# Teacher Mentorship & Retention of Effective Teachers Grant Report Form

#### Instructions:

Please send an electronic copy of the Teacher Mentorship & Retention of Effective Teachers final completed report by June 30, 2021 to <a href="mailto:Grants.PELSB@state.mn.us">Grants.PELSB@state.mn.us</a>.

#### **Report components:**

- Coversheet
- II. Teacher Mentorship & Retention of effective Teachers Program Narrative Please describe how you have strengthened and/or supplemented your existing mentorship and retention efforts and how the awarded funds allowed you to do this work. Additionally, describe any specific work done to support teachers new to the profession or district, including teaching residents, teachers of color, teachers who are American Indian, teachers in license shortage areas, teachers with special needs, and/or experienced teachers in need of peer coaching. Finally, using the methodologies outlined in the "Progress Monitoring" portion of your original proposal, evaluate the effectiveness of the funded work.
- III. Program Data Please provide data from the year funded by the grant. Please also describe how grant funding has impacted the data from the most recent reporting year. You are welcome to include graphs.
- IV. Additional Reporting Requirements Please provide information on any additional funding that was used to support mentorship and retention efforts. Districts and schools must also provide information on retention strategies that were developed as a part of the grant program.
- V. Teacher Mentorship & Retention of effective Teachers Grant Funds Expenditure Please list all awarded funds, differentiating between funds spent and funds yet to be spent this fiscal year. Fill in the "method of progress monitoring" and "data" columns based on the information in sections VI of your proposal.

## **Teacher Mentorship & Retention of Effective Teachers Grant Report**

#### **Grantee Information**

Legal Name of Applicant Organization	University of St. Thomas
Total Grant Amount	\$48,000
	a school district
Identify the category you applied under	group of school districts
	X a coalition of school districts, teachers and teacher
	education institutions
	a coalition of schools, teachers or non-licensed
	educators

### **Identified Official with Authority**

Name of official with authority to sign	Sarah Ervin
Title	Senior Accountant
Address	2115 Summit Avenue
City, State and Zip code + 4	Saint Paul, MN 55105-1096
Phone Number and Email	651-962- 6612/sjknutson@stthomas.edu

### **Primary Program Contact**

Name of program contact	Kathlene Campbell
Title	Dean, School of Education
Address	2115 Summit Avenue
City, State and Zip code + 4	Saint Paul, MN 55105
I HOUC NUMBER AND LIMAN	951-962- 4455/Kathlene.campbell@stthomas.edu

#### **Teacher Mentorship & Retention of Effective Teachers Grant Program Narrative**

Since 2016 we have been partnering with St Paul Public Schools and 2017 Minneapolis Public Schools to recruit, prepare, and retrain teachers through a teacher residency pathway, which is.... Through this partnership we have prepared 195 teachers, including 62% identified as people of color. The completion rate for SUTR is 88% and 76% are still teaching. For MSTR we have a completion rate of 93% and of those who completed the program 97% are still teaching. Through this collaborative, we received funding from the National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR), Black Educators' Initiative (BEI) to support residents, mentors, and graduates who identify as Black. This project provided us the financial support to pilot two initiatives aimed to support Black educators, namely navigating pairs and affinity groups. This Teacher Mentorship and Retention of Effective Teachers Grant allowed us to extend these activities to more graduates and residents. Specifically, this grant focused on activities designed to provide connections, networks, and leadership. Each of these activities is described in more detail below, including evaluation results/data/outcome.

**Connect:** This grant supplemented our navigating pair activity where we pair residents with graduates of the program to provide mentorship and support during their teacher preparation program. Through this grant we were able to pay navigating pair leaders and extend this to first year graduates of the program to be paired with graduates with more experience. This grant helped provide leadership stipends to the navigators/mentors and first year teachers.

**Network:** This grant provided support for affinity groups leaders and activities. Through the BEI initiative we launched affinity group activities for residents, graduates, and mentors in January 2020. This Teacher Mentorship grant allowed us to extend our affinity groups beyond individuals who identify as Black. Each district implemented affinity groups based on their assessed district needs. For SUTR, they supported the following affinity groups: Asian Educators, Latinx Educators, LGBTQIA+ educators, Men of Color Educators, Special Education Teachers, Women of Color. For Minneapolis, they ran one large affinity group and then within each gathering, divided into affinity groups as applicable to the group at the time. The affinity groups met virtually once per monthly from September through May and planned one cross-district affinity group in February. District leaders and graduates led the various affinity groups throughout the year. We also received consultation from Sterling Grimes, XXXXXX, to guide the work and facilitate a focus group to gather impact data on the process and outcome of affinity groups to help us make next steps.

**Lead:** This grant allowed us to **strengthen and supplement** our existing mentorship and retention efforts by providing additional support to **mentor teachers** who were providing support to new teacher residents. During this year of distance learning, shifting to in-person learning, as well as providing support in person and simultaneously to students staying at home required additional challenges and new learnings for mentors. Even with these changes, mentors participated in monthly professional development, one on one planning and triad meetings with university supervisors/clinical coaches, and residents, and provided regular feedback and evaluation data. This grant allowed us to provide additional compensation to the mentors for this work to supplement our existing stipends.

#### **Teacher Mentorship & Retention of Effective Teachers Grant Program Data**

Please provide the total expected numbers and percentages of total participants for each of the following groups that your program will involve. Numbers may reflect teachers in multiple categories being counted more than once. Each category's percentage is of the total number of teachers being mentored under this grant.

Table 1: Total number of teachers new to the profession or district that received mentoring as a result of this grant.

Teachers Mentored Using Grant Funding	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Black	White	Other
Tier 3 Teachers new to the profession or district				1	4	
Tier 2 new to the profession or district				1		
Tier 1 teachers new to the profession or district						
Teaching residents*						
Teacher in license shortage areas				2	4	
Teachers with special needs						
Experienced teachers in need of peer coaching						
Total: All teachers supported by grant funding						

<sup>\*</sup>Teaching residents are those in a special in-service induction program, usually with a reduced instructional loads during the first year of employment and additional mentoring and/or professional development. For the purposes of this grant, residents are not pre-service candidates seeking initial licensure in their field and participating in a PELSB-approved residency program or student teachers completing other licensure programs.

# Table 2: Total number of mentors who were paid stipends under this grants for providing mentorship to teachers.

\*Please note in your analysis if this data is a duplicated headcount, meaning teachers are counted in more than one racial/ethnic category.

Mentor Demographics	Paid a stipend as part of a larger mentorship program	Paid an additional stipend
American Indian or Alaskan Native		
Asian	2	2
Black, Not of Hispanic Origin	4	4
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander		
Hispanic		
Multiple Categories		
White, Not of Hispanic Origin	38	38
Total	44	44

Anal	vsis	of	<b>Data</b>
Allui	7313	0.	Dutu

Program Data – Please provide data from the year funded by the grant. Please also describe how grant funding has impacted the data from the most recent reporting year. You are welcome to include graphs. **Data for the year**.

Retention Rate of residents: SUTR: 87%; MSTR: 87%

Retention Rate of new teachers from the residency in the 2020-2021 school year: SUTR: 94%; MSTR 93%

Retention Rate of mentors: SUTR: 82%; MSTR: 92%

#### Describe how grant funding has impacted the data:

There are a variety of activities and supports in place from the district and the University of St Thomas to support residents, new teachers, and mentors. The retention rate for residents is satisfactory given the year of the pandemic, racial unrest and trauma, and spending the majority of the school year in distance learning. Over the course of the year, six residents withdrew from the program, however only one of the six has decided to not become a teacher. One resident will be returning in the fall to pick up where he left off in the residency, one, will be returning to the residency or our on-campus program, two decided they needed a slower pace to the teacher pathway and transitioned to our on-campus program, and the fifth is working out some personal matters and plans to return in Fall of 2022. Of the six all were teacher residents of color. We will be analyzing NExT data in the fall and compare residency student entry and exit surveys to other teacher pathways to assess differences in the residency teacher pathway.

As stated above, given the 2020-2021 school year, the **retention rate for graduates** of the residency program in their first year of teaching is exceptional at 94% and 93%. From these cohorts, two teachers did not finish the year and will not be returning to teaching in the district in the fall. They may choose to teach in other districts and we will document their path. It's difficult to know which activities or combination of activities contributed to this retention rate. This grant funded affinity groups and navigating pairs. Of the graduates in the first year of teaching 9 served as a navigator to a resident. This giving back and having leadership opportunities early on in their teaching careers reduces social isolation, increases reflection, and provides practice in talking about teaching, all with the goal towards retention. We will be analyzing NEXT data in the fall and compare residency graduate Transition to Teaching and Supervisor survey data to determine other impacts of these initiatives on retention.

Finally, our **retention rate for mentors** ranged from 82% for SUTR and 92% for MSTR. During the year, most of the residents stayed with their mentor for the entire school year. We did have some residents (1 in MSTR and switch to a new mentors for a variety of reasons, primarily related to distance learning models and not receiving sufficient practice with instructional models or perceptions around quality of coaching from mentors. Mentors participated in a half-day orientation and then monthly professional development led by our district partners throughout the school year. They also collaborate monthly with university supervisors/student teacher coaches throughout the year. In the fall we will receive NCTR end of year survey data to determine the impact of mentoring and PD on the mentors.

In summary, the program data of high retention rates for residents, graduates, and mentors is promising. We have ongoing work to do to continue to support residents and new teachers and recruit a more diverse pool of mentor teachers. One new initiative we started for SUTR this June is to invite the graduates to lead some of the community building with the new residents. This provides immediate connections across cohorts and will help us transition to our newest navigating pairs for the upcoming school year. We are hopeful that as our residency graduates are eligible to serve as mentor teachers, to help to diversify the pool.

# Teacher Mentorship & Retention of Effective Teachers Grant Additional Reporting Requirements

#### **Retention Strategies**

Per Minn. Stat. § 122A.70, a school district that receives a grant must negotiate additional retention strategies for teachers who are of color or who are American Indian in their beginning years of employment, such as financial incentives for working in the school/district for at least five years or providing collegial support through teacher placement. Please describe the strategies your organization developed.

The University is the lead for this grant and not required to meet this statute. However, through this grant, we have been able to pair colleagues for support to help navigate systems and provide leadership opportunities to graduates. We also provide regularly scheduled affinity groups for graduates and mentors.

#### **Additional Funding**

Please list any and all additional funding you used to support teacher mentorship and retention efforts. Specify if these funds were used to support teachers new to the profession or district, including teaching residents, teachers of color, teachers who are American Indian, teachers in license shortage areas, teachers with special needs, and/or experienced teachers in need of peer coaching.

As stated earlier in this report, we have a Black Educators Initiative (BEI) grant through NCTR to support some of these activities for residents and mentors who identify as Black. Our district partners also have PAR mentors, induction support specialists, and district sponsored new teacher achievement of tenure activities.

# **Teacher Mentorship & Retention of Effective Teachers Grant Funds Expenditure**

**Table 3: Grant Funds Expenditure** 

Amount	Description of Use of Funds	Primarily Used for:	Method of Progress Monitoring	Data
Budgeted \$23,000 Spent \$21,280	Mentor Teacher Payments	□Induction	Participating in mentoring activities, including PD # of mentors of color # of mentors who are residency graduates	4 mentors of color 1 resident grad 2021 2 resident grads 2022
\$13,000	NT 1 1	X Mentoring X Induction	pair matches	47 navigating pair matches to start the year; 41 matches; Bi-monthly satisfaction data
\$12,000	Payment to districts to support affinity groups	X Induction	and	8 meetings throughout the year Retention data presented earlier in the report
CHANGE TO ORIGINAL BUDGET \$500	Launching of Navigating Pairs for the '21-22 school year in summer of '21 with two events.	X Mentoring X Induction	# of events and participation at events.	2 events in July 2021
CHANGE TO THE ORIGINAL BUDGET \$1220	Mentorship support for new program graduates during the fall of '21	□Induction	# of navigating pair matches Survey data on impact Retention data	3 navigating pairs matches for graduates of the program in the fall of '21.