

Connecting Wisconsin Mentors with the Wisconsin Teacher Standards:
Importance, Ease, and Preparation

Tom Ganser
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Wisconsin Research Seminar
Closing the Gap: Highly Qualified to Highly Effective

June 17, 2008

Wisconsin Dells, Wisconsin

Feedback, comments, questions, and reactions are welcomed by the authors:

Tom Ganser
Office of Field Experiences
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
800 West Main Street
Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190 USA

Phone: 262-472-1123
Email: gansert@uww.edu

Connecting Wisconsin Mentors with the Wisconsin Teacher Standards:

Importance, Ease, and Preparation

Tom Ganser

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

This is a study of mentors of beginning teachers. The population consists of 169 Wisconsin participants where standards have been required in teacher preparation programs since 2000 and where since August, 2004, school districts have been required to provide mentors for beginning teachers issued an Initial Educator license. Participants were identified as having served as a mentor for at least one beginning teacher.

Data were collected through a survey consisting of demographic items and Likert-type items related to the participants' perceptions regarding (1) the importance of each standard for beginning teachers, (2) how easy it is for them to work with beginning teachers in terms of each standard, and (3) how well prepared they are for working with beginning in term of each standard; and additional written comments.

Results for participants indicate that they rated the importance of standards for their beginning teachers as 4.49 (5=important 1=unimportant), their ease in working with beginning teachers in terms of standards as 3.68 (5=easy 1=difficult), and their preparation for working with beginning teachers in terms of standards as 4.27 (5=well prepared 1=not prepared).

Additional analysis was conducted with respect to rank order by teacher standards (in terms of importance, ease, and preparation) according to age, gender, years of teaching experience, level and type of teaching assignment, training, and number of mentees served.

Connecting Wisconsin Mentors with the Wisconsin Teacher Standards:

Importance, Efficacy, and Preparation

Tom Ganser

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

This paper reports of an investigation of the perceptions of mentors of beginning teachers in the context of newly adopted teacher standards regarding (1) the importance of the standards for the beginning teachers, (2) how easy it is for mentors to work with novices within the context of the standards, and (3) how well prepared mentors are for working with novices within the context of the standards.

Mentoring in the United States

Mentoring programs have become a predictable and often expected type of support offered to beginning teachers in the United States. Although the number of programs has grown exponentially within the last several years, formalized mentoring programs as the most common feature of teacher induction programs have been in existence for at least 40 years (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999; Ganser, 2005). Smith and Ingersoll (2004) report that participation in induction programs by beginning teachers has doubled from about 40% in 1990-91 to about 80% in 1999-2000. At least 19 states require mentoring as part of alternative route certification programs (Education Week, 2003) and that 33 states mandate mentoring programs for beginning teachers as part of the teacher licensing system (Hall, 2005). Incorporating mentoring into licensing makes it far more of a “high-stakes” venture than in the past, when mentoring programs were a desirable albeit optional part of staff development efforts. Finally, teacher mentoring and induction programs in the United States should be viewed as part of a global phenomenon (Cullingford, 2006; Britton, Paine, Pimm, & Raizen, 2003; Kochan & Pascarelli, 2003; Moskowitz & Stephens, 1997; Wong, Britton, & Ganser, 2005).

Wang and Odell’s (2002) literature review suggests that the origins of mentoring programs reflect a “humanistic perspective” emphasizing the mentor providing a novice teacher with psychological and emotional support. In this approach to mentoring, the mentor functions an advisor or counselor “who helps novices to solve their personal problems, redefine their needs as teachers, and feel comfortable about teaching” (p. 493). In many respects, this is a view of

mentoring that comes naturally to veteran teachers serving as mentors and stands at the heart of mentoring as a naturally emerging phenomenon. Wang and Odell (2002) characterize mentoring that moves beyond a “How are things going?” conversation in the faculty lounge to an interest in the practical knowledge and know-how involved in carrying on the work of teaching as a “situated apprenticeship perspective.” At this level, mentoring adds to psychological and emotional support concern with “the acquisition of techniques and skills necessary for teaching, knowing the available resources for teaching, and understanding the contexts and cultures of teaching” (p. 496). Mentors are viewed not only in the role of counselor but also as experts with strong practical knowledge about teaching. Finally, Wang and Odell (2002) describe a “critical constructivist perspective” for mentoring in which mentors function as change agents who help novices to critique “existing knowledge and structures and the cultures of teaching and schooling” and to develop “new ideas and assumptions about teaching” (p. 498). This perspective does not replace the humanistic and situated apprenticeship perspectives, but rather builds upon them.

Teacher Standards and Mentoring in the United States

From an historical perspective, formal mentoring programs have evolved over their history, spanning more than a generation of teachers, due to a number of developments, including changes in the characteristics of beginning teachers, the emergence of alternative teacher certification programs (Feistritzer, 2008), and complex supply and demand issues related to teaching (Ganser, 2002a; Ganser, 2006b). Most recently, the emergence of teacher/teaching standards, as a development of K-12 curriculum standards (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999), is starting to have a significant impact on mentor programs.

Teacher/teaching standards represent a profound shift in how teaching is viewed from a practice rooted in individualistic cultures of individuals and organization (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986) to a profession guided by shared, general principles. Accordingly, mentoring is being conceptualized in terms teacher/teaching standards that are packaged in a variety of ways (e.g., Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2002). For example, in an ambitious attempt to articulate standards for quality mentoring, Odell and Huling (2000) call for aligning the underlying purposes for mentoring, the initial preparation and ongoing professional development of mentors, and mentor’s views of

roles and relationship to novice teachers with professional standards for teaching and learning. Other examples of standards for mentoring can be found in Portner (2008) and [NTC, Richard Strong, ???]

Noting that “teaching and teacher education have entered an era of standards-based teaching (p. 2), Sato (2006) cautions that this is “new territory for most teachers and mentors” (p. 5). More importantly, support for mentoring based on standards is uneven, at best. On the one hand, even though “new teacher induction programs are required by state law to include mentors . . . little guidance or support exists for districts beyond this requirement” (Basile, 2006, p. 16). Hughes (2006) points to a “glaring omission” from mentor training in Virginia in categories incorporated in the state’s *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents*” (p. 270).

Most typically, mentors work with teachers who are newly licensed in systems aligned with teacher standards that are often variations of the INTASC model standards (Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992), as in the case of the Wisconsin Educator Standards (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2000). Wang, Odell, and Strong (2006) find evidence that without substantial mentor preparation, “novice-mentor conversations alone, even in induction programs, are unlikely to be fully effective in supporting novice teachers’ focus on standards-based teaching” (p. 141). Rowley (2006) argues that mentors who dismiss or condemn new licensing requirements based on standards fail because they cannot help novices prepare for a required entry-year assessment process based on standards and as a result communicate “a lack of caring for the mentee facing a significant and often anxiety-provoking event” (p. 161).

The evidence is growing that induction programs lower the rates of turnover among beginning teachers (Guarino, Santibanex, & Daley, 2006), especially when mentoring is complemented with other forms of beginning teacher assistance, such as common planning time, seminars for beginning teachers, and participation in external networks of teachers (Smith and Ingersoll, 2004). However, there often appears to be a “disconnect” between mentoring and the teaching/teacher standards which are part of newer systems of teacher preparation and licensing. For example, the standards that today are central to teacher preparation and licensing probably played a far less prominent role – or none at all – in the preparation and licensing of the experienced teachers who serve as mentors.

Teacher Standards and Mentoring in Wisconsin

The preparation and licensing of teachers in Wisconsin changed dramatically with the implementation of *Wisconsin Administrative Code: Chapter PI 34, Teacher Education Program Approval and Licenses* (hereafter, PI 34) in 2000 (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2000). PI 34, about 8 years in the making, replaced a largely “input” model of teacher preparation and licensing with a far more performance-based “output” model. A central feature of PI 34 was the introduction of three sets of Wisconsin Educator Standards for (1) teachers, (2) school administrators, and (3) student support services (e.g., school counselors). With respect to teachers, the standards adopted are minor modifications of the INTASC model standards (Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992). The standards for administrators and support service personnel begin with and build upon the teacher standards.

PI 34 significantly alters both the preparation and the licensing of teachers. With respect to preparation, the approval of programs by DPI requires evidence (beginning in 2000) that they are based on the Wisconsin standards, or on an alternative set of standards approved by DPI. With respect to licensing, PI 34 introduced a new licensing system based on three tiers of licenses: (1) Initial Educator (3-5 year, non-renewable), (2) Professional Educator (5 year, renewable), and (3) Master Educator (10 year, renewable). Importantly, PI 34 changed license renewal from evidence of having earned 6 graduate credits, or a combination of graduate credit and “equivalency clock hours,” to the design, implementation, and approval of a “Professional Development Plan” based on the standards.

Teachers issued an Initial Educator license must develop a Professional Development Plan that must be approved as appropriate by a three-person team including another teacher, a school administrator, and a representative of higher education. The team members are required to be trained by DPI for their roles and responsibilities, and this training includes information on the Wisconsin Educator Standards. To qualify for the next, “Professional Educator” license, the same team or a newly assembled team must verify completion of the plan. PI 34 also requires school districts to provide at least two support seminars related to standards and to provide the Initial Educator with a “qualified, trained mentor” for at least one year. “Qualified” is described as having an appropriate license, and “trained” is described as being able to support, assist, and provide feedback to the beginning teacher. To support the implementation of PI 34, DPI has

developed supplementary handbooks (e.g., Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2005; Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2007).

For the context of this study, it is important to note that beginning teachers issued Initial Educator licenses “grew up” with the Wisconsin Educator Standards during their preparation programs, but this generally is not the case with their mentors. Although PI 34 permit teachers licensed under the old system (six graduate credits for license renewal) to switch to the new system (Professional Development Plan linked to standards for license renewal), most experienced teachers have opted to remain with the old system. Accordingly, veteran teachers often have very little, if any, direct and meaningful experience with the standards reflecting their own preparation or how they renew their license. For them, familiarity with the standards comes most directly in training to serve on a Professional Development Plan team and probably as part of mentor training since one mentor role is to facilitate mentees in designing a Professional Development Plan. However, increasing numbers of school districts have modified their district evaluation procedure to reflect the standards and often inservice activities link topics and activities to the standards. Consequently, teachers in these districts cannot escape first-hand experience with the standards.

Data Sources

This study is based on a mailed survey. The survey consisted of three parts:

1. Background/demographic information.
2. Three sets of 10 Likert-type items (five-point scale) with the following prompts for each of the ten Wisconsin Educator Standards:
 - (A) Based on your experience as a mentor, **how important** do you believe each of the following Teacher Standards is for beginning teachers in general? [Scale: 5 = Important to 1 = Unimportant]
 - (B) Based on your experience as a mentor, **how easy or difficult** is it for you to assist beginning teachers in developing their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to each of the following Teacher Standards? [Scale: 5 = Easy to 1 = Difficult]
 - (C) Based on your experience, **how well prepared** are you in each of the following Teacher Standards *to work as a mentor* with beginning teachers? [Scale: 5 = Well prepared 1 = Not prepared]

3. Space was provided for additional comments about mentoring in general or about mentoring as related to the three sets of items described in 2.

Participants

Names of 298 persons serving as mentors for beginning teachers in a formal mentoring program in Wisconsin during 2005-06 were provided by the school district administrator (superintendent), the director of school-district mentoring/induction program, or a school principal in a convenience sample of 25 Wisconsin public school districts (out of a total of 426 districts). 2004-05 enrollment in the 25 districts ranged from 153 to 13,318 ($M = 2,809$, $SD = 3025$, Median = 2577). Eliminating the two largest school districts with enrollments exceeding 10,000 results in a mean enrollment of 2013, a standard deviation of 1241, and a median enrollment of 1989 for the remaining 23 school district. Surveys were sent to all 298 individuals. An email message and a second survey was mailed to individuals not responding to the first mailing. Of the 186 surveys returned, 17 were eliminated (e.g., served as mentor for a school counselor, not teacher), resulting in 169 usable surveys. The response rate for the participants was 60.1 % (169 out of 281).

Among the 169 participants, the average age was 44 years. Slightly more than three-quarters of the participants are female. In terms of teaching experience, they averaged nearly 18 years of experience. More than 4 in 5 of the participants identified themselves as regular education teachers, whereas about 1 in ten identified themselves as special education teachers. Almost 39 % of the participants work in an elementary school, almost 16 % in a middle school, and slightly more than 41 % in a high school; seven participants indicating having a multi-level assignment (i.e., elementary/middle, middle/high, elementary/middle/high). With respect to training, 127 (75 %) reported having participated in mentor training, by itself or along with Professional Development Team training or training to serve as a cooperating teacher for student teachers (as required by PI 34). Among the 169 participants, three indicated having participated in only in Professional Development Team training and 17 in cooperating teacher training only. Twenty-one (12 %) participants indicated having received no training whatsoever (i.e., mentor, Professional Development Team, cooperating teacher).

The 169 participants reported having worked with a total of 569 mentees ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 5.63$), including 98 mentees with an Initial Educator license ($M = 1.89$, $SD = 3.01$). The number of mentees served by participants ranged from 1 to 40. If one eliminates the six

participants who worked with 20 or more mentees (specifically, 20, 21, 30, 31, and 40), the remaining 163 participants served 393 mentees ($M = 2.41$, $SD = 2.26$, Range 1 to 15), including 132 Initial Educators ($M = 1.43$, $SD = 1.16$).

See Table 1 for additional information about the participants.

Findings

The findings of this study are reported in a series of tables displaying the number, means, standard deviation, and rank order (based on means) of the ratings assigned by the participants. Generally, the tables are presented in sets of three, one each for the ratings regarding the IMPORTANCE of each standard for beginning teachers, the EASE for the participant as mentor in working with a beginning teacher in terms of each standard and one for the PREPARATION of the participant for working with novices with respect to each standard. The higher the mean, the more important the standard, the easier the work, and the better the preparation; the lower the mean, the less important the standard, the more difficult the work, and the poorer the preparation.

Tables 2-4	All Participants	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Tables 5-7	Participants by Age	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Tables 8-10	Participants by Gender	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Tables 11-13	Participants by Teaching Experience	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Tables 14-16	Participants by School Level	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Tables 17-19	Participants by Teaching Assignment	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Tables 20-22	Participants by Mentor Training	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Tables 23-25	Participants by PDP Training	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Tables 26-28	Participants by Mentees Served	Importance, Ease, Preparation
Table 29	All Participants	Summary Table of Means only

In addition, several tables displays the results by rank order in terms of the three standards assigned the highest means and the three standards assigned the lowest means. Due to ties in rank order, in fourteen cases four rank orders are displayed and in two cases five rank orders are displayed.

Table 30	All Participants	Summary Table by Rank Order
Table 31	All Participants and by Sub-Group	Importance by High Rank Order
Table 32	All Participants and by Sub-Group	Importance by Low Rank Order
Table 33	All Participants and by Sub-Group	Ease by High Rank Order

Table 34	All Participants and by Sub-Group	Ease by Low Rank Order
Table 35	All Participants and by Sub-Group	Preparation by High Rank Order
Table 36	All Participants and by Sub-Group	Preparation by Low Rank Order
Table 37	All Participants	Summary Table by High/Low Rank Order

Results

Two aspects of the results of this study are discussed below, overall means of ratings for Importance, Ease, and Preparation and rank order for Importance, Ease, and Preparation by individual standard.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 display the mean ratings for participants, and rank order based on mean rating.

The mean rating for the Importance of all the standards for beginning teachers among participants is 4.49 (SD 0.73). The mean ratings range from a high of 4.75 (SD 0.51) for Standard 3 (Teachers understand that children learn differently) to a low of 4.39 for Standard 8 (SD 0.72) (Teachers know how to test for student progress) and for Standard 10 (SD 0.69) (Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community).

The mean rating for the Ease for participants in working with beginning teachers with respect to the standards is 3.68 (SD 0.99). The mean ratings range from a high of 3.86 (SD 0.93) for Standard 7 (Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons) to a low of 3.52 (SD 1.00) for Standard 9 (Teachers are able to evaluate themselves).

The mean rating for the extent of Preparation the participants perceive they have for working with beginning teachers is 4.27 (SD 0.86). The mean ratings range from a high of 4.41 (SD 0.81) for Standard 5 (Teachers know how to manage a classroom) to a low of 4.13 (SD 0.92) for Standard 9 (Teachers are able to evaluate themselves).

Tables 5 through 28 display the N, Means, Standard Deviation, and Rank Order for each of the standards with respect to Importance, Ease, and Preparation for eight sub-groups based on (1) Gender, (2) Age, (3) Teaching Experience, (4) School Level, (5) Teaching Assignment, (6) Mentor Training, (7) Professional Development Team Training, and (8) Mentees served. These tables also display the overall N, Means, and Standard deviations for all items.

Table 29 displays the overall means for all the participants and by eight subgroups based on (1) Gender, (2) Age, (3) Teaching Experience, (4) School Level, (5) Teaching Assignment, (6) Mentor Training, (7) Professional Development Team Training, and (8) Mentees served. The

overall means for the Importance of the standards ranges from a high of 4.66 among participants who have worked with 10 or more mentees to a low of 4.48 among male respondents. The overall rating for the Ease of working with beginning teachers in terms of the standards ranges from a high of 3.84 among participants who have received PDP training to a low of 3.32 among male participants. Finally, the overall rating for Preparation in working with beginning teachers in terms of the standards ranges from a high of 4.42 among participants who are older than 48 and who have more than 25 years of teaching experience to a low of 4.02 among male participants. In addition, Table 29 reveals that the differences in subgroup means range from a high difference of 0.46 between female and male participants in terms of Ease, to virtually no difference (0.01) between regular education and special education teachers with respect to Importance and between teachers who have and who have not received Professional Development Team Training with respect to Importance, and (0.03) between regular and special education teachers with respect to Ease.

Establishing as a significant difference in subgroup means of at least 0.20, Table 29 shows no significant differences among the subgroups in terms of beliefs about the Importance of the standards for beginning teachers. However, with respect to Ease, female teachers who have participated in Professional Development Team training find working with beginning teachers in terms of the standards easier than other participants. In addition, in terms of Preparation, male teachers, ages 39 to 48, with up to ten years of teaching experience and no mentor training believe they are less prepared for working with beginning teachers in terms of the standards than other participants.

Table 31 displays the rank order for the participants according to mean rating. Tables 31-36 display the mean ratings for the participants according to high or low rank order. “High” rank order was defined as a ranking of 1, 2, or 3 and “low” rank order was defined as 8, 9, or 10. In 14 cases, the number of standards considered “high” or “low” by rank was extended to four standards due to ties and in two cases to five standards due to ties. As a group, Tables 31-36 suggest that there is considerable similarity in rank order across subgroups. The most similar ranking is shown in Table 32 (Importance – Low Rank Order) where there are only 10 outliers, and half of these outliers are found in Standard 2 (Teachers know how children grow). The least similarity of ranking is shown in Table 34 (Ease – Low Rank Order) where there are 24 outliers, with five of these outliers found in Standard 6 (Teachers communicate well), five in Standard 10

(Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community), and six in Standard 4 (Teachers know how to teach).

If one considers a difference of at least four rank order places lower between a standard in terms of Importance and in terms of either Ease or Preparation, three noticeable “gaps” emerge between how participants ranked the Importance of the standards and either the Ease and/or the Preparation for working with a beginning teacher in terms of the standard. There were 20 significant gaps in Standard 1 (Teachers know the subject they are teaching)--13 representing Importance/Ease gaps and seven representing Importance/Preparation gaps. There were 15 significant gaps in Standard 9 (Teachers are able to evaluate themselves)—seven representing Importance/Ease gaps and eight representing Importance/Preparation gaps. There were 10 significant gaps in Standard 6 (Teachers communicate well). In addition, there were six, four, five, and seven significant gaps in Standards 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively, and there were no significant gaps in Standards 5, 7, and 9.

Table 30 presents a summary of rank order for the participants. There are three instances of noticeable gaps in rank order. First, the participants rank Standard 1 (Teachers know the subject the are teaching) high in terms of Importance but low in terms of Ease. Second, participants rank Standard 7 (Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons) low in terms of Importance but high in terms of Ease. Third, participants also rank Standard 9 (Teachers know how to test for student progress) high in terms of Ease but low in terms of Importance.

Reflection

Building on the work of this paper’s author and reflecting Wang and Odell’s (2002) keen insights, it is reasonable to view formalized mentoring programs for beginning teachers as having reached a third generation. The first generation of mentoring programs was focused largely on emotional support and helping beginning teachers to “make it” though the day, the week, the month, the semester, the year. In some ways, this called for mentors to do what comes naturally. The second generation of mentoring programs added to the mix greater emphasis on effective teaching. From this perspective, mentoring was inadequate if it seldom reached beyond the “How’s it going?” level. Today’s targets for third generation mentoring continue to focus on effective teaching, but as viewed within the framework of teacher standards, particularly in Wisconsin. Teacher standards provide today’s mentors with a way to think about teaching and to

organize their work as mentors. This is still very much a work in progress, however, since the majority of mentors were prepared for teaching before the emergence of teacher standards and for whom continuing licensing and often the district-based evaluation system is not associated with the Wisconsin Teacher Standards, at least not in any direct way. Consequently, unlike the teachers issued an “Initial Educator” license, many mentors are still coming to terms with teacher standards in their own work and as related to mentoring. Still, a great deal of progress has been made in the last five years to offset as a predictable response to any mention of the Wisconsin Teacher Standards, “The what . . . ?”

This study is clearly based on the perceptions of mentors, but the importance of perceptions should not be underestimated. After the mentor training is over, mentors are on their own, and their decision to get involved in the work of their mentees or to stand off to the side and let things unfold, is largely a private matter based on perceptions. Similarly, how mentors get involved in the work of their mentees, should they decide to, is also a personal decision that is influenced by perceptions. It seems reasonable that mentors will tend to focus on some teacher standards rather than others based on how important they believe the standards are for beginning teachers. This tendency is probably more pronounced in the case of mentors whose teaching responsibilities remain the same or nearly the same despite mentoring responsibilities than in the case of full time mentors. Similarly, most mentors are likely to be drawn to activities related to standards for which they feel prepared and which they think will be relatively easy. Conversely, mentors are likely to avoid standards which they feel are unimportant, which are difficult, or for which they feel ill prepared.

This study is one-sided, to be sure, since it does not document the perceptions of beginning teachers regarding the importance of specific teacher standards in their work, how well prepared they are for those standards, or how easy it might be for them to work with their mentor in terms of particular standards. The notion of “gaps” between perceptions of importance, easy, and preparation that emerges in this study suggests that there may also be “gaps” between mentor and mentee in terms of how they view the standards. Differences in metaphors for mentoring (e.g., Mentoring as nurturing a seedling vs. Mentoring as a jump-starting a dead car battery; Ganser, 1998; Ganser 1999) can negatively impact the quality of a mentoring relationship. Similarly, if the views of mentors and their mentees regarding the

teacher standards as a superstructure for mentoring are divergent, the potential benefits of the Wisconsin Teacher Standards as a way of bringing some structure to mentoring will be considerably reduced.

There are at least two ways in which the “gaps” can and should be addressed – and increasingly are being addressed. Preparation for mentors should include a focus on the Wisconsin Teacher Standards that takes into account mentors prior experiences with the standards and a serious examination regarding their perceptions of the standards in terms of importance for beginning teachers; how well prepared they feel they are in the knowledge, skills and dispositions associated with the standard; and helping them to build up their confidence with respect to the standards. In addition, mentor programs should early on facilitate mentors and mentees in exploring the similarity of their perceptions of the standards in terms of importance, ease of addressing, and preparation.

The Wisconsin Teacher Standards are becoming a unifying force in both preservice and inservice teacher education, as well as in the conceptualization of “third generation” mentoring programs. Uncovering and examining perceptions about the standards in meaningful ways is essential to maximize the potential benefit.

References

- Basile, C. (2006). From mentoring to the Colorado New Educator Consortium. In J. R. Dangel (Ed.), *Research on Teacher Induction: Teacher Education Yearbook XIV*, pp. 5-18. Lahham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Britton, E., Paine, L., Pimm, D., & Raizen, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Systems for Early Career Learning*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kulwer Academic Press.
- Cullingford, C. (Ed.). (2006). *Mentoring in Education: An International Perspective*. London: Ashgate.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (Ed.). (1999). *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Education Week. (2003). *Quality Counts: If I Can't Learn from You. Ensuring a Qualified Teacher for Every Classroom*. Bethesda, MD: Author.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach, Lessons from an exemplary support teacher, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52 (1), pp 17-30.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. (1986). The culture of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 505-526). New York: Macmillan.
- Feistritzer, E. (2008). *Alternative Teacher Certification: A State-by-State Analysis*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.
- Ganser, T. (2002). Building the capacity of school districts to design, implement, and evaluate effective new teacher mentor programs: Action points for colleges and universities. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 10 (1), 4-55.
- Ganser, T. (2002). The new teacher mentors: Four trends that are changing the look of mentoring programs for new teachers. *American School Board Journal*, 189(12), 25-27.
- Ganser, T. (2005). Learning from the past—Building for the future. In H. Portner (Ed.), *Teacher Mentoring and Induction: The State of the Art and Beyond*, pp. 3-19. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Guarino, C. M., Santibanez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 173-208.
- Hall, J. L. (2005). Promoting quality programs through state-school relationships. In H. Portner (Ed.), *Teacher Mentoring and Induction: The State of the Art and Beyond*, pp. 213-223. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hughes, M. (2006). Practices and features in mentor training programs across Virginia. In J. R. Dangel (Ed), *Research on Teacher Induction: Teacher Education Yearbook XIV*, pp. 259-277. Lahham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium. (1992). Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development: A resource for state dialogue. Retrieved on May 29, 2008, from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>.

Kochan, F. K., & Pascarelli, J. T. (2003). *Global Perspectives on Mentoring: Transforming Contexts, Communities, and Cultures*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age.

Moskowitz, J., & Stephens, M. (1997). *From student of teacher to teacher of students: Teacher induction around the Pacific rim. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. Selected findings of the study*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved Ma7 29, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/APEC/findings.html>.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions. Retrieved on May 29, 2008, from <http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/NCATE%20Standards%202008.pdf>.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2002). What all teachers should know and be able to do. Retrieved on May 29, 2008, from http://www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/what_teachers.pdf.

Odell, S. J., & Huling, L. (2000). *Quality Mentoring for Novice Teachers*. Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Portner, H. (2008). *Mentoring New Teachers, 3rd edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rowley, J. B. (2006). *Becoming a High Performance Mentor: A Guide to Reflection and Action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sato, M. (2006). Introduction: Mentoring practitioners toward standards of excellence. In J. H. Shulman & M. Sato (Eds.), *Mentoring Teachers Toward Excellence: Supporting and Developing Highly Qualified Teachers*, pp. 1-11. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of teacher induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681-714).

Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach and standards-based teaching reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 481-546

Wang, J., Odell, S. J., & Strong, M. (2006). Conversations about teaching: Learning from three novice-mentor pairs. In J. R. Dangel (Ed), *Research on Teacher Induction: Teacher Education Yearbook XIV*, pp. 125-144. Lahham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI). (2000). *Wisconsin Administrative Code: Chapter PI 34, Teacher Education Program Approval and Licenses*. Wisconsin Administrative Register No. 532. Retrieved on May 29, 2008, from <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/p34.html>.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI). (2005). *Initial Educator Support System: District Guide*. Retrieved on May 29, 2008, from <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/pdf/iessdistrictguide.pdf>.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2007). *Professional Development Plan: Initial Educator Toolkit*. Retrieved on May 29, 2008, from <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/pdf/pdpinitialeducatortoolkit.pdf>

Wong, H. T., Britton, T., & Ganser, T. (2005). *What the world can teach us about new teacher induction*. Phi Delta Kappan, 86(5), 379-384.

SUBCHAPTER II - WISCONSIN STANDARDS

PI 34.02 Teacher Standards. To receive a license to teach in Wisconsin, an applicant shall complete an approved program and demonstrate proficient performance in the knowledge, skills and dispositions under all of the following standards:

- (1)** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the disciplines he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for pupils.
- (2)** The teacher understands how children with broad ranges of ability learn and provides instruction that supports their intellectual, social, and personal development.
- (3)** The teacher understands how pupils differ in their approaches to learning and the barriers that impede learning and can adapt instruction to meet the diverse needs of pupils, including those with disabilities and exceptionalities.
- (4)** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies, including the use of technology to encourage children's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.
- (5)** The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
- (6)** The teacher uses effective verbal and nonverbal communication techniques as well as instructional media and technology to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
- (7)** The teacher organizes and plans systematic instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, pupils, the community, and curriculum goals.
- (8)** The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the pupil.
- (9)** The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effect of his or her choices and actions on pupils, parents, professionals in the learning community and others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
- (10)** The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support pupil learning and well being and who acts with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.

Table 1 – Characteristics of Study Participants

Variable		Subgroups	N	Percent
AGE	25-38 years		56	33.7
	39-48 years		60	36.1
	49 + years		50	30.1
GENDER	Female		131	77.5
	Male		38	22.5
TEACHING EXPERIENCE	< 11 years		39	23.3
	11-25 years		90	53.9
	> 25 years		38	22.8
LEVEL	Elementary		65	38.9
	Elementary/Middle		3	1.8
	Middle		26	15.6
	Middle/High School		2	1.2
	High School		69	41.3
	Ele/Mid/High School		2	1.2
TYPE	Regular Ed		139	82.2
	Special Ed		21	12.4
	Other		9	5.3
TYPE OF TRAINING	Mentor only		46	27.2
	Cooperating Teach only		17	10.1
	PDP Team only		3	1.8
	Mentor & Coop Teach		57	33.7
	Coop Tch & PDP Team		1	0.6
	Mentor & PDP Team		6	3.6
	Mentor, Coop Tch, & PDP Team		18	10.7
	None		21	12.4
MENTEES SERVED	Wisconsin Participants only		569	N = 169
INITIAL EDUCATORS SERVED	Participants only		185	N = 98

Table 2 – Importance

Std	Description	N	M	SD	R
1	Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.	169	4.68	0.57	3
2	Teachers know how children grow.	169	4.54	0.59	7
3	Teachers understand that children learn differently.	169	4.75	0.51	1
4	Teachers know how to teach.	169	4.64	0.59	4
5	Teachers know how to manage a classroom.	169	4.72	0.51	2
6	Teachers communicate well.	168	4.60	0.57	5
7	Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons	168	4.47	0.68	8
8	Teachers know how to test for student progress.	167	4.39	0.72	9.5
9	Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.	168	4.58	0.59	6
10	Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community.	168	4.39	0.69	9.5

Table 3 – Ease

Std	Description	N	M	SD	R
1	Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.	168	3.60	1.06	8
2	Teachers know how children grow.	168	3.55	0.95	9
3	Teachers understand that children learn differently.	168	3.77	0.89	3
4	Teachers know how to teach.	168	3.66	1.02	6
5	Teachers know how to manage a classroom.	168	3.68	1.03	4
6	Teachers communicate well.	167	3.66	0.95	6
7	Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons	167	3.86	0.93	1
8	Teachers know how to test for student progress.	166	3.83	0.95	2
9	Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.	167	3.52	1.00	10
10	Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community.	167	3.66	1.03	6

Table 4 – Preparation

Std	Description	N	M	SD	R
1	Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.	169	4.30	0.92	4
2	Teachers know how children grow.	168	4.24	0.84	7
3	Teachers understand that children learn differently.	169	4.35	0.78	3
4	Teachers know how to teach.	169	4.36	0.82	2
5	Teachers know how to manage a classroom.	169	4.41	0.81	1
6	Teachers communicate well.	168	4.21	0.85	8
7	Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons	168	4.27	0.86	6
8	Teachers know how to test for student progress.	167	4.28	0.84	5
9	Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.	168	4.13	0.92	10
10	Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community.	168	4.16	0.92	9

Table 5 - Importance - by Age

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Age	> 48 yrs	N	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	560
		M	4.80	4.57	4.82	4.69	4.79	4.63	4.51	4.40	4.48	4.54	4.62
		SD	0.40	0.57	0.39	0.52	0.47	0.56	0.61	0.61	0.66	0.60	0.56
		Rank	2	6	1	4	3	5	8	10	9	7	
Age	39 to 48 yrs	N	60	60	60	60	60	59	59	59	59	59	595
		M	4.58	4.56	4.47	4.34	4.25	4.14	4.05	3.96	3.91	3.82	4.58
		SD	0.62	0.62	0.73	0.82	0.86	0.90	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.62
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Age	25 to 38 yrs	N	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	49	50	50	499
		M	4.53	4.45	4.71	4.58	4.66	4.50	4.40	4.28	4.68	4.32	4.51
		SD	0.70	0.57	0.57	0.65	0.56	0.65	0.78	0.78	0.55	0.79	0.68
		Rank	5	7	1	4	3	6	8	10	2	9	

Table 6 - Ease - by Age

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Age	> 48 yrs	N	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	550
		M	3.75	3.42	3.67	3.61	3.67	3.59	3.78	3.91	3.63	3.77	3.68
		SD	0.99	0.99	0.92	1.12	1.10	1.00	0.98	0.89	0.94	1.06	1.00
		Rank	4	10	5.5	8	5.5	9	2	1	7	3	
Age	39 to 48 yrs	N	60	60	60	60	60	59	59	59	59	59	595
		M	3.70	3.70	3.79	3.83	3.89	3.95	4.03	4.07	4.11	4.20	3.70
		SD	0.99	0.99	0.99	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.97	0.91	0.99
		Rank	9.5	9.5	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Age	25 to 38 yrs	N	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	49	50	50	499
		M	3.32	3.64	3.80	3.64	3.53	3.70	3.86	3.80	3.50	3.74	3.65
		SD	1.22	0.75	0.88	0.96	1.07	0.99	0.90	0.89	0.95	1.01	0.97
		Rank	10	6.5	2.5	6.5	8	5	1	2.5	9	4	

Table 7 - Preparation - by Age

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Age	> 48 yrs	N	56	55	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	559
		M	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.53	4.59	4.27	4.43	4.40	4.32	4.46	4.42
		SD	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.76	0.73	0.82	0.81	0.87	0.81	0.83	0.80
		Rank	6	8	4	2	1	10	5	7	9	3	
Age	39 to 48 yrs	N	60	60	60	60	60	59	59	59	59	59	595
		M	4.23	4.22	4.22	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.08	4.03	4.02	4.23
		SD	0.87	0.87	0.86	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.96	0.87
		Rank	1	2.5	2.5	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Age	25 to 38 yrs	N	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	49	50	50	499
		M	4.08	4.13	4.30	4.18	4.22	4.04	4.14	4.22	4.04	3.98	4.13
		SD	1.12	0.75	0.76	0.87	0.84	0.92	0.88	0.77	1.09	0.94	0.90
		Rank	7	6	1	4	2.5	8.5	5	2.5	8.5	10	

Table 8 - Importance - by Gender

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Gender	Female	N	131	131	131	131	131	130	130	129	130	130	1304
		M	4.72	4.60	4.76	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.50	4.45	4.62	4.42	4.61
		SD	0.53	0.55	0.50	0.54	0.51	0.56	0.68	0.66	0.59	0.70	0.59
		Rank	2	7	1	4	3	5.5	8	9	5.5	10	
Gender	Male	N	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	380
		M	4.54	4.30	4.75	4.50	4.79	4.55	4.37	4.18	4.47	4.32	4.48
		SD	0.68	0.65	0.54	0.73	0.53	0.60	0.67	0.87	0.60	0.66	0.68
		Rank	4	9	2	5	1	3	7	10	6	8	

Table 9 - Ease - by Gender

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Gender	Female	N	130	130	130	130	130	129	129	128	129	129	1294
		M	3.76	3.68	3.86	3.73	3.75	3.75	3.96	3.96	3.60	3.76	3.78
		SD	1.02	0.96	0.91	1.03	1.04	0.93	0.90	0.91	0.97	1.02	0.97
		Rank	4.5	9	3	8	6.5	6.5	1.5	1.5	10	4.5	
Gender	Male	N	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	380
		M	3.05	3.08	3.47	3.42	3.43	3.33	3.50	3.39	3.25	3.30	3.32
		SD	1.04	0.75	0.76	0.98	0.96	0.95	0.92	0.97	1.06	1.02	0.95
		Rank	10	9	2	4	3	6	1	5	7	8	

Table 10 - Preparation - by Gender

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Gender	Female	N	131	130	131	131	131	130	130	129	130	130	1303
		M	4.35	4.35	4.45	4.40	4.48	4.25	4.37	4.39	4.19	4.22	4.35
		SD	0.89	0.77	0.71	0.78	0.74	0.78	0.80	0.78	0.84	0.85	0.80
		Rank	6.5	6.5	2	3	1	8	5	4	10	9	
Gender	Male	N	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	380
		M	4.16	3.84	4.00	4.21	4.18	4.08	3.95	3.89	3.92	3.95	4.02
		SD	1.03	0.95	0.91	0.93	1.01	1.08	0.98	0.92	1.15	1.14	1.01
		Rank	3	10	5	1	2	4	6.5	9	8	6.5	

Table 11 - Importance - by Teaching Experience

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Teaching Exp	Up to 10 yrs	N	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	390
		M	4.71	4.59	4.74	4.47	4.62	4.59	4.38	4.24	4.79	4.41	4.56
		SD	0.60	0.55	0.59	0.72	0.59	0.59	0.78	0.81	0.47	0.75	0.67
		Rank	3	5.5	2	7	4	5.5	9	10	1	8	
Teaching Exp	11 to 25 yrs	N	90	90	90	90	90	89	89	88	89	89	894
		M	4.60	4.51	4.75	4.69	4.77	4.62	4.49	4.43	4.55	4.34	4.58
		SD	0.61	0.60	0.48	0.54	0.48	0.55	0.64	0.71	0.56	0.71	0.60
		Rank	5	7	2	3	1	4	8	9	6	10	
Teaching Exp	> 25 yrs	N	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	380
		M	4.84	4.55	4.82	4.70	4.74	4.61	4.54	4.46	4.47	4.50	4.62
		SD	0.37	0.60	0.39	0.54	0.52	0.55	0.62	0.62	0.69	0.60	0.57
		Rank	1	6	2	4	3	5	7	10	9	8	

Table 12 - Ease - by Teaching Experience

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Teaching Exp	Up to 10 yrs	N	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	390
		M	3.64	3.64	3.82	3.69	3.55	3.86	4.00	3.79	3.56	3.94	3.75
		SD	1.06	0.78	0.94	1.00	1.09	0.91	0.86	0.89	0.99	1.01	0.96
		Rank	7.5	7.5	4	6	10	3	1	5	9	2	
Teaching Exp	11 to 25 yrs	N	90	90	90	90	90	89	89	88	89	89	894
		M	3.54	3.58	3.77	3.64	3.73	3.60	3.83	3.80	3.47	3.47	3.64
		SD	1.08	1.01	0.85	0.98	0.95	0.97	0.91	0.98	1.05	1.03	0.99
		Rank	8	7	3	5	4	6	1	2	9.5	9.5	
Teaching Exp	> 25 yrs	N	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	370
		M	3.73	3.35	3.73	3.64	3.74	3.62	3.78	3.97	3.65	3.86	3.71
		SD	1.02	0.95	0.96	1.19	1.13	0.92	1.06	0.96	0.89	0.98	1.01
		Rank	5.5	10	5.5	8	4	9	3	1	7	2	

Table 13 - Preparation - by Teaching Experience

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Teaching Exp	Up to 10 yrs	N	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	390
		M	4.15	4.21	4.33	4.24	4.31	4.21	4.15	4.15	4.31	4.08	4.21
		SD	1.01	0.77	0.77	0.81	0.83	0.77	0.99	0.84	0.77	0.93	0.85
		Rank	8	5.5	1	4	2.5	5.5	8	8	2.5	10	
Teaching Exp	11 to 25 yrs	N	90	89	90	90	90	89	89	88	89	89	903
		M	4.31	4.20	4.32	4.31	4.37	4.19	4.29	4.28	3.99	4.07	4.23
		SD	0.98	0.88	0.82	0.89	0.88	0.93	0.87	0.87	1.04	0.97	0.92
		Rank	3.5	7	2	3.5	1	8	5	6	10	9	
Teaching Exp	> 25 yrs	N	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	380
		M	4.43	4.34	4.45	4.58	4.63	4.26	4.37	4.38	4.32	4.47	4.42
		SD	0.68	0.85	0.69	0.60	0.59	0.76	0.67	0.78	0.70	0.73	0.71
		Rank	5	8	4	2	1	10	7	6	9	3	

Table 14 - Importance - by School Level

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Level	Elementary	N	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	650
		M	4.64	4.74	4.75	4.64	4.77	4.63	4.51	4.49	4.60	4.48	4.62
		SD	0.62	0.48	0.50	0.56	0.46	0.52	0.59	0.62	0.63	0.69	0.58
		Rank	4.5	3	2	4.5	1	6	8	9	7	10	
Level	Middle School	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	25	26	26	259
		M	4.54	4.38	4.77	4.52	4.65	4.50	4.50	4.34	4.77	4.50	4.55
		SD	0.71	0.64	0.51	0.75	0.63	0.71	0.86	0.85	0.43	0.71	0.69
		Rank	4	9	1.5	5	3	7	7	10	1.5	7	
Level	High School	N	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	630
		M	4.75	4.39	4.74	4.64	4.70	4.59	4.36	4.26	4.49	4.22	4.51
		SD	0.47	0.63	0.51	0.58	0.54	0.56	0.69	0.77	0.59	0.71	0.64
		Rank	1	7	2	4	3	5	8	9	6	10	

Table 15 - Ease - by School Level

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Level	Elementary	N	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	650
		M	3.71	3.62	3.71	3.60	3.61	3.65	3.85	3.95	3.44	3.57	3.67
		SD	1.03	0.86	0.82	1.04	1.06	0.91	0.87	0.84	0.92	1.07	0.95
		Rank	3.5	6	3.5	8	7	5	2	1	10	9	
Level	Middle School	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	25	26	26	259
		M	3.58	3.62	3.69	3.81	3.48	3.73	4.15	3.72	3.71	4.08	3.76
		SD	1.06	1.06	1.09	0.90	1.06	0.96	0.78	1.10	1.02	0.98	1.01
		Rank	9	8	7	3	10	4	1	5	6	2	
Level	High School	N	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	620
		M	3.55	3.40	3.77	3.59	3.81	3.59	3.69	3.73	3.52	3.56	3.62
		SD	1.07	1.02	0.91	1.13	0.98	1.02	1.06	1.03	1.10	1.02	1.04
		Rank	8	10	2	5.5	1	5.5	4	3	9	7	

Table 16 - Preparation - by School Level

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Level	Elementary	N	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	650
		M	4.35	4.32	4.42	4.44	4.48	4.14	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.18	4.32
		SD	0.94	0.83	0.69	0.81	0.75	0.77	0.76	0.83	0.86	0.98	0.83
		Rank	4.5	7	3	2	1	10	4.5	6	8	9	
Level	Middle School	N	26	25	26	26	26	26	26	25	26	26	258
		M	4.38	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.27	4.16	4.08	4.15	4.27
		SD	0.98	0.75	0.88	0.89	0.89	1.13	1.04	0.99	0.98	1.05	0.95
		Rank	1	6	5	3	3	3	7	8	10	9	
Level	High School	N	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	630
		M	4.29	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.38	4.19	4.17	4.24	4.13	4.16	4.22
		SD	0.92	0.92	0.85	0.85	0.89	0.82	0.93	0.86	0.96	0.88	0.89
		Rank	2.5	8.5	4	2.5	1	6	7	5	8.5	10	

Table 17 - Importance - by Teaching Assignment

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Teaching Type	Regular Ed	N	139	139	139	139	139	138	138	137	138	138	1384
		M	4.66	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.74	4.61	4.50	4.42	4.57	4.43	4.58
		SD	0.57	0.60	0.51	0.58	0.51	0.58	0.67	0.67	0.59	0.63	0.60
		Rank	4	7.5	1.5	3	1.5	5	7.5	10	6	9	
Teaching Type	Spec Ed	N	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	210
		M	4.74	4.76	4.86	4.52	4.69	4.62	4.33	4.24	4.62	4.29	4.57
		SD	0.62	0.44	0.48	0.68	0.46	0.50	0.66	1.00	0.59	0.90	0.67
		Rank	3	2	1	7	4	5.5	8	10	5.5	9	

Table 18 - Ease - by Teaching Assignment

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Teaching Type	Regular Ed	N	139	139	139	139	139	138	138	137	138	138	1384
		M	3.64	3.50	3.71	3.66	3.65	3.63	3.86	3.80	3.51	3.60	3.66
		SD	1.09	0.94	0.88	1.01	1.06	0.94	0.96	0.96	1.01	1.00	0.99
		Rank	6	10	3	4	5	7	1	2	9	8	
Teaching Type	Spec Ed	N	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	200
		M	3.15	3.55	3.90	3.43	3.80	3.58	3.65	3.80	3.50	3.93	3.63
		SD	0.88	1.05	1.02	1.16	0.88	1.02	0.67	1.01	1.00	1.30	1.01
		Rank	10	7	2	9	3.5	6	5	3.5	8	1	

Table 19 - Preparation - by Teaching Assignment

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Teaching Type	Regular Ed	N	139	139	139	139	139	138	138	137	138	138	1384
		M	4.38	4.22	4.32	4.40	4.42	4.22	4.31	4.26	4.14	4.18	4.29
		SD	0.89	0.85	0.77	0.80	0.80	0.84	0.83	0.82	0.91	0.88	0.84
		Rank	3	7.5	4	2	1	7.5	5	6	10	9	
Teaching Type	Spec Ed	N	21	20	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	209
		M	3.76	4.20	4.43	4.12	4.33	4.10	4.00	4.29	4.00	3.90	4.11
		SD	1.09	0.83	0.98	0.95	0.97	1.00	1.10	1.06	1.05	1.22	1.03
		Rank	10	4	1	5	2	6	7	3	8	9	

Table 20 - Importance - by Mentor Training

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Mentor Training	Yes	N	128	128	128	128	128	127	127	126	127	127	1274
		M	4.68	4.56	4.79	4.65	4.76	4.59	4.45	4.37	4.62	4.41	4.59
		SD	0.54	0.58	0.48	0.59	0.51	0.60	0.69	0.73	0.56	0.67	0.61
		Rank	3	7	1	4	2	6	8	10	5	9	
Mentor Training	No	N	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	410
		M	4.66	4.46	4.66	4.62	4.60	4.63	4.55	4.45	4.46	4.34	4.54
		SD	0.66	0.60	0.57	0.60	0.52	0.49	0.65	0.69	0.67	0.76	0.63
		Rank	1.5	8.5	1.5	4	5	3	6	8.5	7	10	

Table 21 - Ease - by Mentor Training

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Mentor Training	Yes	N	127	127	127	127	127	126	126	125	126	126	1264
		M	3.56	3.54	3.78	3.68	3.74	3.69	3.86	3.82	3.60	3.67	3.69
		SD	1.05	0.97	0.93	1.03	1.03	0.99	0.94	0.98	1.04	1.05	1.00
		Rank	9	10	3	6	4	5	1	2	8	7	
Mentor Training	No	N	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	410
		M	3.73	3.56	3.76	3.59	3.50	3.54	3.85	3.85	3.28	3.61	3.63
		SD	1.10	0.87	0.80	1.00	1.01	0.81	0.91	0.85	0.84	1.00	0.93
		Rank	4	7	3	6	9	8	1.5	1.5	10	5	

Table 22 - Preparation - by Mentor Training

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Mentor Training	Yes	N	128	127	128	128	128	127	127	126	127	127	1273
		M	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.41	4.47	4.28	4.31	4.30	4.25	4.24	4.32
		SD	0.86	0.82	0.78	0.80	0.79	0.82	0.82	0.81	0.88	0.89	0.83
		Rank	4	8	3	2	1	7	5	6	9	10	
Mentor Training	No	N	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	1723
		M	4.17	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.00	4.17	4.22	3.76	3.90	4.11
		SD	1.09	0.91	0.80	0.88	0.86	0.92	0.97	0.94	0.94	1.00	0.94
		Rank	5.5	7	1.5	3.5	1.5	8	5.5	3.5	10	9	

Table 23 - Importance - by PDP Training

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
PDP Training	Yes	N	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	280
		M	4.71	4.68	4.68	4.54	4.70	4.61	4.39	4.39	4.71	4.25	4.57
		SD	0.46	0.48	0.67	0.64	0.60	0.57	0.79	0.79	0.46	0.84	0.65
		Rank	1.5	4.5	4.5	7	3	6	8.5	8.5	1.5	10	
PDP Training	No	N	127	127	127	127	127	126	126	125	126	126	1264
		M	4.68	4.50	4.77	4.66	4.74	4.60	4.49	4.38	4.55	4.42	4.58
		SD	0.59	0.61	0.47	0.59	0.50	0.57	0.66	0.72	0.61	0.66	0.61
		Rank	3	7	1	4	2	5	8	10	6	9	

Table 24 - Ease - by PDP Training

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
PDP Training	Yes	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	270	270
		M	3.81	3.93	4.04	3.70	3.63	3.67	3.96	3.85	3.83	3.84	3.84
		SD	0.83	1.11	1.06	0.91	1.01	1.11	0.85	0.99	0.97	0.98	0.98
		Rank	7	3	1	8	10	9	2	4	6	5	
PDP Training	No	N	127	127	127	127	127	126	126	125	126	126	1264
		M	3.50	3.43	3.65	3.59	3.66	3.60	3.76	3.81	3.40	3.53	3.59
		SD	1.12	0.90	0.86	1.07	1.06	0.92	0.95	0.96	1.00	1.04	1.00
		Rank	8	9	4	6	3	5	2	1	10	7	

Table 25 - Preparation - by PDP Training

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
PDP Training	Yes	N	28	27	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	279
		M	4.36	4.48	4.52	4.29	4.43	4.21	4.43	4.29	4.43	4.11	4.35
		SD	0.99	0.85	0.88	1.01	0.92	1.07	0.96	1.01	0.96	1.03	0.96
		Rank	6	2	1	7.5	4	9	4	7.5	4	10	
PDP Training	No	N	127	127	127	127	127	126	126	125	126	126	1264
		M	4.29	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.42	4.17	4.21	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.24
		SD	0.92	0.83	0.78	0.80	0.81	0.82	0.86	0.83	0.92	0.94	0.85
		Rank	3	7	4.5	2	1	8	6	4.5	10	9	

Table 26 - Importance - by Mentees Served

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Mentees	One Mentee	N	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	740
		M	4.76	4.53	4.78	4.66	4.74	4.54	4.56	4.40	4.61	4.42	4.60
		SD	0.49	0.58	0.50	0.60	0.48	0.62	0.67	0.69	0.62	0.70	0.61
		Rank	2	8	1	4	3	7	6	10	5	9	
Mentees	2 to 7 Mentees	N	74	74	74	74	74	73	73	73	73	73	735
		M	4.63	4.53	4.77	4.63	4.73	4.66	4.41	4.39	4.52	4.34	4.56
		SD	0.61	0.60	0.48	0.59	0.53	0.53	0.68	0.76	0.60	0.71	0.63
		Rank	4.5	6	1	4.5	2	3	8	9	7	10	
Mentees	10 + Mentees	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11	12	12	119
		M	4.58	4.75	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.75	4.50	4.36	4.83	4.58	4.66
		SD	0.67	0.45	0.65	0.39	0.65	0.45	0.67	0.92	0.39	0.51	0.59
		Rank	7.5	3.5	5.5	1.5	5.5	3.5	9	10	1.5	7.5	

Table 27 - Mentees Served

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Mentees	One Mentee	N	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	730
		M	3.68	3.52	3.63	3.56	3.58	3.59	3.79	3.78	3.42	3.56	3.61
		SD	1.05	0.91	0.89	0.93	1.00	0.86	0.90	0.95	0.98	1.01	0.95
		Rank	3	9	4	7.5	6	5	1	2	10	7.5	
Mentees	2 to 7 Mentees	N	74	74	74	74	74	73	73	73	73	73	735
		M	3.50	3.49	3.91	3.69	3.67	3.73	3.86	3.82	3.57	3.65	3.69
		SD	1.11	1.01	0.89	1.10	1.08	1.07	1.00	0.98	1.08	1.11	1.05
		Rank	9	10	1	5	6	4	2	3	8	7	
Mentees	10 + Mentees	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11	12	12	119
		M	3.50	3.75	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.58	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.92	3.78
		SD	0.90	0.97	0.79	1.16	0.75	0.79	0.74	0.89	0.89	0.67	0.85
		Rank	10	6	8.5	5	1	8.5	2.5	2.5	7	4	

Table 28 - Preparation - by Mentees Served

Group	Subgroup	Stat	WTS 1	WTS 2	WTS 3	WTS 4	WTS 5	WTS 6	WTS 7	WTS 8	WTS 9	WTS 10	ALL ITEMS
Mentees	One Mentee	N	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	740
		M	4.38	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.28	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.29
		SD	0.89	0.76	0.74	0.72	0.73	0.73	0.78	0.70	0.96	0.86	0.79
		Rank	3	8	5.5	2	1	7	4	5.5	10	9	
Mentees	2 to 7 Mentees	N	74	73	74	74	74	73	73	73	73	73	734
		M	4.24	4.18	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.14	4.16	4.22	4.10	4.16	4.22
		SD	0.96	0.90	0.87	0.91	0.91	1.02	0.99	1.00	0.96	1.04	0.95
		Rank	4	6	1	2	3	9	7.5	5	10	7.5	
Mentees	10 + Mentees	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11	12	12	119
		M	4.17	4.58	4.42	4.17	4.50	4.17	4.42	4.45	4.50	4.25	4.36
		SD	0.83	0.79	0.67	1.03	0.80	0.72	0.51	0.69	0.52	0.75	0.73
		Rank	9	1	5.5	9	2.5	9	5.5	4	2.5	7	

Table 29 - Overall Means

	All	Gender		Age			Years of Teaching Experience			School Level			Teaching Assignment		Mentor Training		PDP Training		Mentees Served		
		F	M	> 48 years	39 to 48 years	25 to 38 years	Up to 10 yrs	11 to 25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Ele	Mid	High	Reg	Spec	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	2-7	10 or more
Importance	4.49	4.61	4.48	4.62	4.58	4.51	4.56	4.58	4.62	4.62	4.55	4.51	4.58	4.57	4.59	4.54	4.57	4.58	4.60	4.56	4.66
Ease	3.68	3.78	3.32	3.68	3.70	3.65	3.75	3.64	3.71	3.67	3.76	3.62	3.66	3.63	3.69	3.63	3.84	3.59	3.61	3.69	3.78
Preparation	4.27	4.35	4.02	4.42	4.23	4.13	4.21	4.23	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.22	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.11	4.35	4.24	4.29	4.22	4.36

Table 30 – Importance, Ease, Preparation -- Rank Order

Std	Description	Importance	Ease	Preparation
1	Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.	3	8	4
2	Teachers know how children grow.	7	9	7
3	Teachers understand that children learn differently.	1	3	3
4	Teachers know how to teach.	4	6	2
5	Teachers know how to manage a classroom.	2	4	1
6	Teachers communicate well.	5	6	8
7	Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons	8	1	6
8	Teachers know how to test for student progress.	9.5	2	5
9	Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.	6	10	10
10	Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community.	9.5	6	9

Table 31 - Importance - High Rank Order - by Standard

[illegible]

Table 32 - Importance - Low Rank Order - by Standard

	All	by Gender		by Age			by Teaching Experience			by School Level			by Teaching Assignment		by Mentor Training		by PDP Training		by Mentees Served		
		F	M	> 48 yrs	39 to 48 yrs	25 to 38 yrs	Up to 10 yrs	11 to 25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Ele	Mid	High	Reg	Spec	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	2-7	10 or more
1. Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.																					7.5
2. Teachers know how children grow.			9								9		7.5			8.5			8		
3. Teachers understand that children learn differently.																					
4. Teachers know how to teach.																					
5. Teachers know how to manage a classroom.																					
6. Teachers communicate well.											7										
7. Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons.	8	8		8		8	9	8		8	7	8	7.5	8	8		8.5	8		8	9
8. Teachers know how to test for student progress.	9.5	9	10	10	8	10	10	9	10	9	10	9	10	10	10	8.5	8.5	10	10	9	10
9. Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.				9	9				9												
10. Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community	9.5	10	8		10	9	8	10	8	10	7	10	9	9	9	10	10	9	9	10	7.5

Table 33 - Ease - High Rank Order - by Standard

	All	by Gender		by Age			by Teaching Experience			by School Level			by Teaching Assignment		by Mentor Training		by PDP Training		by Mentees Served		
		F	M	> 48 yrs	39 to 48 yrs	25 to 38 yrs	Up to 10 yrs	11 to 25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Ele	Mid	High	Reg	Spec	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	2-7	10 or more
1. Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.										3.5									3		
2. Teachers know how children grow.																	3				
3. Teachers understand that children learn differently.	3	3	2			2.5		3		3.5		2	3	2	3	3	1			1	
4. Teachers know how to teach.											3										
5. Teachers know how to manage a classroom.			3									1		3.5				3			1
6. Teachers communicate well.							3														
7. Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons.	1	1.5	1	2		1	1	1	3	2	1		1		1	1.5	2	2	1	2	2.5
8. Teachers know how to test for student progress.	2	1.5		1	3	2.5		2	1	1		3	2	3.5	2	1.5		1	2	2	2.5
9. Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.					2																
10. Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community				3	1		2		2		2			1							

Table 34 - Ease - Low Rank Order - by Standard

	All	by Gender		by Age			by Teaching Experience			by School Level			by Teaching Assignment		by Mentor Training		by PDP Training		by Mentees Served		
		F	M	> 48 yrs	39 to 48 yrs	25 to 38 yrs	Up to 10 yrs	11 to 25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Ele	Mid	High	Reg	Spec	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	2-7	10 or more
1. Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.	8		10		9.5	10	7.5	8			9	8		10	9			8		9	10
2. Teachers know how children grow.	9	9	9	10	9.5		7.5		10		8	10	10		10			9	9	10	
3. Teachers understand that children learn differently.					8																8.5
4. Teachers know how to teach.		8		8					8	8				9			8		7.5		
5. Teachers know how to manage a classroom.						8	10				10					9	10				
6. Teachers communicate well.				9					9							8	9				8.5
7. Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons.																					
8. Teachers know how to test for student progress.																					
9. Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.	10	10				9	9	9.5		10		9	9	8	8	10		10	10	8	
10. Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community			8					9.5		9			8						7.5		

Table 35 - Preparation - High Rank Order - by Standard

[illegible]

Table 36 - Preparation - Low Rank Order - by Standard

	All	by Gender		by Age			by Teaching Experience			by School Level			by Teaching Assignment		by Mentor Training		by PDP Training		by Mentees Served		
		F	M	> 48 yrs	39 to 48 yrs	25 to 38 yrs	Up to 10 yrs	11 to 25 yrs	> 25 yrs	Ele	Mid	High	Reg	Spec	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	2-7	10 or more
1. Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.							8					8.5		10							9
2. Teachers know how children grow.			10	8					8				7.5		8				8		
3. Teachers understand that children learn differently.																					
4. Teachers know how to teach.																	7.5				9
5. Teachers know how to manage a classroom.																					
6. Teachers communicate well.	8	8		10		8.5		8	10	10			7.5			8	9	8		9	9
7. Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons.							8													7.5	
8. Teachers know how to test for student progress.			9		8		8				8						7.5				
9. Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.	10	10	8	9	9	8.5		10	9	8	10	8.5	10	8	9	10		10	10	10	
10. Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community	9	9			10	10	10	9		9	9	10	9	9	10	9	10	9	9	7.5	

Table 37 – Importance, Ease, Preparation – High and Low Rank Order

	Importance		Ease		Preparation	
	High Rank	Low Rank	High Rank	Low Rank	High Rank	Low Rank
1. Teachers know the subjects they are teaching.	3			8		
2. Teachers know how children grow.				9		
3. Teachers understand that children learn differently.	1		3		3	
4. Teachers know how to teach.					2	
5. Teachers know how to manage a classroom.	2				1	
6. Teachers communicate well.						8
7. Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons.		8	1			
8. Teachers know how to test for student progress.		9.5	2			
9. Teachers are able to evaluate themselves.				10		10
10. Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community.		9.5				9