

**Report of the Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST)/
Mentor Assistant Program (MAP) Task Force
December 29, 2008**

On June 2, 2008, Governor M. Jodi Rell signed into law Public Act No. 08-107 calling for the end of the State Department of Education's Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST) by July 2009. Entitled "An Act Concerning the BEST Program," the legislation further called for the creation of a task force chaired by the Commissioner of Education to develop a mentor assistance program that would replace the BEST program and, by January 1, 2009, to make recommendations to the Education Committee of the General Assembly, and Legislative Program Review and Investigations Committee, on how the new program would be implemented in SFY 2010. The task force was called upon specifically to complete seven objectives. (See Appendix A) These objectives ranged from describing what the new program requirements would be, to devising strategies to recruit and train mentors, to developing "recommendations concerning the development of a data collection and evaluation system for monitoring the mentor assistance program on local and state-wide levels."

What follows is the task force's report, organized around these seven objectives. Included as well are recommendations to specific issues posed in the objectives.

Objective 1: A Description of the New Mentor Assistance Program

The new Mentor Assistance Program (MAP) recommended by the task force to replace BEST introduces different expectations for teacher induction, teacher certification, assessment, and district accountability. Where BEST was originally a state-based assessment and certification program, the new MAP focuses more heavily on guided teacher support, coaching, and the completion of learning modules over the first two years of teaching. Both programs define clear linkages to teacher certification, but the new MAP places greater responsibility on districts to embed mentoring within a comprehensive system of teacher evaluation and professional development, while maintaining the independence and confidentiality of the mentor-beginning teacher relationship.

The shift from a state-based to district-based system is best exemplified by how the relationships between the State Department of Education and districts are changing, and how regional educational service centers (RESCs), teachers' associations, and institutions of higher education will play a larger part in the induction process of new teachers in the years to come. The biggest changes will center on how the accountability function for certification, once exclusively the purview of the State Department of Education, will now be shared with districts. Under the new model the governance of mentoring programs statewide will be decentralized with old and new players assuming different roles in the process. Below, in three parts, we offer an overview of how these roles and functions will change.

A. Governance /Accountability

As an organizing principle for Connecticut's future mentor assistance program, the task force concluded that:

- The unit of accountability for mentor assistance must be the district, with authority vested in the district to recommend provisional certification to the state, based on teachers satisfactorily completing agreed upon mentoring modules within 2-3 years; and
- The unit of accountability for district implementation of standards-based mentoring must be the state, with authority vested in state personnel or state-contracted independents to assess districts and their fidelity to supporting the mentorship program for new teachers.

SDE

Accordingly, the Commissioner and State Board of Education will:

- Develop and publish the State's goals for statewide teacher induction, mentoring, professional development and evaluation, drawing on statewide data and national research findings;
- Distribute state funding to districts to assist with implementation of district plans;
- Manage and make accessible to local districts the data systems needed to document that teachers and mentors have met district and statewide standards;
- Monitor district implementation of mentoring program, to ensure fidelity to plan/goals, including random district audits/observations by state personnel;
- Award provisional certification to teachers who have satisfactorily completed the induction program, based on established criteria and aligned with the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching;
- Develop guidelines for and approve district mentor assistance plans, drawing on input from various stakeholder groups; and
- Oversee an outside evaluation of the MAP program every 3-5 years.

RESCs

In collaboration with EASTCONN, the RESC Alliance, and other stakeholders, the SDE will also:

- Develop training modules for beginning teachers to complete;
- Train new mentors to carry out responsibilities at the district level;
- Provide professional development and training for regional mentors working at the district level;
- Provide professional development and training of district teams and principals in managing, designing and administering mentor assistance plans; and
- Provide technical assistance to urban, small, regional and/or suburban districts, based on district size and needs.

Districts

Superintendents and local boards of education will:

- Develop a three-year mentoring assistance plan that incorporates the State's goals and instructional priorities, plus any local considerations based on community and student needs;
- Form a local coordinating committee (or committees, based on the size of the district) to guide the activities outlined in the plan;
- Develop an annual budget to support the activities detailed in the plan and submit annually to receive payment (See Part B below);
- Recruit and pair mentors from within and outside the district to work with beginning teachers;
- Ensure substitute coverage for mentors and beginning teachers to participate in the activities and modules called for in the plan;
- Communicate regularly with beginning teachers about training opportunities, statewide workshops, and support group work;
- Coordinate mentoring assistance programs and teacher evaluation and supervision programs, keeping the two separate but complementary;
- Verify, through the local coordinating committee, that the work of beginning teachers and instructional modules has been satisfactorily completed to warrant provisional certification; and
- Attest that all beginning teachers in their district have satisfactorily completed all modules and are now eligible for provisional certification.

Schools

Principals and staff will:

- Administer the state's online needs assessment to establish the goals and priorities of each beginning teacher as he/she develops an individualized mentoring plan;
- Organize mentoring opportunities by grade, department, or specialty area;
- Take steps to make time available, as needed, to help teachers to achieve the goals of their mentoring plans;
- Coordinate the activities and schedules of mentors and beginning teachers to ensure faithful implementation of the district plan;
- Review and approve beginning teachers' individualized, two-year mentoring plan; and
- Submit annual report on mentor-teacher activities to district coordinating committee for review and approval.

Institutions of Higher Education (IHE)

The SDE and IHE will:

- Work with RESCs to align modules with NCATE approved pre-service professional preparation programs;
- Develop and deliver regional strategies for supporting mentor assistance programs; and
- Arrange or coordinate pre-service student teaching experiences related to statewide standards.

B. Content and Elements Required in District Mentoring Plans

With the emphasis on districts taking a major role in coordinating and implementing local mentoring programs, the task force outlined what it felt would be essential elements of each district's three-year plan. Each district plan will be required, at a minimum, to provide the following information to the Department of Education:

Background Information

- Community profile: Characteristics, governance structure, DRG status;
- District profile: Size, administrative structure, schools in need of improvement;
- Student profile: Characteristics, achievement levels; achievement gaps;
- Faculty profile: Number of beginning teachers, tenured teachers, degree status, etc.;
- Mentor profile: Characteristics, years of service of mentors practicing in the district; and
- Beginning Teacher Profile: Assignments, schools.

A Three-Year Action Plan must incorporate:

- Statement of three-year objectives linked to State's Goal Statement for MAP;
- General timeline for district coordinating teams to meet with central office personnel, principals, mentors, and/or district facilitators (the composition of coordinating teams will vary);
- Description of process used to select mentors and assign them to beginning teachers, based on subject areas, levels, and need;
- Description of process used to train and update mentors in best practices, essential knowledge (e.g., CALI);
- Timeline of district-wide mentoring days for observations, individual discussion, small group meetings, etc; professional development days; RESC training sessions; and beginning teachers' completion of tasks associated with each module;
- Description of process used to collect, review, and coordinate teachers' mentoring plans (Templates for teacher plans will be web-based and provided by SDE);
- Description of the processes to resolve internal disputes over the district's recommendations to the state over who has or has not met the completion standards required for each of the learning modules completed; and
- Description of resources and budget needed to carry out the above activities.

C. Legal Implications of the new MAP for Teacher Tenure

As a final statement of its intent and support for a clear separation of mentoring and evaluation, the task force argued that under no circumstances should a teacher's completion of the MAP be a factor in a principal's and district's decision to continue or not continue his/her employment. Superintendents must be free to attest to provisional certification, but not be bound to continue employment. Reciprocally, teachers cannot use successful completion of the mentor program as legal evidence to dispute an employment decision, should they be non-renewed. The group strongly believes that the integrity of the new MAP will depend on the formal separation of mentoring and evaluation, even if they coexist in a comprehensive system of induction, professional development and evaluation. The task force urged that Connecticut's statutes on collective bargaining and teacher evaluation be amended as needed to ensure this formal separation. Connecticut General Statute 10-151 confers tenure to teachers who work for four consecutive years in the same district.

Objective 2: A Description of Instructional Modules Required by the Program

The creation of a series of planned learning modules for each beginning teacher to complete before moving on to provisional certification status was a key recommendation of the Legislative Program Review and Investigations Committee when it submitted its report to the General Assembly in January 2008. Among other things, learning modules were thought to provide a common framework for mentors and beginning teachers to follow, and a way to bring greater consistency to the experiences beginning teachers would undergo. Primarily, however, learning modules were an explicit way of linking new teachers' learning to a common set of standards as set forth in the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. These standards would both extend and broaden the experiences and knowledge beginning teachers had acquired as student teachers but had not fully mastered in their daily practice.

The task force had little difficulty agreeing upon the need for modules, or on the content and components of the modules they hoped to see developed for statewide use. The SDE and RESCs had years of experience and data to draw upon as the group decided which modules were most important, and the Connecticut Education Association (CEA) had surveyed its members to determine what issues and subjects beginning teachers felt they needed the most help in. Reaching consensus happened quickly, with the group recommending the five modules below as the standard program for all beginning teachers in their first two years of practice.

1. Classroom Management and Climate

- Student Discipline, Suspension, Expulsion and Connecticut General Statutes
- Student Engagement
- Positive Behavioral Supports

2. Lesson Planning and Unit Design

- Backward Design
- Unwrapping Standards and Making Standards Work
- Content and Disciplinary Thinking

3. Delivering Instruction

- Differentiating Instruction
- Teaching Students with Special Needs and Learning Disabilities
- Teaching English Language Learners
- Questioning Techniques
- Culturally Relevant Instruction

4. Assessing Student Learning

- Using Data to Inform and Refine Instruction
- Data Teams/Professional Learning Communities
- Scientific, Research-based Intervention
- Connecticut Accountability and Learning Initiative
- Reporting on Student Progress to Parents, Administrators and other Stakeholders

5. Professional Practices

- Ethical Behavior
- Collaborative Planning, Working in Teams
- Parent Relationships
- Communicating Effectively with Colleagues and Parents
- District Policies, Norms and Traditions

The discussions that accompanied the selection of modules made it clear that, while each represented a discrete knowledge base and skill set, to some degree, all overlapped with one another and could be united by certain common themes: the stages of human development, language acquisition and literacy, data-driven planning and decision-making, effective communication, the importance and power of teamwork, and making use of technologies to enhance instruction. All of these themes, it was argued, needed to be considered with each module.

Possibly the most important issues to emerge around the modules centered on how the modules would be presented to beginning teachers, what roles mentor teachers would play in coaching new teachers through the activities planned for each, and what “successful completion” of each module would mean.

The group settled on several answers to these questions:

1. Mentors would work with their beginning teacher(s) to develop a planned set of activities to complete within each module. These activities would be grounded in the beginning teacher needs assessment completed at the beginning of the year.

2. Each module would consist of discrete learning activities that could be presented in person by mentors, offered in workshops or through on-line courses, or through the completion of a set of readings. While it was assumed that the SDE, RESCs and/or higher education might offer workshops or on-line courses, it was the belief of the group that the mentors themselves should be the primary vehicle – through meetings and planned discussions – for the learning experiences beginning teachers would undergo. The group reasoned that mentors would be explicitly trained to work with their beginning teachers in this manner and, given the importance of using the mentoring relationship as an invitation to think and talk about the craft of teaching, mentors would be the key purveyors of information.
3. The manner in which each module would be completed would follow a mutually agreed upon sequence, with two built-in requirements at the end. Beginning teachers would first select among the topics offered within each module to explore, read about, or discuss over a period of sessions with a mentor. Next they would be required to bring the learning and observations into practice by applying them in a lesson, project, or demonstration of how the activity impacted student learning. Finally, the beginning teacher would be required to submit a reflection paper or project that summarized, described, and/or analyzed what had been learned by the beginning teachers and their students throughout the module and what implication this learning held for their development as teachers.
4. Each module would be presented in this manner, concluding with a reflection piece capping the entire set of activities and demonstrations. Written reflections/projects would be signed off by the mentor and beginning teacher, indicating completion, and forwarded to each district's coordinating committee to make certain that the work had been satisfactorily completed. Each reflection piece, finally, would be reviewed by the coordinating committee drawing upon rubrics specifically designed for the modules. The standard for passing the module would be completion of all tasks, and evidence of meeting the basic expectations of the rubric.
5. The Superintendent of Schools will submit a teacher's name upon completion of all modules and a final review by coordinating committee for receipt of a provisional certificate through the State Department of Education.

Objective 3: Mentor Eligibility and Mentor Assignments

Since 1988, when the BEST program first started, Connecticut has engaged the services of well over 20,000 mentors, all of whom have been trained by the state and RESCs to provide support and coaching to beginning teachers. Over this time, the infrastructure and systems needed to train and support mentors have been put into place to enable the Department of Education and Connecticut's six Regional Educational Service Centers to train new mentors and retrain others who have come in and out of the system over the course of their careers.

Annually, approximately 4,200 beginning teachers participate in the BEST program during the first two years of their work as Connecticut educators. Approximately 3,000 mentors work with beginning teachers, but over the years the distribution of mentors has been uneven, with some districts hiring more mentors than others; and still other districts struggling to reach a minimum

ratio of mentors to beginning teachers. It is still unknown, moreover, how many teachers will volunteer to serve as mentors in the years ahead.

The creation of a new Mentor Assistance Program (MAP) will require different expectations about recruiting and training new mentors. The new MAP will also require the development of procedures and fiscal policies needed to sustain a new cohort of mentors whose primary tasks will be to coach teachers to help beginning teachers grow as teachers and document their growth through the completion of modules. Fortunately, there is enough capacity and overlap between the current program and MAP that the shift in focus will not be wrenching, but it will require a reorganization of the staffing and services needed to maintain a constant number of mentors each year.

The task force reasoned that much of the infrastructure currently in place at the Department of Education and RESCs needs to be retained to provide for the training of mentors each year, and for the development and maintenance of new accountability and oversight functions of the state, as delineated above. What could be surrendered and put to new uses, however, is approximately \$1.5 M, as the following budget suggests:

Table 1 Projected Budget for MAP

	SFY 2010	SFY 2011	SFY 2012	Notes
Projected MAP Budget	\$4,300,000	\$4,300,000	\$4,300,000	
State Department of Education				
Salaries	\$925,000	\$943,500	\$962,370	8.0 FTE
Expenses	\$0	\$0	\$0	
EASTCONN				
Salaries				
Regional Services	\$565,000	\$576,300	\$587,826	4.5 FTE
Central Services	\$650,000	\$663,000	\$676,260	4.0 FTE
Expenses				
Scoring of FY09 Portfolios	\$900,000	\$0	\$0	
Dev. of 5 Mentor Modules	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	
Dev. of Online Courses and Workshops for Beginning Teachers	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	
Dev. of Mentor Training Modules	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	
Dev of Training Modules for Coordinating Committees	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	
Modify Current Principals' Training Program for new MAP	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$0	
Modify Current 3-day Mentor Training Program Using New Modules	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	
Modify Training for Existing Trainer of Trainers	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	
Training and Workshops for Beginning Teachers, Mentors and Districts	\$200,000	\$800,000	\$525,000	450 Mentors
Total	\$3,448,000	\$3,000,800	\$2,751,456	
Surplus for Mentor Stipends, Coordinating Teams, District Support	\$852,000	\$1,299,200	\$1,548,544	

With this budget as a framework, the group agreed to redesign the former BEST program by redeploying employees currently working in the Department and RESCS and setting aside funds to allocate to districts to pay future mentors for their services. This allocation would be made through program grants targeted for each district to make payments based on a common, minimal standard of one mentor being paid \$500 each year to provide 50 contact hours to one beginning teacher over a span of two years. In general terms, mentors would provide 10 hours of contact time for each of the five modules, but adjustments in exactly how much time per module would not only be expected, but desirable, provided the 50-hour standard were met.

Seventy percent of districts throughout Connecticut already pay their mentors stipends for services, and therefore may choose to use their program funds to subsidize existing agreements for mentor services, substitute coverage, or other activities related to induction. This will only be allowed, however, if mentors are indeed compensated for their time. Mentors may choose to convert their stipends to pay for classroom material or release time, but in no circumstance can or should their compensation be denied in the name of other professional development activities, release time, conference fees, etc., or other areas that may be part of a collective bargaining agreement.

Objective 4: Recruitment Strategies for Hiring Mentors

Recruiting and hiring mentors will ultimately be the responsibility of districts, as it is now, but it was widely acknowledged that the Department, IHEs and the RESCs will play a significant role in the recruitment effort. Each year, for example, the Department will advertise the importance of mentoring and, together with the state's many stakeholder groups, reach out to tenured teachers each spring to become mentors and to participate in the training sessions offered throughout the summer and fall.

In addition to ensuring that all future mentors will receive a minimum level of compensation, the group felt that an important and untapped source of new mentors would be retired teachers. Together with the mentor teachers already at work in their own districts, retired teachers could fill many of the gaps that almost assuredly will confound districts that may not always have teachers with the content or subject area expertise to match what is needed in any given year. Recently retired teachers will also have much more flexibility to travel and schedule their time to work with beginning teachers.

Finally, the group urged that more teachers be informed that mentor compensation can, within existing law, be treated as part of one's total earnings when calculating retirement. This added "bump" to retirement, it was felt, would be yet another incentive for teachers to take on the work of mentoring. The group strongly felt, however, that the incentive to include mentor pay as part of retirement should not be a justification for mentors to work with any more than three teachers in any given year. In fact, the group concluded, that a standard of two teachers per mentor was really the most any mentor should take on, but, given the exigencies of identifying sufficient numbers of mentors in certain districts, only three teachers per mentor would be permissible. This standard will be an expectation of each district's three-year plan.

Objective 5. Transitioning to the New MAP

Moving from BEST to MAP will require at least three years, given the magnitude and complexity of the tasks needed to build a new system. Five new teaching modules will need to be developed, complete with all of the resources and connections to the Department's data systems (see below). Mentor training sessions will need to be developed and delivered. Guidance documents for districts, including the creation of a new grant application system, will need to be written. Implementation workshops will need to be planned and delivered to guide superintendents and principals in setting up committees and protocols for carrying out the program. Teachers under BEST who fail to pass this year's portfolio assessment will be required to either submit a portfolio in February 2010, or complete one or two of the new modules that will be written between now and July 2009. Much work, in short, will need to be done, before the new MAP is up and running as envisioned.

Much of the difficulty of implementing the new program will be the cost, given the fact that with a fixed budget of \$4.3 M, and approximately \$900K needed to score this year's portfolios this summer, the money needed to pay mentors for the first year will be insufficient to the task. At best only \$825K will be available in FY10 to meet start-up expenses.

For this reason, a phase-in plan will commence next year that will direct dollars largely to training and program development, so that the formal commencement date of the new MAP would be September 2010. Deferring the start of the new MAP for an entire year will allow districts time to prepare for implementation, allow the Department to finish scoring this year's portfolios, provide remediation for teachers who fail the portfolio, and build all of the technical systems needed to make the management of MAP efficient and user-friendly.

Accordingly, the 2009-2010 school year can be used as a period to pilot aspects of the new MAP with a limited number of districts. This will also allow the Department to develop procedures to grant teachers who will be in their second year of practice during the 2009-2010 school year, "credit" for any mentoring they had received in the previous year, thereby reducing the number of modules they would otherwise be obliged to complete.

The effects of this strategy will ultimately have a down side, inasmuch as most first-year teachers in 2009-2010 may not have access to a mentor until their second year and will need to await provisional certification until their third year of teaching. Because of this difficulty, the Department will explore other ways to implement the program more quickly and will announce any alternative plan no later than April 2009.

Objective 6: Exemptions from the New MAP

As is widely known, not all teachers practicing in Connecticut are required to participate in the BEST program. Teachers coming to Connecticut with over three years teaching experience, for example, are exempt from completing a BEST portfolio, and other more specialized teachers, like occupational and vocational teachers, are not expected to submit portfolios to receive provisional certification.

Clearly the most desirable thing to do with the new MAP is to make a mentor available to all teachers, but to do so would require several million new dollars. Because of this, and because of Connecticut's current economic crisis, only the following teacher groups will be required to participate in the new MAP program in 2010. With the exception of Teachers of English as a Second Language, which has been included, this list is the same as it was under the former BEST program:

- Elementary Education
- English/Language Arts
- Mathematics
- Science
- Social Studies
- Special Education
- Bilingual Education
- Music
- Physical Education
- Visual Arts
- World Languages
- Teachers of English as a Second Language

All other teachers holding an initial certificate in Connecticut will be required to complete the first two mentoring modules and one year of mentorship.

Objective 7: Data Management and Collection

A key feature of the new MAP will be the creation of data systems at the state level that will be made available to each district to access the resources and record-keeping tools to manage the program at the local level. These systems will be made available directly by the Department of Education and EASTCONN. The systems will include easy-to-use templates for writing and updating each district's MAP plan; templates for recording each teacher's completion of each of the five modules, templates that will enable teachers to record the completion of module activities and submit written reflection papers and/or projects, as well as links to on-line programs and/or workshops that are part of each of the five modules.

The entire thrust of all of this on-line support will be to help teachers reflect on their practice, make resources easily available from a wide array of internet sources, and make the administration of the new MAP less of a burden on districts than it might otherwise be if they had to build document tools on their own. This on-line support system, finally, will make consistent all of the information districts will need to report to the state each year.

General Recommendations

In addition to the seven objectives outlined in the charge to the task force, several other questions were raised. Below, we offer responses to each, as well as to other questions raised by the group itself.

Q. Should the General Assembly legislate the reduction of classroom teaching loads for mentors, as part of the new MAP?

A. As desirable as it might be to provide release time for teachers and mentors to meet during the school day, the task force concluded that this could not be a requirement for all districts, and certainly not a precondition for implementing an effective mentoring program. Many mentors, for example, do not want to leave their classrooms during the day and prefer, instead, to work after hours. The cost of this requirement, finally, would be prohibitive.

Q. Who should be eligible to mentor beginning teachers?

A. The task force urged the continuation of current policies in mentor eligibility, but it did argue that retired teachers should also be included in the pool of future mentors. Teachers minimally holding a provisional certificate with three years of experience in Connecticut and retired Connecticut teachers who complete the RESCs' mentor training program are those who will be eligible to serve.

Q. Should beginning teachers be obligated to complete the MAP during their first two years of teaching?

A. The task force believes the first two years are the most important for beginning teachers, and that any delay should be discouraged. It is envisioned that beginning teachers will complete two modules in year 1 and three modules in year 2. The task force recognizes, however, that under certain circumstances, a three-year mentor plan may be necessary.

Q. Should the state provide full funding to implement the MAP program?

A. The task force concluded that, under its current appropriation, the state could not provide all of the funds needed to implement the new MAP, and, therefore, took the position that the MAP must be funded at a level that will allow for local support, technical assistance and compensation to allow participants to meet the new expectations of the program.

Clearly, the most difficult part of implementing the new MAP will be the long-range costs associated with it. Even with a three-year transitional period, and one year being dedicated to building the infrastructure and capacity to deliver a program to approximately 4,200 teachers annually, the total budget currently in place will not meet the needs of our future teaching force, nor will it ensure a steady stream of provisionally certified teachers to staff our schools in the years ahead.

A review of the budget in Table 1 tells why \$4.3M will fall short of meeting the needs of the new MAP.

If one assumes, for example, that at least \$2.1 to \$2.5M will be needed annually to pay 3,000-4,000 mentors for their services, the Department of Education's existing budget will always be in deficit in amounts ranging from \$600K to \$1.0M, even if by 2011 we realize an annual savings of \$1.5M.

How might the additional dollars be raised?

Scaling back on the Department's or EASTCONN's staffing will not solve the problem, for the simple reason that these positions are essential for managing MAP at the state level and at the regional levels. The roughly \$2.3M here is basic infrastructure that ensures the stability and sustainability of the program, as it did for BEST.

Making an annual request of the General Assembly is yet another way to make up for the additional dollars needed to run MAP. But, as any realist will point out, budgets are frequently politicized and unpredictable. And, as the task force reasoned, something as essential as Connecticut's system for certifying teachers should not be subject to the volatility of and uncertainty of biennial budgeting.

For these reasons, the task force concluded that another solution needed to be found to place the new MAP on a secure financial foundation.

After discussion, the task force concluded that possibly the most sensible way to finance Connecticut's future MAP is to increase the fees charged teachers for certification and to dedicate the increase to a revolving fund reserved exclusively for mentor compensation. Currently, first-year teachers pay \$100 for an initial certificate, \$200 for their provisional certificate, and \$300 for their professional certificate. The total amount of money taken in through all certification fees in 2007-2008 was **\$2,048,400**.

This fee structure has remained unchanged since 1992. If this system were changed to allow for a uniform, higher fee for all certificates, the state could generate an additional \$2M annually, a portion of which could be dedicated to mentor compensation, stipends for district coordinating team members, and/or professional development.

Below, we offer a portrait of what monies might be generated by establishing a consistent fee of \$250 for all certificates (including the \$50 application fee), including the renewal of professional certificates for which there is currently no fee.

Table 2 Proposed Fee Structure for Teacher Certificates, effective July 1, 2009

Fee Name	App. Fee	Exam Fee	Initial Fee	Renewal Fee	Duration	# Trans	Total Revenue
Professional Educator Certificate (Includes Renewals)	\$50		\$200 (plus application fee)	\$200 (plus application fee)	5 years	5147	\$1,286,750
Nonrenewable Interim Provisional Educator Certificate	\$50		\$200 (plus application fee)	\$0	1 year	331	\$82,750
Provisional Educator Certificate (Includes Renewals)	\$50		\$200 (plus application fee)	\$200 (plus application fee)	8 years	3333	\$833,250
Interim Provisional Educator Certificate	\$50		\$200 (plus application fee)	\$0	1 year	11	\$2,750
Nonrenewable Interim Initial Educator Certificate	\$50		\$200 (plus application fee)	\$0	1 year	732	\$183,000
Initial Educator Certificate (Includes Renewals)	\$50		\$200 (plus application fee)	\$200 (plus application fee)	3 years	6249	\$1,562,250
Interim Initial Educator Certificate	\$50		\$200 (plus application fee)	\$0	1 year	68	\$17,000
Two Additional Endorsements	\$50		\$50	\$0	varies	29	\$2,900
Adult Educator	\$50		\$0	\$50	varies	172	\$8,600
Review Fee	\$50		\$0	\$0		1660	\$83,000
One Additional Endorsement	\$50		\$0	\$0	varies	1140	\$57,000
Duplicate Certificate	\$50		\$0	\$0		304	\$15,200
Temporary 90-Day Certificate	\$0		\$0	\$0	90 school days	263	\$0
Temporary Authorization for Minor Assignment	\$0		\$0	\$0	1 school year	53	\$0
Durational Shortage Area Permit	\$0		\$0	\$0	1 year	507	\$0
Five-Year Renewable Coaching Permit	\$50		\$0	\$0	5 years	1408	\$70,400
Temporary Emergency Coaching Permit	\$0		\$0	\$0	1 year	646	\$0
Substitute Teacher Authorization	\$0		\$0	\$0	40 school days	987	\$0
Substitute Teacher Authorization – Long Term	\$0		\$0	\$0	1 school year	290	\$0
						23330	\$4,204,850

As can be seen from this example, if the new fee structures were applied to data collected in 2007-2008, the revenue earned would increase by **\$2,156,450** (\$4,204,850 minus \$2,048,400). These added dollars would be more than sufficient to meet the future expenses of the new MAP; and, as the system improved over the next decade, the new fee structure could also increase revenue coming to the General Fund. Of all the strategies for making the new MAP financially solvent, this one is preferred by the task force.

As a result, the chairperson of the task force will send to the General Assembly by February 2009, legislation authorizing the establishment of a fund and the proposed fee structure. Included in this analysis will be estimates of the numbers of teachers that will be in the Connecticut system over the next decade, alternative fee structures other than the one suggested above, and the fee structures of other professional groups-- like nurses, architects and physical therapists-- that routinely charge fees for the maintenance of a certificate to practice. From this comparative data, it will be readily shown that the fee structure being proposed is neither radical nor a hardship if one considers the total cost over a period of 30 to 35 years.

Q. What will the minimum expectations be for cooperating teachers in the future? Must they have completed all of the mentor modules to be eligible, or will other criteria be used to determine their eligibility to work with student teachers?

A. The task force believes that future cooperating teachers, who work with student teachers, will be obligated to participate in a full-day of training to provide them with a comprehensive overview of what the new MAP includes and how their work in guiding student teachers will play into the entire induction program that future teachers will experience. Universities may conduct the full-day MAP training as well, ensuring the number of cooperating teachers is not depleted.

Conclusion

The legislative task force responsible for this report strongly believes that the new MAP described throughout has much promise, if it is adequately funded. Many of the difficulties that beset the BEST program, still a nationally acclaimed model for performance-based certification programs, were directly the result of limited financial support for mentors and not seeing fully just how essential mentors are in the recruitment and sustenance of beginning teachers. As beginning teacher numbers decline nationwide, we believe that the new program we propose will go a long way toward attracting and retaining new teachers, improving instruction, and inspiring new generations of teachers to work with each other and their leaders to build better schools for all. We look forward to your support and discussing our ideas with you in greater detail.

Members of the BEST/MAP Task Force:

Stephanie Shulder-Littrell
Mary Cortright
Janis Hochadel
Mary Loftus Levine
Maureen McSparran Ruby
Catherine Carbone
Dale Bernardoni
Richard Schwab
Glenn Iannaccone
Paul Paese
David Cicarella
Denise Rose
Senator Thomas Gaffey
Representative Andrew Fleischmann
Senator Thomas Herlihy
Representative DebraLee Hovey
Senator Edward Meyer
Senator John Kissell
Representative Mary Mushinsky

The task force met a total of 10 times during the period of September to December. Below is a list of the meeting dates:

September 16
September 23
October 3
October 10
October 17
October 27
November 18
November 24
December 1
December 16

Appendix A: Objectives 1-7

Sec. 3. (*Effective from passage*) (a) There is established a task force to develop a plan to replace the beginning educator support and training program with a mentor assistance program starting with the 2009-2010 school year. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (1) Requirements for an initial educator's successful completion of the mentor assistance program, (2) sequential modules based on state standards as set forth in the Common Core of Teaching, as developed by the Department of Education, (3) requirements concerning (A) mentor eligibility and assignments and training of mentors, and (B) the frequency with which mentor teachers should meet with beginning teachers, (4) methods to encourage collaboration from the Department of Education, Regional Educational Service Centers and local and regional school districts to identify, recruit and retain mentors, (5) recommendations concerning the transition between the beginning educator support and training program and the mentor assistance program, including, but not limited to, an evaluation process and procedures concerning initial educators who completed one or more professional knowledge clinical assessments, but have not received a satisfactory evaluation by June 30, 2009, (6) recommendations concerning possible exemptions from the mentor assistance program for educators who taught previously in another state, taught previously in a nonpublic school or have teaching assignments for which such program may not be relevant and any other situation for which the task force determines that an exemption may be appropriate, and (7) recommendations concerning the development of a data collection and evaluation system for monitoring the mentor assistance program on local and state-wide levels. The task force should consider whether legislative changes should be made, including, but not limited to, amending section 10-220a of the general statutes to (i) require a reduced classroom teaching work load for mentors, as determined by the school district, (ii) expand the categories of persons who can become mentors, (iii) require that beginning teachers receive and complete the mentor assistance program during their first two years of certification, and (iv) require that school districts receive full funding to implement the mentor assistance program.