentees have a clear understanding about professional standards and its use in observations and guiding professional growth. | 6.1 | 3.0 | 12.1 | 45.5 | 12.1 |
| 26. Mentors use the pre-observation, observation, post-observation cycle.  | 6.1 | 3.0 | 24.2 | 30.3 | 15.2 |
| 27. The district new teacher program requires mentees to observe best practices in the classrooms of experienced educators.                  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 33.3 | 21.2 | 18.2 |

### **Building a new teacher program in our school/district (Table 6)**

A large percentage of the respondents reported their agreement (agree or strongly agree) with components #1 (63.7%), #2 (69.7%), #4 (63.6%), #5 (69.7%), #9 (60.6%), and #10 (63.6%). The percentage of the respondents indicating their agreement with a sufficient budget to implement a new teacher program (33.4%) was relatively small.

### **Coaching effectiveness (Table 6)**

Most respondents reported their agreement on components #15 (60.7%), #16 (69.7%), #17 (63.6%), and #18 (63.6%). It is a relatively small percent of respondents (39.4%) that indicated new teacher programs provided a content-focused coaching model.

### **Mentoring (Table 6)**

Most respondents (60.6%) reported that their school/district's administrators fully support the mentoring process. However, a relatively small percent of the respondents (45.4%) indicated that the new teacher program leadership met regularly and frequently with the mentors/mentees.

### **Observation (Table 6)**

Although the majority of respondents (57.6%) reported that mentors and mentees had a clear understanding about professional standards and its use in observations and guiding professional growth, less than a half of respondents indicated their agreement with components #23 (45.5%), #24 (45.5%), and #26 (45.5%). In addition, only 39.4% of the respondents reported that the district new teacher program requires mentees to observe best practices in the classrooms of experienced educators.

## **III. Summary**

The results of this SMS survey study indicate the current status of the schools/districts of SMS training participants:

- (1) The school/district of the SMS training participant placed major focus on Orientation for new teachers (63.6%), Teacher observation (60.6%), and Mentoring skills, tools, and strategies (57.6%).

- (2) Among the majority of these elements, Mentoring skills, tools, and strategies (36.4%), Orientation for new teachers (57.6%), and Teacher observation (36.4%) reached full implementation at schools after SMS training sessions were delivered.
- (3) A relatively large percent of the respondents had a need for a more sufficient budget for the new teacher program.
- (4) Only a few SMS training participants indicated that their district new teacher program required mentees to observe best practices in the classrooms of experienced educators.

Although SMS is only a two-year mentoring project, this study identified significant relationships between the level of focus on each topic at SMS training sessions and the focus on each topic after SMS training sessions. It also indicated significant relationships between the level of focus on each topic and its progress toward full implementation.

In addition, the responses from open-ended questions highlight strengths and weaknesses in implementing SMS. Even though they faced challenges (e.g., lack of support from the school board and limited time and funds in implementing SMS elements) most of respondents indicated that they benefited from having information on best practices, collegial networking, practical examples, and useful materials.

The respondents suggested that the program should continue with many of the same offerings and with the addition of coaching and observation strategies. They also suggested that more opportunities to practice would be helpful.

**Part IV**  
**Schools Mentoring Schools Grant Program Expenditures Report**

MDE provided \$50,000 for 2005-07 for the Schools Mentoring School Program. Up to four regional sites would implement a program to provide assistance to nearby school districts in developing their own effective system of support for new teachers under Minnesota Statute 122A.628. This was a two-year grant and any balance in the first year did not cancel but was available in the second year.

A process for disseminating up to four grants was established requiring applications be reviewed through a panel using scoring criteria created by MDE (Appendix B). On November 18, 2005, the review panel recommended to the Commissioner of Education three applicants as Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites. Grant awards were extended to Brainerd School District for \$18,000, Minnesota State University–Mankato for \$18,000, and Lakes Country Service Cooperative for \$13,000. As a recipient of a Schools Mentoring Schools Grant, each regional site was required to submit an annual end-of-fiscal-year report by July 31. Final expenditures were reported each fiscal year:

|                                     | <b>ISD 181,<br/>Brainerd<br/>Public<br/>Schools</b> | <b>Minnesota<br/>State<br/>University,<br/>Mankato</b> | <b>Lakes<br/>County<br/>Service<br/>Cooperative</b> |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>2005-06</b>                      |   |  |   |
| Salary and Wages (100)              |   | \$113.53   | \$1,028.36  |
| Employee Benefits (200)             |   |  | \$123.71  |
| Travel Expenses (366)               | \$120.15  | \$3,500.00   | \$617.91  |
| Purchased Services (300)            | \$6,050.00  | \$250.29   | \$1,060.00  |
| Supplies and Materials (400)        |   | \$54.50  | \$352.00  |
| Other (800)                         |   | \$195.90   | \$156.60  |
| Total:                              | \$6,170.15  | \$4,114.22   | \$3,338.58  |
| <b>2006-07</b>                      |   |  |   |
| Salary and Wages (100)              | \$591.00  |  | \$2,912.80  |
| Employee Benefits (200)             |   |  | \$353.14  |
| Travel (366)                        |   | \$3,500.00   | \$863.40  |
| Purchased Services (300)            | \$11,238.85   | \$6,170.72   | \$4,474.97  |
| Supplies and Materials (400)        |   | \$3,515.04   | \$534.93  |
| Other (800)                         |   | \$696.49   | \$499.68  |
| Total:                              | \$11,829.85   | \$13,882.25  | \$9,638.92  |
| <b>GRANT AWARDED</b>                | \$18,000.00   | \$18,000.00  | \$13,000.00   |
| <b>Total Reimbursed for 2005-07</b> | \$18,000.00   | \$17,996.47  | \$12,977.50   |



**Reference:**

Costa, Arthur L. Y Garmston, Robert J. (2002). *Cognitive coaching; a foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Guskey, Thomas G. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA; Corwin Press.

The Southeast Center for Teacher Quality. "Teacher Recruitment and Retention Briefs." *The Southeast Center for Teacher Quality* (Dec 2004). Available at [www.teacherquality.org](http://www.teacherquality.org) and [www.NewTeacher.com](http://www.NewTeacher.com).

MEMORANDUM

**TO:** School District Superintendents, School Principals,  
Staff Development Directors

**FROM:** Deborah Luedtke  
Schools Mentoring Schools Grant Coordinator

**DATE:** September 22, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Site Grants

**Application for 2005-2007  
Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Site Grants**

Minnesota Session Laws 2005, 1st Special Session, Chapter 5, Article 2, Sec. 47. [122A.628] authorized funds for Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites (see attached). Public school districts, charter schools or partnerships of schools are invited to become a regional site to assist other school districts in their region with the development of thorough and effective teacher mentoring programs.

- A total of \$50,000 is available for two years (December 1, 2005-June 30, 2007). A minimum of \$12,500 will be awarded.
- Up to four sites will be selected and factors including geographic balance will be considered in the selection process.
- Sites will provide mentoring assistance and service to participating districts in their region.

The Minnesota Department of Education will appoint a panel to recommend recipients and grant amounts based on the application and scoring process. The Commissioner of Education will determine final approval of all grants. Additional or fewer dollars may be allotted to each grant depending on the number of applications that are approved for funding. Work cannot begin until a completed grant contract is executed between school districts and the Minnesota Department of Education.

Applications accepted from school districts or partnerships of schools must include:

- Signature page (if more than one district is involved, include additional signature pages as needed)
- Grant proposal
- Proposed activities
- Evaluation plan
- Proposed budget

Questions contact: Deborah Luedtke, Schools Mentoring Schools Coordinator, by phone: 651-582-8440 or email: [deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us](mailto:deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us) .

*Minnesota*  
*Department of Education*

Schools Mentoring Schools Grants  
2005-2007

Grant Application Packet

**Application Deadline:  
Due in MDE Office by  
Wednesday, October 26, 2005  
4:00 P.M.**

## Schools Mentoring Schools Grant Overview

Minnesota Session Laws 2005, 1st Special Session, Chapter 5, Article 2, Sec. 47. [122A.628] authorized funds for Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites. Public school districts or partnerships of schools are invited to become a regional site to assist other school districts in their region with the development of thorough and effective teacher mentoring programs. These sites will provide high quality mentoring assistance and services to nearby school districts. Based on geographic balance and proven mentoring program methods, up to four sites will be selected as a regional site. One of the sites will include Brainerd School District and their new teacher support system.

The regional sites will develop a two-year plan based on their recognized experience and methods to equip schools to work with their own new and beginning teachers. Regional sites will provide districts in their area

- Assistance to develop their own mentorship program
- Coaching/mentor training
- Teacher classroom observation training
- Train-the-trainer to teacher teams

Minnesota legislature has appropriated \$50,000 for the Schools Mentoring Schools initiative. Grants will be awarded up to four (4) sites. Funds are to be used over a two-year time period from December 1, 2005, through June 30, 2007. A maximum of five percent (5%) may be used for program administration per fiscal year. Neither out-of-state travel nor equipment, such as computer purchases, will be funded.

Sites that have a Board of Teaching Mentor Grant must include in their application a description of proposed activities that may continue and/or expand but does not duplicate Board of Teaching grant activities during a common funding year.

A panel appointed by the Minnesota Department of Education will review applications based on selection criteria, included in this application packet. Recommendations from the panel will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Education for final action.

Grant recipients will provide reports describing implementation efforts and evaluation results. Reports will be required at mid-implementation (June 30, 2006) and at the end of the grant period (June 30, 2007). These will be used to develop a commissioner's annual report to the legislature on the operation of each training center.

Note: A half-day orientation session for grant recipients will be held in November to review grant expectations, timelines and reports. Travel expenses for the state-sponsored meeting should be included in the grant application.

An original application and five (5) copies (NO FAX TRANSMISSIONS) are addressed to

**Schools Mentoring Schools Grant**  
**ATTENTION: Deborah Luedtke, F-3**  
**Minnesota Department of Education**  
**1500 Highway 36 West**  
**Roseville, MN 55113-4266**

Applications must be received in the Minnesota Department of Education **no later than 4:00 P.M. on Wednesday, October 26, 2005.** *Late applications will not be considered.*

Call Deborah Luedtke at 651-582-8440 or Email: [deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us](mailto:deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us) with questions regarding the application process.

# Schools Mentoring Schools Grant Application

**DEADLINE: Wednesday, October 26, 2005**  
**AWARD NOTIFICATION: Friday, November 11, 2005**

**Instructions:**

1. **Complete signature sheet (page 3).** *If more than one district is involved, include additional signature pages as needed.*
2. **Additional pages are attached for the response to components 1-9.** Please limit responses to ten (10) pages in total. No attachments or addendums will be allowed.
3. **An original application and five (5) copies (NO FAX TRANSMISSIONS) addressed to**  
**Schools Mentoring Schools Grant**  
**ATTENTION: Deborah Luedtke, F-3**  
**Minnesota Department of Education**  
**1500 Highway 36 West**  
**Roseville, MN 55113-4266**

**Identification Information**

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

District Number \_\_\_\_\_

- X if District is fiscal agent of the grant (include information below)
- MN Tax ID # \_\_\_\_\_
- Federal Employer # \_\_\_\_\_

Grant Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_

- Title \_\_\_\_\_
- Street Address \_\_\_\_\_
- City, Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_
- Phone Number \_\_\_\_\_
- FAX \_\_\_\_\_
- Email \_\_\_\_\_

**Assurances**

I hereby submit this grant application on behalf of the school district which agrees if approved and funded to implement the approved proposal and to complete the required grant project report.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(District #)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

## Grant Proposal

Describe the grant proposal by responding to components 1-9 below. Each component carries a maximum of ten (10) points according to scoring criteria. Please limit responses to ten (10) pages in total. No attachments or addendums will be allowed.

**Component 1: Describe the district's or consortia's recognized experience in mentorship and implementation of a research-based mentoring program.**

**10 points**

(Please attach response)

**Component 2: Describe how the Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers will be incorporated in the grant activities (see attached).**

**10 points**

(Please attach response)

**Component 3: Describe the activities the regional site will provide participating districts in developing a mentorship program.**

**10 points**

(Please attach response)

**Component 4: Describe the coaching/mentoring training the regional site will provide participating districts. Include title of training, training outcomes and expectations of the participants.**

**10 points**

(Please attach response)

**Component 5: Describe the teacher classroom observation training the regional site will provide participating districts. Include title of training, training outcomes and expectations of the participants.**

**10 points**

(Please attach response)

**Component 6: Describe the train-the-trainer session(s) for teacher teams from participating districts. Include title of training, training outcomes and expectations of the participants.**

**10 points**

(Please attach response)

**Component 7: Describe your evaluation plan. Include both participant's use of training when returning to their home district and implementation of the regional site program.**

**10 points**

(Please attach response)

**Component 8: Complete a proposed action plan similar to the one below.**

**10 points**

(Please insert response)

| Activity | Timeline<br>2005-2007 | Person<br>Responsible | Resources needed | Intended<br>Results |
|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|
|          |                       |                       |                  |                     |
|          |                       |                       |                  |                     |

**Component 9: Identify resources needed for grant proposal. A maximum of five percent (5%) may be used for program administration per fiscal year. Neither out-of-state travel nor equipment, such as computer purchases, will be funded.**

**10 points**

(Please insert response)

**2005-06**

| Object Code                  | Brief narrative for budget activity | Grant Request |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Salary and Wages (100)       |                                     |               |
| Employee Benefits (200)      |                                     |               |
| Travel (366)                 |                                     |               |
| Purchased Services (300)     |                                     |               |
| Supplies and Materials (400) |                                     |               |
| Other (800)                  |                                     |               |

**2006-07**

| Object Code                  | Brief narrative for budget activity | Grant Request |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Salary and Wages (100)       |                                     |               |
| Employee Benefits (200)      |                                     |               |
| Travel (366)                 |                                     |               |
| Purchased Services (300)     |                                     |               |
| Supplies and Materials (400) |                                     |               |
| Other (800)                  |                                     |               |

**Component 10: 2005-06 Board of Teaching mentor grant recipients only: Provide a description of activities that continue and/or expand but do not duplicate Board of Teaching grant activities during a common funding year.**

**No points**



## APPENDIX B

### Scoring Criteria for *Schools Mentoring Schools* Grants 2005-2007

The evaluator may assign 1-10 points for each component within the 10 page grant proposal limit. A score of zero may be assigned if there is no evidence that the objective has been addressed.

#### **Component 1: Describe the district's or consortia's recognized experience in mentorship and implementation of a research-based mentoring program.**

Criteria:

- (1) The mentorship program description is given but does not list components of a research-based mentoring program.
- (5) The mentorship program description is defined and lists 1-2 components of a research-based mentoring program.
- (10) The mentorship program description provides a detailed explanation of researched methods of mentorship such as
  - Evidence of exemplary results on teacher practice processes for selecting, orienting and training mentors;
  - Instructional skill development for mentors;
  - Processes for actualizing mentor/new teacher interactions;
  - Staff development activities unique to new teachers and to their teaching assignment;
  - Use of teaching standards in new teacher-mentor professional development activities;
  - Alignment of activities with principal/administrator evaluation; and
  - Process for program evaluation based on effectiveness of strategies applied and program goals achieved.

#### **Component 2: Describe how the *Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers* will be incorporated in the grant activities.**

Criteria:

- (1) A description is given but does not directly state how the *Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers* will be incorporated in the grant activities.
- (5) The *Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers* are included but limited to 1-2 grant activities.
- (10) The *Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers* are addressed in all grant activities:
  - Regional assistance to help develop other district's mentorship program;
  - Coaching/mentor training;
  - Teacher classroom observation training; and
  - Train-the-trainer for teacher teams.

**Component 3: Describe the activities the regional site will provide participating districts in developing a mentorship program.**

Criteria:

- (1) A description of the activities is given but does not address any of the required schools-mentoring-schools program components.
- (5) The proposed activities are clearly described but addresses only 1-2 *Schools Mentoring Schools* program components.
- (10) The activities are clearly described, can be delivered in a regional model and address all regional mentor program components:
  - Regional assistance to help develop other district's mentorship program;
  - Coaching/mentor training;
  - Teacher classroom observation training; and
  - Train-the-trainer for teacher teams

**Component 4: Describe the coaching/mentoring training the regional site will provide participating districts. Include title of training, training outcomes and expectations of the participants.**

Criteria:

- (1) A general description of the coaching/mentoring training is provided.
- (5) A description of the coaching/mentoring training is provided but only one or two of the required items.
- (10) A detailed description of the coaching/mentoring training is provided and addresses:
  - Title of training;
  - Training outcomes; and
  - Specific expectations that participants use the training information beyond the training event such as a follow-up activity after participant has put training into practice; completion of an action plan for use at their home district; and/or reflection on implementation of a goal set at training.

**Component 5: Describe the teacher classroom observation training the regional site will provide participating districts. Include title of training, training outcomes and expectations of the participants.**

Criteria:

- (1) A general description of the classroom observation training is provided.
- (5) A description of the classroom observation training is provided but only one or two of the required items.
- (10) A detailed description of the classroom observation training is provided and addresses:
  - Title of training;

- Training outcomes; and
- Specific expectations that participants use the training information beyond the training event such as a follow-up activity after participant has put training into practice, completion of an action plan for use at their home district, and/or reflection on implementation of a goal set at training.

**Component 6: Describe the train-the-trainer session(s) for teacher teams from participating districts. Include title of training, training outcomes and expectations of the participants.**

Criteria:

- (1) A general description of the train-the-trainer session(s) is provided.
- (5) A description of the train-the-trainer session(s) is provided but only one or two of the required items.
- (10) A detailed description of the train-the-trainer session(s) is provided and addresses:
  - Title of training;
  - Training outcomes; and
  - Specific expectations that participants use the training information beyond the training event such as a follow-up activity after participant has put training into practice, completion of an action plan for use at their home district, and/or reflection on implementation of a goal set at training.

**Component 7: Describe your evaluation plan that includes both (1) implementation of the regional site program and (2) participant’s use of training at their district or site.**

Criteria:

- (1) A general description of an evaluation plan only addresses one area: participant’s use of training at their home district or implementation of the regional program.
- (5) A description of an evaluation plan addresses two areas: participant’s use of training at their home district and implementation of the regional program.
- (10) A detailed description of an evaluation plan addresses two areas:
  - Implementation of the regional program;
    - types and number of activities provided
    - number of participating districts/schools per training
    - number of participants per training

- number of school districts developing and completing mentor program implementation plans
- Participant's use of training at their home district.
  - participant's evaluation of training events and effect of the training to the participant's district and/or site's mentor program or mentoring experience with a new teacher

**Component 8: Complete a proposed action plan including an evaluation plan (include activities, timeline, person responsible, resources needed and intended results of each activity).**

Criteria:

- (1) The action plan addresses grant activities with minimal information.
- (5) The action plan addresses all grant activities defined and described.
- (10) Proposal is well-defined, detailed and addresses all required grant activities including:
  - Assisting other districts in developing their own mentorship program;
  - Providing coaching/mentoring training;
  - Providing teacher classroom observation training;
  - Providing train-the-trainer training; and
  - Developing and implementing an evaluation process.
  - A maximum of 5% is used for program administration per fiscal year. Neither out-of-state travel nor equipment is funded.

**Component 9: Identify resources needed for grant proposal (includes object code, brief description for budget activity and grant funds requested).**

Criteria:

- (1) There is little correlation between the budget and the activities described in the proposal. Resources identified are unrealistic to accomplish the tasks.
- (5) Resources requested are given. Some activities listed are not defined in the budget proposal; clarity and completeness of budget is lacking.
- (10) There is clear correlation between the requested budget and the activities described in the proposal. Resources are requested for the identified tasks. Resources appear to be adequate.

**Component 10: (BOT 2005-06 mentor grant recipients only).** Description of activities do not duplicate Board of Teaching grant activities during the common funding year.

- Compare grant activities and timelines of both BOT and MDE proposals.

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Lori Bird, Minnesota State University, Mankato  
Barb Hexum, Lake Country Service Cooperative  
Loretta Norgon, Brainerd School District

**FROM:** Deborah Luedtke  
Schools Mentoring Schools Grant Coordinator

**DATE:** May 22, 2006

**SUBJECT:** Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites 2005-07 - Report 1

Minnesota Session Laws 2005, 1st Special Session, Chapter 5, Article 2, Sec. 47. [122A.628] authorized funds for Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites to provide high quality mentoring assistance to nearby school districts for the development of effective systems of support for new teachers. Three regional sites have been identified for school years 2005-07.

The commissioner of education is required to review and report annually to the legislature on the operation of each training center. To develop the commissioner's state-level annual report, a performance report from each regional site is required. The first regional site reports are due July 31, 2006, and are confined to four components:

- Update Regional Site Information
- Action Plans
- Resources
- Formative Assessment of Grant Progress

A final regional site report is due July 31, 2006. It will be more comprehensive in nature and include impact of regional site activities on a school/school district and their new teachers. Regional Site Coordinators will meet with the grant coordinator in June 2006 to preview final report components.

Call Deborah Luedtke at 651-582-8440 or Email: [deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us](mailto:deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us) with questions regarding the reporting process.

For questions concerning expenditures and payments, contact Terry Alvarado at 651-582-8749 or email at [terry.alvarado@state.mn.us](mailto:terry.alvarado@state.mn.us)

May 2006

# Schools Mentoring Schools Sites 2005-2007 Report 1

**Report due: Monday, July 31, 2006**

**Instructions:**

4. Complete report components 1 - 4.
5. Send report by mail or email (NO FAX TRANSMISSIONS) addressed to

Schools Mentoring Schools Sites  
**ATTENTION: Deborah Luedtke, F-3**  
Minnesota Department of Education  
1500 Highway 36 West  
Roseville, MN 55113-4266  
deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us

**Component 1: Update Regional Site Information**

District/School Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grant Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_

- Title \_\_\_\_\_
- Street Address \_\_\_\_\_
- City, Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_
- Phone Number \_\_\_\_\_
- FAX \_\_\_\_\_
- Email \_\_\_\_\_



**Component 2: ACTION PLANS.**

- **Complete action plan accomplishments from implementation of the grant through June 30, 2006. Include grant category number(s) your site’s mentoring activity best applies.**
- **Submit an updated action plan for July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007, to include revisions from original grant proposal.**

**Grant Category** (more than one grant category may be used for each activity listed)

1. Provided assistance to schools, districts in developing their own mentorship program
2. Coaching and observation training
3. Teacher classroom observation training
4. Train-the-trainer to other teacher teams
5. other

(Please insert response)

**Grant activities completed for 2005-06**

| Grant Category | Activity Title and Description | Date(s) of activity | Number of Participants | Number of districts/schools participating in the event | Please comment on participant’s evaluations or feedback from the activity |
|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--|---|
|                |                                |                     |                        |  |   |
|                |                                |                     |                        |  |   |
|                |                                |                     |                        |  |   |

**Grant activities proposed for 2006-07**

| Grant Category | Activity Title and Description | Timeline 2006-2007 | Intended Results |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
|                |                                |                    |                  |
|                |                                |                    |                  |
|                |                                |                    |                  |

**Component 3: RESOURCES.**

- Identify resources used in the site grant from implementation of the grant until June 30, 2006.
- Identify resources to be used in the grant from July 1, 2006 until June 30, 2007.
- A maximum of five percent (5%) may be used for program administration per fiscal year. Neither out-of-state travel nor equipment, such as computer purchases, will be funded.

(Please insert response)

**Grant Funds Used in 2005-06**

| <b>Object Code</b>           | <b>Brief narrative of budget activity</b> | <b>Amount Spent</b> |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Salary and Wages (100)       |   |                     |
| Employee Benefits (200)      |   |                     |
| Travel (366)                 |   |                     |
| Purchased Services (300)     |   |                     |
| Supplies and Materials (400) |   |                     |
| Other (800)                  |   |                     |

**Revised Budget for 2006-07**

| <b>Object Code</b>           | <b>Brief narrative of budget activity</b> | <b>Amount Budgeted</b> |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Salary and Wages (100)       |   |                        |
| Employee Benefits (200)      |   |                        |
| Travel (366)                 |   |                        |
| Purchased Services (300)     |   |                        |
| Supplies and Materials (400) |   |                        |
| Other (800)                  |   |                        |



**Component 4: FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT.**

- Briefly summarize the effects of school year 2005-06 regional site activities.

(Please insert response)

| <b>Grant Categories</b>   | <b>Successes</b> | <b>Challenges</b> |
|---|------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Assistance to schools/districts in developing their own mentorship program</b> |                  |                   |
| <b>Coaching and observation training</b>  |                  |                   |
| <b>Teacher classroom observation training</b>                                     |                  |                   |
| <b>Train-the-trainer to teacher teams</b>   |                  |                   |

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Lori Bird, Minnesota State University, Mankato  
Barb Hexum, Lakes Country Service Cooperative  
Loretta Norgon, Brainerd School District

**FROM:** Deborah Luedtke  
Schools Mentoring Schools Grant Coordinator

**DATE:** January 4, 2007

**SUBJECT:** Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites 2005-07 - Report 2

Minnesota Session Laws 2005, 1st Special Session, Chapter 5, Article 2, Sec. 47. [122A.628] authorized funds for Schools Mentoring Schools Regional Sites to provide high quality mentoring assistance to nearby school districts for the development of effective systems of support for new teachers. Three regional sites have been identified for school years 2005-07.

The commissioner of education is required to review and report annually to the legislature on the operation of each training center. To develop the commissioner's state-level annual report, a performance report from each regional site is required. The summative regional site reports are due July 31, 2007, and are confined to four components:

- Update of Regional Site Information
- Grant Activities 2006-07
- Grant Expenditures 2006-07
- Summative Grant Results

Call Deborah Luedtke at 651-582-8440 or email: [deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us](mailto:deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us) with questions regarding the reporting process.

For questions concerning expenditures and payments, contact Pam Fields by phone at 651-582-8349, or email her at [pam.fields@state.mn.us](mailto:pam.fields@state.mn.us)

January 2007

# Schools Mentoring Schools Sites 2005-2007 Report 2

**Report due: Monday, July 31, 2007**

**Instructions:**

- 6. Complete report components 1 - 4.
- 7. Send report by mail or email (NO FAX TRANSMISSIONS)  
addressed to:

Schools Mentoring Schools Report 2  
**ATTENTION: Deborah Luedtke, F-3**  
Minnesota Department of Education  
1500 Highway 36 West  
Roseville, MN 55113-4266  
deborah.luedtke@state.mn.us

**Component 1: UPDATE OF REGIONAL SITE INFORMATION**

Grantee Organization

Name

Grant Contact Person

- Title
- Street Address
- City, Zip Code
- Phone Number
- FAX
- Email



**Component 2: GRANT ACTIVITIES 2006-07**

- **Complete action plan accomplishments from implementation of the grant through June 30, 2007. Indicate grant category number most applicable to this activity.**

**A. Grant Activities**

Grant funds were provided to identified school districts in the regional site’s geographic area for activities in the following categories:

6. Assistance to districts and schools in developing their own mentorship program
7. Coaching
8. Mentoring
9. In-class observation
10. Train-the-trainer opportunities for teams of teachers

**Grant Activities Completed in 2006-07**

*Please insert your responses in the following table. List activities in chronological order. More than one grant category may be listed for an activity.*

| Grant Category Number | Activity Title and Description | Objective | Date(s) of Activity | Information about Participants     |                        |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
|                       |                                |           |                     | Name of District or Charter School | Number of Participants |
|                       |                                |           |                     |                                    |                        |
|                       |                                |           |                     |                                    |                        |
|                       |                                |           |                     |                                    |                        |

**B. Results of Completed Activities**

To gather a representative sample of information about results, a survey will be sent in August-September 2007 to a group of participants, with one participant chosen to represent each district or school. The survey will cover the following areas:

Effectiveness

- What worked about the training that had a positive important impact on your practice?
- What didn’t work?



**Component 3: GRANT EXPENDITURES**

- Identify expenditures used in the site grant from implementation of the grant from July 1, 2006 until June 30, 2007.
- A maximum of five percent (5%) is allowed for program administration per fiscal year. Neither out-of-state travel nor equipment, such as computer purchases, are funded.

**Grant Funds Used in 2006-07**

*Please insert your responses in the following table.*

| Object Code                  | Brief Narrative of Budget Activity | Amount Spent |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Salary and Wages (100)       |                                    |              |
| Employee Benefits (200)      |                                    |              |
| Travel (366)                 |                                    |              |
| Purchased Services (300)     |                                    |              |
| Supplies and Materials (400) |                                    |              |
| Other (800)                  |                                    |              |

**Component 4: SUMMATIVE GRANT RESULTS**

- Briefly summarize the effects of the two-year grant activities -----

*Please insert your responses in the following table.*

| Grant Categories   | Successes | Challenges |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Assistance to districts and schools in developing their own mentorship program |           |            |
| Coaching   |           |            |
| Mentoring  |           |            |
| In-class observation   |           |            |
| Train-the-trainer opportunities for teams of teachers                          |           |            |

Do you have any additional insights you would like to share, such as how Schools Mentoring Schools impacted your regional site or your work with districts and schools in teacher induction?

## APPENDIX E



### SCHOOLS MENTORING SCHOOLS SURVEY 2006-2007 SCHOOL YEAR (to Present)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) provided grants to three Schools Mentoring Schools regional sites: Brainerd Public Schools, Lake Country Service Cooperative and Minnesota State University, Mankato. In school years 2005-07, sites implemented programs (workshops, training, network groups, etc.) to provide assistance to nearby school districts in developing their own effective system of support for new teachers. The regional sites offered workshops in the following areas: (1) coaching/mentor training, (2) in-class observation, and (3) train-the-trainer opportunities.

The purpose of this survey is to identify school/district efforts to build exemplary teacher induction/mentorship programs. Each regional site identified workshop participants to be contacted for this survey. Information gathered in this study will be aggregated to identify the effects of the Schools Mentoring Schools program.

The survey will take **only about 10-15 minutes** to complete. Please complete it by **November 16, 2007**. If you have any questions, please contact the Division of School Improvement at 651-582-8824.

We appreciate your participation.

#### **I. SCHOOL INFORMATION**

*Please type your information below:*

1. *Your District or School Name*

2. *Your Name*

3. *Your Title*

4. *Years and months in present position district*

5. *Years experience with this school and/or*

6. *Regional Site in which I participated received*

7. *Total number of hours of training that I*

8. *Total number of mentor teachers in your school or district*

9. *Average number of mentees per mentor in your school or district*

10. *Total number of years your school/district has been implementing a new teacher program*

11. *Number of years as a mentor, if you have served (if not, leave it blank)*

**II. MENTEES**

Please mark the **level of focus** on different mentee groups that is most representative of your school/district new teacher program.

|  | Not a Focus | Minor Focus | Major Focus |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Novice teachers (less than 1 year experience in the field) | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Novice Teachers (1-3 years experience)                     | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| New teachers to this school (1-3 years experience)         | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| New teachers to this school (4 or more years experience)   | 0           | 1           | 2           |

**III. TOPICS IN SCHOOLS MENTORING SCHOOLS TRAININGS**

Please mark the **level of focus** on different topics that were delivered overall in your Schools Mentoring Schools training sessions.

|  | Not a Focus | Minor Focus | Major Focus |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Coaching skills  | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Formative assessment (Needs Assessment) for new teachers | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Mentor reflection  | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Mentoring skills, tools and strategies                   | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Orientation for new teachers                             | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Professional growth plan for new teachers                | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Professional teaching standards                          | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Teacher observation                                      | 0           | 1           | 2           |
| Train-the-trainer opportunities                          | 0           | 1           | 2           |

**IV. TOPICS IN YOUR SCHOOL/DISTRICT NEW TEACHER PROGRAM**

Please mark the **level of focus** on different topics that is most representative of your school/district new teacher program.

In addition, please rate your school's level of progress toward implementing each element area during 2006-present.

|  | Not a Focus | Minor Focus | Major Focus | Not Applicable | Planning | Early implementation | Full implementation |   |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Coaching skills  | 0           | 1           | 2           |                | 1        | 2                    | 3                   | 4 |
| Formative assessment (Needs Assessment) for new teachers | 0           | 1           | 2           |                | 1        | 2                    | 3                   | 4 |
| Mentor reflection  | 0           | 1           | 2           |                | 1        | 2                    | 3                   | 4 |
| Mentoring skills, tools and strategies                   | 0           | 1           | 2           |                | 1        | 2                    | 3                   | 4 |
| Orientation for new teachers                             | 0           | 1           | 2           |                | 1        | 2                    | 3                   | 4 |
| Professional growth plan for new teachers                | 0           | 1           | 2           |                | 1        | 2                    | 3                   | 4 |
| Professional teaching standards                          |             |             |             |                |          |                      |                     |   |
| Teacher observation                                      | 0           | 1           | 2           |                | 1        | 2                    | 3                   | 4 |
| Train-the-trainer opportunities                          | 0           | 1           | 2           |                | 1        | 2                    | 3                   | 4 |



Please indicate your perception of the level of agreement that is most representative of your school/district after participating in the Schools Mentoring Schools training session(s).

|  | Not applicable | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|--|----------------|-------------------|----------|-------|----------------|
| <b>Building a New Teacher Program in our school/district</b>   |                |                   |          |       |                |
| My school/district regularly evaluates the effectiveness of our new teacher program.   | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| My school/district's new teachers are required to participate in new teacher and mentoring activities.                                     | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| There is a sufficient budget to implement a new teacher program.   | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| My school/district's new teacher program provides a new teacher with mentoring support throughout the school year.                         | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| The new teachers are satisfied with the amount of time that it takes them to participate in mentoring and new teacher program activities.  | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| Mentors are satisfied with the amount of time that it takes them to participate in mentoring activities.                                   | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| My school/district's new teacher program provides mentor training sessions in uses of formative assessments for new teachers' development. | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| The new teacher program requires mentors to work with new teachers to set and implement professional goals and action plans.               | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| The new teacher program provides training to new teachers in effective teaching strategies.  | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| My school/district has the capacity to provide professional development to new teachers and mentors.                                       | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| My school/district requires new teachers to attend sessions specific to new teacher professional development, support and collaboration.   | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| <b>Coaching Effectiveness</b>  |                |                   |          |       |                |
| My school/district's new teacher program has adopted a coaching model  | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| My school/district's new teacher program provides a content-focused coaching model.  |                |                   |          |       |                |
| My school/district's new teacher program provides an instruction-focused coaching model.   | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| Mentor coaching practices with a new teacher include a focus on increasing new teacher's content knowledge and delivery of instruction.    | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| Mentor coaching practices with a new teacher include a focus on classroom environment for student learning.                                | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| Mentor coaching practices with a new teacher include a focus on differentiated instruction to meet student needs.                          | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| Mentor coaching practices with a new teacher include a focus on teacher practice reflection for professional growth.                       | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| <b>Mentoring</b>   |                |                   |          |       |                |
| My school/district's administrators fully support the mentoring process.   | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| My school/district developed selection criteria for choosing the mentors.  | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| The new teacher program leadership meets regularly and frequently with the mentors/mentees.  | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| Training and support have been adequately provided to the new teachers to apply best practices.  | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| <b>Observation</b>   |                |                   |          |       |                |
| Mentors are required to observe mentees' classrooms to provide feedback.   | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |
| Mentors and mentees use observations to inform the new teacher professional growth process.  | ①              | ②                 | ③        | ④     | ⑤              |

|  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mentors and mentees have a clear understanding about professional standards and its use in observations and guiding professional growth. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Mentors use the pre-observation, observation, post-observation cycle.  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| The district new teacher program requires mentees to observe best practices in the classrooms of experienced educators.                  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

***What component was most helpful in the Schools Mentoring Schools training sessions?***

***What is/has been your biggest challenge in implementing your school/district new teacher program?***

***What type of service or training would you include in the Schools Mentoring Schools program if it were to continue?***

## APPENDIX F

### Minnesota Statutes 2005

#### 122A.628 Schools mentoring schools regional sites.

Subdivision 1. **Program.** The commissioner of education shall select up to four school districts, or partnerships of school districts, for the purpose of assisting other school districts in the region with the development of thorough and effective teacher mentoring programs. The commissioner shall use geographic balance and proven teacher induction programs as criteria when selecting the sites. One site must include the Brainerd teacher support system, which has been cited by the Minnesota Board of Teaching as a model program and was one of only six programs in the nation to be recognized for the 2004 NEA-Saturn/UAW partnership award. The sites shall be known as schools mentoring schools regional sites.

The sites shall provide high quality mentoring assistance programs and services to other nearby school districts for the development of effective systems of support for new teachers. The sites shall offer coaching/mentor training, in-class observation training, and train-the-teacher opportunities for teams of participating teachers. The sites shall use their recognized experience and methods to equip schools to work with their own new and beginning teachers. The commissioner shall review and report annually to the legislature on the operation of each training center.

Subd.2. **Revenue.** A school district that is selected to participate in the schools mentoring schools program under this section may utilize its professional compensation revenue under section 122A.4142, subdivision 4, to pay regional training sites for staff development and training services.

HIST: 1Sp2005 c 5 art 2 s 47

*Copyright 2005 by the Office of Revisor of Statutes, State of Minnesota.*