

## **Executive Summary**

### **NCIPP Advisory Board Meeting – December 2008**

#### **Agenda and Summaries**

##### *Presentations*

1. Introduction- Bonnie Jones

This brief introduction provided background on OSEP's vision for the center.

2. Overview – Mary Brownell

This presentation provided an overview of NCIPP, including its significance, purpose, partner organizations, strategic outcomes, and goals. An overview of the logic model and NCIPP's scope of work was also discussed.

3. Induction and Mentoring- Bonnie Billingsley

In this presentation, an overview of the literature synthesis was provided, including the nature of the studies reviewed, major findings, and notable limitations. Descriptions of mentor programs and the effects of mentoring research were also given. Finally, solutions for instruction and technology, including the promising aspects of e-mentoring were discussed.

A discussion was held centering on questions related to current special education induction programs. Solutions for induction and technology, and its promises for helping special educators were also highlighted.

4. Collaboration- Marleen Pugach

This presentation gave an overview of the literature related to the following four questions: (1) How are novice special education teachers situated within the concept and practice of professional learning communities? (2) What roles do building principals play in creating school communities that support the induction of SETs? (3) What professional development practices might best serve as a vehicle for improving the quality of new SET's practice? and (4) What is the role of co-teaching/teaming as a collaborative enterprise for the induction of SETs?

The discussion following the presentation related to issues about special education instruction, how teachers are prepared, supports teachers need, and benefits for students. A question was also addressed concerning the policies overriding the issues of large and small school divisions.

## 5. University Partnerships- Erica McCray

This presentation provided information on the purposes of school and university partnerships, and an overview of the research on the two main types of partnership structures – alternative certification programs and professional development schools (PDSs). The main features, contextual supports, and outcomes of both partnership structures were described, in addition to how these partnerships address issues related to special education.

The discussion focused on conjecture about the best possible scenario for training teachers and research in this area.

## 6. Policy Analysis- Paul Sindelar

This session presented the findings of the analysis on state policies on induction and mentoring. An overview was provided on how state policies address mentor selection and training, program delivery, evaluation, and accountability. Four states (Illinois, Ohio, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania) were highlighted as addressing all induction provisions, and a brief description was provided on each of these programs.

A discussion following the presentation focused on how NCIPP plans to operate for a probability of success. Patterns found with mentors and teachers in similar programs, and current policies were identified as ways to help guide the current project.

### *Soliciting Advice*

#### 1. Website- Meg Kamman and Sean Smith

The purpose of this activity was to allow AB members to provide feedback on the NCIPP website. Specifically, AB members were asked to provide feedback on the following dimensions of the website: aesthetics of design, ease of navigation, and the utility of features.

After reviewing the website, AB members reported the aesthetics of design appeared visually clean and simple, had a nice format, good pictures and color, and was generally intuitive. Suggestions for the aesthetics included making the font larger and darker, and placing the top navigation bar on the yellow vertical panel on the homepage. AB members identified several features that may enhance the ease of navigation of the website. Such features included making a darker column text on the homepage, making the home page more prominent, including navigation buttons on all pages, and including a mission statement on the homepage. AB members liked the audience portals and internal search engine.

Responses for the utility of features included the following: making the partnerships more prominent, including the mission statement on the first page, spelling out US Office of SpEd Programs under the IDEA logo, listing contacts, chunking papers (10-15 pgs), capturing data matters, including “NCIPP” after its official name, and including links to related sites. AB members found the “start here” as a nice addition.

AB members also provided additional suggestions. These included alphabetizing the list of partner centers, posting a photo of Meg, having a voluntary registry, using tabs for different stakeholders, and making it clearer from the homepage that the focus is Induction and listing the four areas under it.

## 2. Important Information and Vehicles for Dissemination- Paul Sindelar

The purpose of this activity was to gain insight from AB members about the information their audiences’ need, based on what they knew about our syntheses and policy analysis. In addition, AB members were also asked to provide recommendations for the vehicles in which to disseminate that information.

Some suggestions for needed information included: pairing research to briefs, breaking the topics into subtopics, making the information more practitioner-friendly, and highlighting effective practices for new teachers. Other important information identified included: state policies on mentoring/induction, quality indicators of mentoring/induction, contact info/description of exemplars, links to SIG supported mentoring/induction supported projects, and teacher education policy updates/exemplary models. Also, different models of implementation at higher education levels, research briefs for teacher educators, executive summaries, information for superintendents and principals, information on parent centers, comparative information on policy and practice (using a matrix or summary), and reports translating research into application were identified as important pieces of information to include.

Vehicles suggested by AB members for disseminating the information included: tables/charts on elements of state policies by state, attending/presenting at annual conferences (i.e., AACTE), briefs with various target audiences, webinars, newsletters, UCEA (the conference and their newsletters), listservs, e-newsletters, news releases for target audience, podcasts, audio messages, videos, PowerPoint presentations, and youtube.com. Someone also suggested contacting Google.com to make a keyword agreement so people can find the website with greater ease.

## 3. Next Steps via Different Stakeholders- Mary Brownell

*Deans and Department Chairs*

Advisory Board members recommended that Deans and Department Chairs would need certain types of evidence to willingly engage in partnerships with schools that focused on the induction of beginning special education teachers. Such evidence would include both improved student achievement outcomes (i.e., participating beginning teachers were able to secure better student achievement gains) and beginning teacher outcomes (e.g., improved classroom practice, improved ability to collaborate, improved knowledge of special education practice). In addition, to these value-added outcomes, deans and chairs would probably be convinced if these programs produced graduates who were desirable to hiring districts, or if peer institutions were implementing exemplary induction programs and they felt compelled to do the same. Finally, deans and chairs must be convinced that programs are affordable, feasible, and aligned with accreditation requirements (e.g., NCATE) as well as state and federal policy. If induction programs are an add on and they do not reap clear benefits, then deans and chairs are unlikely to support them.

#### *District Administrator*

The conversation from the District administrator's perspective focused on feasibility and how programs will help their schools and districts meet AYP and accountability standards. Specifically, administrators would want to know how to implement and sustain programs, the cost-benefit of these activities, and the opportunity to see successful programs with similar contexts being executed. At an operational level, administrators would want the roles and functions for all involved clearly delineated. Further, building partnerships with key stakeholders would be key. From a cost and sustainability standpoint, they would want to know what the essential components are and how to build an infrastructure that included a data/feedback loop to ensure continuous improvement.

#### *State Policymakers*

The Advisory Board identified several measures of importance to state policy makers. They believed these stakeholders would be keenly interested in cost effectiveness and the impact of induction on teacher retention, reduced hiring costs, and improved teacher quality—and the impact of these outcomes on student achievement. In addition to feasibility, they are concerned with the simplicity of administration and benefits that may accrue to district and local implementers. State policy makers must attend to such considerations as the extent to which the program connects with the broader state agenda and whether it complies with federal legislation. They must consider the constituencies—and the breadth of constituencies—that support the induction program and appreciate the political consequences of supporting it—or not. State policy makers are concerned with research, particularly when statewide assessments are used as an outcome measure, or when value-added methodology is employed. They need and would benefit from a functioning exemplar of good induction programming.

### *Teachers*

The advisory board identified numerous factors of importance to teachers, both the mentor and mentee. They believed mentors would be interested in a variety of issues. Specifically the characteristics of effective mentors, tools and training mentors need to support beginners, advantages mentors might receive in the mentoring process and how mentors can be assessed and assess beginning teachers. The advisory board also provided insight into the views of the mentee. The beginners would be concerned with how mentoring could fit into their schedule and assist in instruction and impacting students. The advisory board recommended future research must recognize teacher learning as a phase, documenting growth along with successes and barriers. Additionally, documenting specific support structures as well as school cultural components are essential. Finally, creating a rubric on induction and mentoring with the important components on different levels might be of assistance.

### *Teacher Educators*

Advisory Board members identified a series of questions teacher educators would want answered. Which instructional practices will successfully carry over into LEA-level classroom practice? What “processes” for supporting new teachers e-mentoring transfer well from IHE prep to LEA practice? Which practices do LEA/IHE have in common that make a difference with kids and best teacher practice? What type of follow up is desirable? Are key sets of practices being implemented with fidelity? What are the implications for pre-service preparation? How does it work with Distance Ed and for grads that move away?

#### 4. Promising Programs, Resources, and Links – handout

The purpose of this handout was to solicit information from AB members regarding any promising induction and mentoring programs they know of in special education, providing information about resources that might be helpful to NCIPP, and describing efforts they are involved in that naturally link to NCIPP.

AB members identified six promising programs, reasons why they were promising or exemplary, and contact information. AB members also identified helpful resources including: CEC induction and mentoring standards, various organization websites (i.e., aacte.org), attend organization annual meetings, AACTE webinars, *Keeping Quality Teachers* document, IDEA Partnership “shared work” website, parent focus groups, and e-news. Finally, AB members described efforts that they or their organization are currently involved that link to NCIPP’s goals. Such efforts included the CTQ project, CCSSO, WVU’s distance education program, highlighting NCIPP

in the PACE e-newsletter, discussing NCIPP issues at PACE meetings, and linking the PACE website with NCIPP's.

### **Advisory Board Meeting Evaluation provided by John McLaughlin**

The interactive structure, varied agenda with a good balance of presentation and interaction, chart work, and feedback from the board all contributed to the success of the Advisory Board Meeting. The meeting was compiled of 3 individuals from TA&D, 2 from IHE, and 7 individuals from other organizations. The survey results indicated that 100% of those who returned the survey "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they understand both the goals of NCIPP and how NCIPP's role may aid their organization. Furthermore, 100% of those surveyed "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that the meeting enabled them to provide input into future NCIPP plans and allowed them to network and collaborate with others whom they presently work with or may work with in the future. Based on a scale of 1-10 (1 being "Very Unsatisfied" and 10 be "Very Satisfied"), those surveyed felt that in comparison to other Advisory Board Meetings they had attended they were very satisfied (5% chose 7, 35% chose 9, and 60% chose 10).

The survey also allowed the opportunity to provide suggestions for improvement of future meetings. It was suggested some pre-reading material (including the papers themselves) be sent out before the meeting so that there could be more time to discuss other issues. It was also recommended that induction and other abbreviations be defined upfront to reduce potential confusion. Finally, it was recommended that the presentations be a little more concise and that the teacher unions are recognized in the NCIPP plan.

The final domain the survey addressed was the perceived usefulness of the literature syntheses. The analysis of those surveyed indicates that they found: the Induction and Mentoring syntheses to be "Very Useful" (N=2) and "Extremely Useful" (N=6); the Collaboration syntheses be "Very Useful" (N=5 ) and "Extremely Useful" (N=3); the University Partnerships syntheses to be "Very Useful" (N=5) and "Extremely Useful" (N=3); and finally, the State Policy synthesis to be "A little Useful (N=1), "Very Useful" (N=2), and "Extremely Useful" (N=5).

### **Advisory Board Action Items**

#### *Currently Addressed*

Adjustments currently being made to website include: corrections in partner centers and contact information; addition of mission statement to home page; change of text color; and adding related site page. A follow-up is being conducted on each of the suggested promising programs.

*Upcoming*

When the research syntheses and policy review finish revisions, NCIPP will collaborate with Cynthia Warger to create numerous dissemination formats, using the advisory board suggestions as a guide. The NCIPP team will also consider the advisory board viewpoints of stakeholders when planning the evaluation study.