

State of New Mexico
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338
<http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lescdefault.asp>

SENATORS

Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY

Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti



ADVISORY

Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director
Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

December 12, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Education Study Committee

FR: Eilani Gerstner 

RE: STAFF REPORT: HIGHER EDUCATION ISSUES: TEACHER MENTORSHIP PROGRAM

Teacher mentorship, also known as teacher induction, has been considered an important strategy in stemming beginning teacher turnover. According to the Education Commission of the States (ECS), nationally, beginning teacher attrition is estimated at 40 to 50 percent in the first five years of entering the profession. Teacher mentorship programs can range from informal "buddy" systems to formal programs with release time from classroom teaching duties for mentors and mentees to observe each other's instruction. Often, even within a state, teacher mentorship programs vary among school districts, but more states are defining aspects of mentorship programs that all districts must address.

Formal beginning teacher mentorship programs have existed in some New Mexico school districts since the late 1990s, and mentorship for all beginning teachers has been required in law since 2001. Legislation enacted in 2007 amended the mentorship law to require teacher preparation programs to work with colleges of arts and sciences and high schools to develop a model to provide mentorship services to each of their graduates who have obtained a teaching position in a public high school, including charter schools, and report their recommendations to the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC).

This report, which is included in the LESL 2007 Interim Workplan, addresses beginning teacher mentorship in New Mexico, mentorship programs in other states, and a report from the Mentorship Task Force convened to develop a model as required in the 2007 amendments to the law.

Revised 04/15/08

Beginning Teacher Mentorship in New Mexico

In 1999, the LESC undertook a study of teacher quality, prompted by House Joint Memorial 5, *Recruitment of High Quality Teachers*, which requested the LESC, in cooperation with the former State Department of Education (SDE), and the New Mexico teacher preparation programs, to create a systematic plan for the recruitment, preparation, induction, professional development, and support of high-quality teachers and to report findings and recommendations to the LESC by October 1, 1999. Among the requirements of the plan were identifying and adopting strategies that incorporate the best professional development and teaching standards. Testimony heard by the committee included the value of student internships and mentoring. In 2000, the LESC endorsed legislation to establish a statewide teacher mentorship program for all beginning teachers. Although the legislation did not pass, the Legislature appropriated \$500,000 to SDE for teacher performance enhancement.

In 2000, the LESC heard testimony on the implementation of the teacher performance enhancement program (teacher mentorship or induction) for which the 2000 Legislature had appropriated funds. SDE testified that \$250,000 of the appropriation was used to fund six pilot induction programs that would serve as statewide models for all districts. The remaining balance was available to schools through a competitive application process for beginning teacher mentorship programs. Testimony indicated that the research confirms that structured, high-quality beginning teacher mentorship programs are essential to attracting and retaining a quality teaching force.

In 2000, the LESC also heard testimony from the bureau chief of the Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Bureau of Research and Teacher Assessment in the Connecticut State Department of Education, who described the Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) Program, the mission of which is to place qualified, quality teachers in every classroom. The program requires that a trained mentor or mentors provide three years of mentoring and support for novice teachers. Novice teacher performance is evaluated during the second year of teaching, using a portfolio assessment framework, and it is based on the same standards used for approving teacher preparation programs. The bureau chief reported that, as a result of the program, Connecticut had experienced increased induction and retention of new teachers.

In 2001, LESC-endorsed legislation was enacted to establish a beginning teacher mentorship program in law for all new teachers with standard, alternative, or substandard licenses, in order “to provide an effective transition into the teaching field; ensure success in teaching; improve student achievement; and retain capable teachers in the classroom.”

The Beginning Teacher Mentorship Law

The 2001 mentorship law required SDE to work with school employees, representatives from teacher preparation programs, and the former Commission on Higher Education to develop a framework for a beginning teacher mentorship program that included:

- individual support and assistance for each beginning teacher from a designated support provider or mentor;
- structured training for and compensation of mentors;
- an ongoing, formative evaluation that is used for the improvement of teaching practice;

- procedures for a summative evaluation of beginning teachers' performance during the first three years of teaching, including an annual assessment of suitability for license renewal, and for final assessment of beginning teachers seeking Level 2 licensure;
- support from local school boards, school administrators, and other school district personnel; and
- regular review and evaluation of the teacher mentorship program.

The law also requires the department to:

- require submission and approval of each district's mentorship plan;
- provide technical assistance to school districts that do not have a well-developed mentorship program in place; and
- encourage school districts to collaborate with teacher preparation program administrators at institutions of higher education, career educators, educational organizations, regional service centers, and other state and community leaders in the teacher mentorship program.

The mentorship law has been amended several times since its creation. As part of the comprehensive school reforms in 2003, the three-tiered teacher licensure system was implemented, making participation in a mentorship program a requirement in law for all Level 1 teachers to be eligible for advancement to Level 2 and making service as a mentor one of the duties that Level 3 teachers may assume as part of their increased leadership responsibilities. As a result of the three-tiered licensure system, several elements of the original law were removed, including the option of using a "support provider" to provide mentoring and the requirement of providing "compensation for mentors."

In 2005, the valid time period for the provisional Level 1 teaching license was extended from a maximum of three years to a maximum of five years, still allowing a Level 1 teacher to advance to Level 2 after three years but providing beginning teachers two more years to develop their skills. Subsequently, the requirement that the framework include "procedures for a summative evaluation of beginning teachers during the first three years of teaching" was amended to apply to *at least* the first three years of teaching so that beginning teachers would continue to undergo a summative evaluation while holding a Level 1 license.

In 2007, the law was amended to require that mentorship funds be distributed according to the number of beginning teachers on the 40th day of the current school year instead of the prior year (see Attachment 1). This amendment also required the Public Education Department (PED) to require teacher preparation programs, colleges of arts and sciences, and high schools to collaborate to develop a model for mentorship in order to provide "structured supervision and feedback" to each of their graduates who have obtained a teaching position in a public high school, including charter schools, and provide their recommendations and a cost analysis to the LESC (see "Recommendations of the Mentorship Task Force," below).

Public Education Department Rule

In 2002, the former State Board of Education (SBE) adopted several rules to define mentorship requirements for beginning teachers¹ (see Attachment 2) and required districts to submit

¹ PED rule, as amended in 2005, defines a beginning teacher as "a teacher holding a New Mexico waiver, internship license, or level 1 teaching license who has less than three complete years, full- or part-time, of classroom teaching experience."

descriptions of their mentorship programs to the department for review and approval. However, the rules have not been updated to include changes in the mentorship law. For example, the rules still state that support providers may provide mentoring and require compensation for mentors.

According to the rules, all mentorship programs must receive initial approval from the director of professional development. In addition, “[t]o receive approval, public school districts, charter schools, or state agencies must submit a proposed mentorship program that aligns with and supports the public school district’s, charter school’s, or state agency’s long range plan for student success and aligns with the PED’s nine essential teacher competencies.” PED reports that a framework was not developed but that the rules address the aspects of the framework that are outlined in law.

PED rule also requires that a teacher’s completion of mentorship be documented on a form available from the professional licensure unit in PED and shall be maintained in each teacher’s licensure file in the professional licensure unit in order to obtain Level 2 licensure. However, PED reports that the department does not distribute such a form or require districts to submit evidence to the department that a beginning teacher has completed a mentorship program.

The only state-level verification that a teacher has participated in a mentorship program occurs when a Level 1 teacher advances to Level 2 through the professional development dossier process. The superintendent completing Strand D of the dossier verifies that a Level 1 teacher has completed a mentorship program on the www.teachnm.org website administered by VisionLink. A screen capture of the online mentorship verification portion is shown below in Figure 1. If the superintendent selects “No,” the teacher fails Strand D of the dossier and does not advance to Level 2.

Figure 1. Verification of Mentorship for Level 1 Teachers Moving to Level 2

| |
|--|
| <p>Mentorship <i>For new-to-the teaching profession teachers moving from level one to level two licensure</i></p> <p>The candidate for level two licensure was a beginning teacher, new to the teaching profession after July 1, 2002, and has completed at least a one-year mentorship program required by state statute and regulation.</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Applicable</p> |
|--|

Source: PED 12/3/07

Since Level 1 teachers may advance to Level 2 after a minimum of three years and a maximum of five years, confirmation of teachers’ completion of a mentorship program may occur as many as four years after the fact. Also, as addressed in the November 2007 report presented to the LESC, “New Mexico’s Three-Tiered Licensure System: Current Results & Future Challenges” (a joint study conducted by the LESC, Legislative Finance Committee, and Office of Education Accountability), VisionLink manages the entire professional development dossier process; therefore PED does not maintain information at the department on which teachers have completed a mentorship program.

District Mentorship Programs

In its 2002 rule, SDE required districts to submit mentorship plans for review and approval. The rule also requires that charter schools and state agencies submit descriptions of their mentorship programs; however, no descriptions from charter schools and state agencies were found in PED records by LESC staff, even though some charter schools and a state agency (the Youth Diagnostic and Development Center, or YDDC) have received mentorship funding over the past five years.

PED reports that, with a few exceptions, updated district mentorship plans have not been submitted to the department since 2002. However, it is possible that districts may have updated their plans and not submitted them to PED. For example, Albuquerque Public Schools (APS), Las Cruces Public Schools (LCPS), and Los Lunas Public Schools provided current descriptions of their mentorship programs as part of their participation in the Mentorship Task Force formed to address the 2007 requirement for a model for beginning teacher mentorship (see "Recommendations of the Mentorship Task Force," below).

To obtain a sense of how school districts have implemented their mentorship plans, LESC staff requested from PED copies of the descriptions of the mentorship plans that districts had filed with the department. From that group, LESC staff selected 10 descriptions from 2002 for review.

The plans included a template that SDE had sent to all districts requesting information about the mentorship programs (see Attachment 3). The plans reviewed varied in length and detail of documentation: some districts provided one-page plans with one- or two-sentence descriptions of how the program met the department's criteria, while others provided plans in excess of 15 pages with detailed program descriptions, accountability requirements, assessment measures, and outcomes. The LESC review of the program plans is listed below in items one through nine with each piece of information requested by department underlined. The review indicated that districts met the department's requested information in a variety of ways:

1. Alignment with the district educational plans for student success (EPSS) and the Level 1 teaching competencies varied from focusing on EPSS and competencies provided to the teachers and mentors, to focusing on the EPSS and competencies in training and mentor/mentee conferences and documenting how beginning teachers used them in their professional growth.
2. Statements of mandatory participation in mentorship for all beginning teachers varied considerably. In some cases, beginning teachers were "requested" to participate in mentoring, while some districts required three years of mentoring with different degrees of support each year, such as graduated levels of required professional development hours and required mentor contact hours.
3. The selection and assignment of mentors ranged from selecting mentors from experienced teachers (including Level 2 teachers), to providing formal application processes for mentors and assigning mentors based on grade level, subject taught, and even "outside interests."
4. Beginning teacher support activities varied from mentors observing mentees' classrooms and meeting individually, to required contact hours and activities between mentors and mentees including observing each other's classrooms and attending seminars together, beginning

teachers meeting with support teams and a minimum amount of professional development hours required for beginning teachers.

5. Mentor support and training ranged from the mentor reviewing the mentorship plan with the principal, to required training days focused on coaching techniques and the needs of new teachers.
6. Formative evaluations of new teachers ranged from keeping documentation of new teacher training in teachers' files, to data collection on classroom observations, professional development logs, documented mentor/mentee contact hours signed by each, and examples of new teachers' instructional plans.
7. Summative evaluations varied from the beginning teachers evaluating themselves, to documentation of retention data for beginning teachers, hours of professional development, New Mexico Teacher Competency Exam scores, student performance data, and/or end-of-year questionnaires for mentors and mentees.
8. Grievances between mentees and mentors could be addressed by complaints them to the principal or following a district's grievance policy.
9. Annual evaluations varied from the principal and beginning teacher reviewing the process as necessary, to districts that set self-imposed deadlines for evaluations of the programs, including student achievement and retention data, to be submitted to the superintendent.

Some districts also reported that:

- conferences between mentors and beginning teachers were confidential and mentors could not take part in any evaluations of the new teacher;
- they provided stipends for mentors, from \$200 to \$2,000 per teacher mentored per year; and
- they provided beginning teachers with gift certificates of \$50 for supplies and other materials.

Some districts' 2002 mentorship program descriptions and the up-to-date descriptions from APS and LCPS indicate that Level 2 teachers can be mentors. Since the mentorship programs have not been updated at PED to include changes in the law, there is no way to tell if some districts are requiring Level 2 teachers to be mentors. Current law requires that mentoring be one of the additional duties of Level 3 teachers, therefore, it would be appear inappropriate for a district to require a Level 2 teacher to be a mentor unless it is on a voluntary basis.

According to PED records, the department distributed a "Program Self-Evaluation" form to districts in 2002 to provide a template for evaluating the mentorship programs (see Attachment 4). If districts utilized this form, the results would provide extensive qualitative and quantitative data about the outcomes of mentorship programs; however, any results of evaluations are currently unavailable, and as evidenced in the variation in districts' descriptions of their annual evaluations shown above, it would appear unlikely that all districts follow such self-evaluations of their programs.

Also, the Educator Quality Division distributed a "District Approval and Funding Checklist" to districts for school year 2003-2004, which indicated that mentorship programs were reviewed and approved, approved conditionally, or denied approval (see Attachment 5 for the checklist).

The checklist also indicates that the number of beginning teachers would be verified and that teachers would be tracked by name and Social Security number over several years to determine the effectiveness of the mentorship programs. However, the Educator Quality Division does not appear to have records of any subsequent evaluations, and PED reports that the department has not reviewed district mentorship plans since the initial review.

Both of these forms, however, would provide useful data and a more accurate picture of how mentoring is being conducted in the state.

Mentorship Funding

Since 2000, the Legislature has appropriated approximately \$8.1 million for beginning teacher mentorship. In 2006, the LESC heard testimony from APS on the need for additional funds to provide quality mentoring programs. Since 2001, these legislative appropriations have provided for per-teacher allocations to districts that ranged from a low of \$365 to a high of \$490.50 per teacher (see Table 1). In 2007, the LESC recommended \$3.0 million, and ultimately \$2.0 million was appropriated for mentorship for FY 08.

Prior to FY 08, mentorship funds were allocated to districts based on the number of beginning teachers on the 120th day of the previous school year and distributed on a reimbursement basis. Attachment 6 provides a summary of the total mentorship allocations to districts from FY 02 to FY 07 and to charter schools and one state agency, the YDDC, from FY 03 to FY 07. The amounts shown in Attachment 6 are the “total allocations,” but it is not clear from PED’s records if districts, charter schools, or the YDDC received all of their allocations because the funds were distributed on a reimbursement basis. According to PED, districts may contract with Regional Education Cooperatives (RECs) to coordinate mentorship programs, but PED does not allocate mentorship funds directly to RECs. However, PED records indicate that REC #9 received funds in FY 04 and FY 05 for a total of \$20,640.

Table 1 below provides a summary of the legislative funding associated with beginning teacher mentorship, the number of teachers for which PED allocated the funds, and the amount of the allocations to districts per teacher from FY 01 through FY 07. PED is in the process of verifying the number of beginning teachers in each district as of the 40th day of school year 2007-2008, and as of the completion of this report, FY 08 funds had not yet been allocated to districts.

**Table 1. Summary of Appropriations for Beginning Teacher Mentorship Program
(Statewide)**

| Legislature | Fiscal Year | Appropriation (in thousands) | Number of Teachers for which PED Allocated Funding | Number of Beginning Teachers Statewide | Amount Allocated per Teacher | Notes |
|-------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|
| 2000 | 2001 | \$500.0 | <i>Not available</i> | <i>Not available</i> | \$1,141 | <i>Pilot year</i> |
| 2001 | 2002 | \$1,000.0 | 2,109* | 1,273 | \$490.50 | <i>Beginning Teacher Mentorship Program enacted</i> |
| 2002 | 2003 | \$998.0 | 2,543* | 1,269 | \$396 | |
| 2003 | 2004 | \$900.0 | 2,284* | 1,329 | \$394 | |
| 2004 | 2005 | \$900.0 | 2,050* | 1,207 | \$439 | |
| 2005 | 2006 | \$900.0 | 2,342 | 2,342 | \$365 | |
| 2006 | 2007 | \$899.1 | 2,431 | 2,345 | \$368 | |
| 2007 | 2008 | \$2,000.0 | <i>PED Jan 2007 estimate 1,536</i> | <i>Not available</i> | <i>estimate \$1,300</i> | <i>PED has not yet determined the number of beginning teachers in school year 2007-2008</i> |
| | Total | \$8,097.1 | | | | |

*Numbers unavailable from PED; LESC estimate based on PED spreadsheets showing the amount of mentorship funding allocated to districts, charter schools, and YDDC for FY 02 – FY 05.

Because PED did not include teacher data prior to FY 06 in the funding spreadsheets it provided to the LESC office, the LESC staff estimated the number of teachers for which PED allocated funding by dividing the allocation to each district by the amount allocated per teacher. PED did provide the total number of beginning teachers statewide for FY 02 through FY 07 in a separate document. As Table 1 illustrates, for FY 02 through FY 05, these two numbers differ by over 800 teachers. Also, in January 2007, PED provided the LESC with an estimate of 1,536 beginning teachers for school year 2007-2008; however, judging from the number of beginning teachers in the previous year, this estimate may be low.

Another problem related to the total number of beginning teachers participating in mentorship programs is that current mentorship reports provided by APS, LCPS, and Los Lunas Public Schools indicate that the number of teachers receiving mentoring services is different than the number that the PED allocations are based upon. For example, PED allocated funds to APS for 310 teachers in FY 07, but APS provided mentoring for 381 teachers. The current APS mentorship report also indicates that some districts may use operational funds to supplement the mentorship funds received from PED. For example, APS provides a \$2,000 stipend to mentors, for a total expenditure of \$762,000 on stipends in FY 07; however, the allocation from PED that year was approximately \$114,000. APS staff reports that the operational budget for their mentoring program was approximately \$800,000 in school year 2006-2007 for mentor stipends, support staff in the mentorship program office, materials, and training sessions and that the majority of funds came out of APS's operational budget.

Until the state has an accurate system of determining the number of teachers participating in mentorship and identifying the common aspects of districts' mentorship programs, a statewide evaluation of beginning teacher mentorship will not be possible.

Issues

- PED has not updated department rules to align with changes in the mentorship law.
- PED records show that, early in the implementation of the law, the districts' programs were initially reviewed and approved or denied approval; however, PED reports that the department has not reviewed or evaluated the programs since that time.
- According to the LESC review of the 2002 district mentorship plans, the annual evaluations vary among districts in scope and specificity and it is unclear if they are conducted regularly (see "District Mentorship Plans").
- It appears that PED does not have accurate numbers of teachers who received mentoring, nor does the department collect names of teachers mentored and type of mentoring they received, which makes any state-level evaluation of the effect of mentoring on teacher retention or other factors impossible at this time.

Recommendations of the Mentorship Task Force

The mentorship law requires PED to encourage partnerships between public schools and institutions of higher education in providing mentoring services; however, few such partnerships appear to exist. Two of the findings the LESC 60-member College/Workplace Readiness and High School Redesign Work Group were that current law does not provide for a consistent and uniform model for mentorship programs among districts or ways to ensure content-area expertise in the mentoring process at the high school level.

Subsequently, the LESC endorsed legislation that was enacted in 2007 to require teacher education programs to collaborate with colleges of arts and sciences and high schools to develop a model for mentoring for all graduates from New Mexico teacher education programs who obtain a teaching position in a public high school, including charter schools, and to provide recommendations and a cost estimate for the model to the LESC. The model must provide for:

- mentorship services for the first year as a Level 1 teacher to each graduate of New Mexico teacher education programs who has obtained a teaching position in any New Mexico public high school, including charter schools; provided that teacher preparation programs may enter into memoranda of agreement with each other or with Level 3 teachers in providing the services to their graduates;
- an annual report to PED of the number of teachers who have completed each teacher preparation program the previous spring or summer and have been hired by public high schools, including charter schools, for the following year; and
- an annual report providing a description of the mentorship services that will be provided to each of their teachers, including the name of the teacher, the grade level the teacher has been hired to teach, and the name of the school district where the teacher has been hired.

In response to the mandate, in June 2007, PED and the Higher Education Department (HED) formed the Mentorship Task Force with membership as prescribed in law, except for limited representation by deans of colleges of arts and sciences. Much of the work toward creating a model occurred as a result of three meetings during fall 2007. Highlights of each one appear below. The overall outcome is that participants are "drawing nearer to a proposed model,"

having agreed that a study of existing programs must be completed first and that the model is likely to include such features as web-based support, supplemental mentoring, regionalization, and direct clinical supervision.

- During its meeting on September 14, the Mentoring Task Force made a number of recommendations – including avoiding duplication of mentoring services and coordinating mentoring efforts through a statewide consortium – and produced a report that highlighted several model programs and addressed such issues as funding and the creation of a website to facilitate the expansion of mentoring services.
- On October 19, staff from the LESC, HED, and PED discussed this draft report with the chair of the task force and agreed that creating the mentorship model will take more time, research, and collaboration and require the participation of deans of colleges of arts and sciences. This group also agreed on several points to bring to the attention of the deans of colleges of education at their meeting in November, among them the need for a research study, the creation of regional service centers, and the value of including deans of other colleges, like business, in the collaboration to create the model mentorship program, with a final report to the LESC by December 2008.
- During their meeting on November 19, the deans and directors of teacher preparation programs agreed that more time is needed to create the mentorship model and approved a motion to conduct these activities:
 - study school districts’ current mentoring efforts, partly through a survey;
 - engage “critical parties” (that is, public schools, postsecondary institutions, regional education cooperatives, and first-year teachers) in discussions led by PED and HED;
 - propose a model (developed by the Mentoring Task Force) utilizing the features previously agreed upon and listed above; and
 - prepare a cost analysis of this model.

What the Research Says

Many research studies have looked at the relationships between teacher induction and teacher retention, teacher quality, and student achievement. A 2004 report by ECS, *The Impact of Mentoring on Teacher Retention: What the Research Says*, surveyed approximately 150 studies on beginning teacher mentorship and found only 10 studies that met the following criteria for meaningful evaluation:

- used quantitative data to determine the effectiveness of mentorship programs;
- had well-defined, verifiable outcomes for teachers who were mentored; and
- conducted comparisons between individuals who received mentoring and those who did not.

The report indicates that, taken collectively, the 10 selected studies show a positive effect of mentorship programs on teachers and their retention. The report notes, however, that “most [studies] were not able to control completely for other factors that might have affected the outcomes” and that “the content, duration and delivery of [mentorship] programs studied were so varied from one site to another that it is not clear to what extent general conclusions can be drawn from any given study.” Studies highlighted in the report include those conducted in California, New York City, Toronto, and Texas in the late 1980s to late 1990s.

Other studies have also indicated benefits of mentorship programs and similar structured collaboration between teaching colleagues.

- A 2007 benefit-cost analysis of mentorship published by the Educational Research Service concluded that “induction returns extend far beyond mere retention questions. The influence on new teacher practice is by far the most important benefit.”
- A study conducted by the University of Pittsburgh in Pittsburgh Public Schools from 2000 to 2002 found that “in schools where teachers talked to each other the most about their jobs, and where the principals did the best job of staying in touch with the community, students had noticeably higher reading and math test scores.”

Overall, beginning teacher mentoring programs can have a positive effect on teacher practice and retention, although accurately measuring that effect requires quantitative and qualitative data, well-defined outcomes, and comparisons between treatment and control groups. So far, New Mexico does not have access to such information about the statewide mentoring program. The state will need accurate data collection processes and evaluations measuring common data and outcomes for all districts’ mentoring programs in order to conduct an evaluation of the impact of mentorship in the state.

Beginning Teacher Mentorship in Other States

According to a 2005 National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) report, *Induction Into Learning Communities*, in 2004, 30 states had some form of teacher induction program, and New Mexico was one of 17 states that required and financed mentoring for all beginning teachers. The NCTAF report also reviewed a selection of existing state mentorship programs. This report highlights two of these programs in California and Connecticut because both of these programs track the relationship between participation and retention and define common aspects of mentoring programs that districts must provide: classroom release time for observations, training in coaching techniques for mentors, and minimum contact hours between mentors and new teachers. In addition, both programs allow local variations.

The California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program is mandatory for new teachers for two years, but it allows exceptional teachers to complete the program in one year. While the state runs the program, variations are allowed and districts, schools, and local universities coordinate programs at the regional level. Required aspects of the programs include:

- mentors receive varied benefits depending on the district (stipends and/or full- or part-time release from classroom duties);
- mentors are trained in “the formative assessment system used by their programs, cognitive coaching, and other support resources” and undergo training before and/or during the school year;
- new teachers are given release time to observe their mentors;
- mentors observe their mentees’ instruction, followed by discussions of the observations;
- new teachers also have access to an external support network;
- the program costs \$5,675 per new teacher per year for two years; and
- the average retention rate of participants five years after program completion is 84 percent.

Finally, as noted earlier (see “Beginning Teacher Mentorship in New Mexico”), the Connecticut BEST program provides new teachers with school- or district-based mentors or support teams as well as content-specific seminars offered regionally and online for one to three years. All public school beginning teachers are eligible to participate. The state, regional service centers, districts, and schools are responsible for administering the program. Program components include:

- stipends for mentors at school districts’ discretion;
- release time, professional development, and continuing education credits for mentors;
- 20 hours of training for mentors in teaching standards, portfolio assessment, and coaching, conducted through regional service centers;
- mandatory release time for mentors and mentees to observe each others’ classrooms;
- a minimum of 30 contact hours between beginning teachers and their mentors, support teams, other teachers in their content area, their principals, and/or district mentorship facilitators; and
- state payments of \$760 per teacher with districts contributing \$900 to \$2,800 per teacher, for a total of between \$1,660 and \$3,560 per teacher.

The estimated annual retention rate of participants in this program is approximately 94 percent.

Policy Options

Because the issues with teacher mentorship programs seem to reside more at the administrative than legislative level, the committee’s policy options might focus on direction to administrative entities, not only to enhance the effectiveness of mentoring programs but also to require a statewide evaluation of those programs.

- The LESC might consider sending a letter to the Secretary of Public Education requesting (1) that PED update its mentorship rule to reflect recent changes in law; (2) that PED review its responsibilities for oversight of mentoring programs, whether in law or rule, and focus departmental efforts on fulfilling those responsibilities and ensuring that school districts and charter schools fulfill their responsibilities; and (3) that PED ensure that the Student Teacher Accountability Reporting System (STARS) contain current, accurate data on the number and location of beginning teachers.
- The LESC might consider sending a letter to the Chair of the Mentorship Task Force requesting (1) that the task force review its membership to ensure alignment with the requirements of law, particularly in terms of representation of colleges of arts and sciences; (2) that the task force proceed with its planned activities toward creating a model mentorship program, including a review of successful programs or program components in other states that might be adapted for use in New Mexico; and (3) that the Mentorship Task Force distribute their final recommendations to all school districts and postsecondary institutions and seek feedback from all parties to gain consensus.
- The LESC might consider endorsing a memorial asking the Office of Education Accountability to study the effect that mentorship programs have on teacher retention in New Mexico during the first five years of service. Initially, this study could compare data for teachers who received no formal mentorship (those who entered the profession prior to 2002) with teachers who received mentorship under the statutory provisions prior to 2007. Eventually, this study could examine the effect of the model mentorship program being developed pursuant to the 2007 amendments to the mentorship law.

ATTACHMENT 1

22-10A-9. Teacher mentorship program for level one teachers; purpose; department duties.

A. The purpose of the teacher mentorship program is to provide beginning teachers with an effective transition into the teaching field, to build on their initial preparation and to ensure their success in teaching; to improve the achievement of students; and to retain capable teachers in the classroom and to remove teachers who show little promise of success.

B. The department shall develop a framework for a teacher mentorship program for all level one teachers. The department shall work with licensed school employees, representatives from teacher preparation programs and the higher education department to establish the framework.

C. The framework shall include:

- (1) individual support and assistance for each beginning teacher from a designated mentor;
- (2) structured training for mentors;
- (3) an ongoing, formative evaluation that is used for the improvement of teaching practice;
- (4) procedures for a summative evaluation of beginning teachers' performance during at least the first three years of teaching, including annual assessment of suitability for license renewal, and for final assessment of beginning teachers seeking level two licensure;
- (5) support from local school boards, school administrators and other school district personnel; and
- (6) regular review and evaluation of the teacher mentorship program.

D. The department shall:

- (1) require submission and approval of each school district's teacher mentorship program;
- (2) provide technical assistance to school districts that do not have a well-developed teacher mentorship program in place;
- (3) encourage school districts to collaborate with teacher preparation program administrators at institutions of higher education, career educators, educational organizations, regional service centers and other state and community leaders in the teacher mentorship program; and
- (4) distribute available funds for mentorship programs to school districts annually on a per-teacher basis according to the number of beginning teachers on the fortieth day of the school year.

E. The department shall require that teacher preparation programs collaborate with colleges of arts and sciences and high schools to develop a model to provide mentorship services with structured supervision and feedback to each of their graduates who have obtained a teaching

position in a public high school, including charter schools; develop cost estimates; and provide recommendations to the legislative education study committee by November 1, 2007. The model shall provide for the following:

(1) mentorship services for the first year as a level one teacher to each of their graduates who has obtained a teaching position in any New Mexico public high school, including charter schools; provided that teacher preparation programs may enter into contracts or memoranda of agreement with each other or with level three teachers in providing services to their students;

(2) an annual report to the department of the number of teachers that have completed each of their programs the previous spring or summer and have been hired by public high schools, including charter schools, for the following school year; and

(3) an annual report providing a description of the mentorship services that will be provided to each of their teachers, including the name of the teacher, the grade level the teacher has been hired to teach and the name of the school and district where the teacher has been hired.

History: 1978 Comp., § 22-10A-9, enacted by Laws 2003, ch. 153, § 40; 2005, ch. 315, § 6; 2005, ch. 316, § 3; 2007, ch. 264, § 3.

Cross references. — For references to the former commission on higher education, see 9-25-4.1 NMSA 1978.

For the public education department, see 9-24-4 NMSA 1978.

2005 amendments. — Laws 2005, ch. 315, § 6 and Laws 2005, ch. 316, § 3 enact identical amendments, effective April 7, 2005, that provide in Subsection C(4) that the framework shall include evaluation during at least the first three years of teaching.

The 2007 amendment, effective June 15, 2007, adds Paragraph (4) of Subsection D and Subsection E.

PART 10 MENTORSHIP PROGRAMS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS

6.60.10.7 NMAC DEFINITIONS

6.60.10.8 NMAC REQUIREMENTS FOR MENTORSHIP PROGRAMS

6.60.10.9 NMAC COMPLETION OF MENTORSHIP PROGRAM

6.60.10.10 NMAC PROGRAM EVALUATION AND FUNDING

6.60.10.11 NMAC SAVINGS CLAUSE

6.60.10.7 NMAC DEFINITIONS

A. **“Beginning teacher”** means a teacher holding a New Mexico waiver, internship license, or level 1 teaching license who has less than three complete years, full-or part-time, of classroom teaching experience. For the purpose of this rule, teachers with more than three complete years, full-or part-time, of classroom teaching experience but who hold a waiver, internship license, or level 1 licensure are not beginning teachers.

B. **“Teaching license”** means a public education department (PED) license issued in early childhood, birth-grade 3; elementary education, grades K-8; middle level, grades 5-9; secondary education, grades 7-12; special education, grades K-12; licensure for K-12 in specialty areas; blind and visually impaired, birth-grade 12; and secondary vocational-technical education.

[7/1/02; 11/30/05]

6.60.10.8 NMAC REQUIREMENTS FOR MENTORSHIP PROGRAMS

All mentorship programs must receive initial approval from the director of professional development for the PED (hereinafter the “director”). To receive approval, public school districts, charter schools, or state agencies must submit a proposed mentorship program that aligns with and supports the public school district’s, charter school’s, or state agency’s long range plan for student success and aligns with the PED’s nine essential teacher competencies and indicators contained in 6.69.4 NMAC, or any successor competencies adopted by the PED for level 1, waiver, or internship licensed teachers. The proposal must describe how the mentorship program addresses the following:

A. provides individual support for beginning teachers from designated mentors or support providers; the support activities must include collaborative curriculum alignment, design, and planning; they must also include classroom observations, student assessment, individual instructional conferences, and instructional resource development;

B. is mandatory for all beginning teachers;

C. includes structured and research-based training activities for mentors; the

training must include the development and needs of beginning teachers, the process of developing mentorship relationships, the process of documenting teacher growth, and best practices in working with novice teachers;

D. uses a structured process for selection of mentors that includes selection and evaluation criteria and details the person or persons responsible for implementing the selection and evaluation process;

E. provides compensation for mentors;

F. uses an ongoing, formative evaluation of beginning teachers for the improvement of teaching practice;

G. uses an ongoing summative evaluation of beginning teacher performance during the first 1 to 3 years of teaching, including an annual assessment of competence for continuing licensure and a final assessment of competence for teachers seeking level 2 licensure; evaluation of beginning teacher performance shall include annual review and progress reports during the mentorship program, collection of documented evidence of teacher growth and development, and summative assessment of level I teacher competencies;

H. has a process for addressing disputes or grievances between mentors and beginning teachers and for replacing mentors for good cause shown;

I. establishes a program that is at least one year in length but includes provisions whereby support for an additional 2 or 3 years can be provided to teachers who do not successfully complete the first year and continue to be employed in the public school district, charter school, or state agency; and

J. has documentation that describes how support was sought and obtained from the local school board, administrators, and other district and school personnel.

[7/1/02; 11/30/05]

6.60.10.9 NMAC COMPLETION OF MENTORSHIP PROGRAM

All beginning teachers must successfully complete a minimum of a one-year mentorship program to be eligible for a level 2 license. Successful completion of the program shall be documented on a form available from the professional licensure unit and shall be maintained in each teacher's licensure file in the professional licensure unit. Under no circumstance shall a beginning teacher who is otherwise eligible to receive a level 2 license unless he or she has been certified as having successfully completed a mentorship program.

[7/1/02]

6.60.10.10 NMAC PROGRAM EVALUATION AND FUNDING

All mentorship programs shall be evaluated locally every three years to determine the effectiveness of the program based on teacher retention. Annually the PED shall review and

make public teacher retention rates statewide and by district. Annual state funding of local district mentorship programs shall be based primarily on the number of beginning teachers who received mentorship services in the previous school year, if funds are appropriated for that purpose by the legislature.

[7/1/02; 11/30/05]

6.60.10.11 NMAC SAVINGS CLAUSE

All mentorship programs submitted by a public school district, charter school, or state agency to comply with 6.60.3 NMAC, Alternative Licensure, and approved by the PED shall be deemed to be in compliance with Sections 1 through 9 of this rule. The director reserves the right to impose additional requirements to comply with Section 10 of 6.60.10 NMAC.

[7/1/02; 11/30/05]

HISTORY OF 6.60.10 NMAC: [Reserved]

COPY

ATTACHMENT 3

RECEIVED

NOV 06 2007

LESC

New Mexico Mentorship Program for Beginning Teachers

Mentorship plans must address all of the requirements listed in 6.61.10.8 of the Mentorship Program for Beginning Teachers which takes affect July 1, 2002. The district plan must be submitted to the New Mexico State Department of Education for approval. Once approved, the plan will be reviewed annually by district self-evaluation. Documentation of each beginning teacher's successful completion of the approved plan must be submitted to the professional licensure unit on the appropriate form provided by the professional licensure unit.

State Board of Education Objective:

To establish requirements for statewide mentorship programs to provide beginning teachers an effective transition into the teaching profession, retain capable teachers, improve the achievement of students, and improve the overall success of the school.

District: _____

Program Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

This form, along with the *Questions for Designing and Implementing Mentoring Program*, may be used as a worksheet for developing your District's Mentoring Plan. You may also find the enclosed *Quick-Check Outline* useful in determining if all components of the law are addressed in each section of your plan.

I. Expected Outcomes

A. Alignment with District EPSS

B. Alignment with Level 1 Essential Teaching Competencies

C. Statement of Mandatory Participation

II. Program Implementation

- A. Selection and Assignment of Mentors

- B. Description of Beginning Teacher Support Activities

- C. Description of Mentor Support and Training

III. Evaluation

- A. Description of Evaluation of Beginning Teachers
 - 1. Formative evaluation

 - 2. Final Summative evaluation

 - 3. Provisions for support of teachers who need an additional second or third year

- B. Description of Process for Addressing Disputes or Grievances between Mentors and Beginning Teachers

- C. Plan for Annual Self-evaluation

COPY

RECEIVED

NOV 08 2007

LESC

BEGINNING TEACHER MENTORING PROGRAM
DISTRICT APPROVAL AND FUNDING CHECKLIST

This checklist will help both your district and the Professional Licensure Unit at the Public Education Department track the status of your Beginning Teacher Mentoring Program.

If at anytime you have questions about your district's program status, please do not hesitate to contact Kersti Tyson at the Public Education Department, 300 Don Gaspar, Avenue, Santa Fe, NM 87501-2786; (505) 827-4201 (phone); (505) 827-3963 (fax) or ktyson@sde.state.nm.us.

_____ District submitted Beginning Teacher Mentoring Plan to James Ball, Assistant Secretary, Educator Quality, Public Education Department.

_____ District Beginning Teacher Mentoring Plan *approved* by James Ball, Assistant Secretary, Educator Quality, Public Education Department.

_____ District Beginning Teacher Mentoring Plan *approved conditionally*. In order for the plan to be approved, your district needs to revise the following components in your Beginning Teacher Mentoring Plan. Please resubmit your plan, reflecting the requested changes to James Ball, Assistant Secretary, Educator Quality, Public Education Department.

_____ District Beginning Teacher Mentoring Plan *denied approval*. In order for the plan to be approved, please make the following revisions and resubmit to James Ball, Director, Professional Licensure, State Department of Education.

_____ Number of beginning teachers in your district during the 200/2004 school year was verified. These teachers, listed by name and social security number will need to be tracked over the next few years as a measure to determine the effectiveness of Beginning Teacher Mentoring Programs.

_____ District *submitted a Budget Adjustment Request Form (BAR)* to the Educator Quality Unit at the Public Education Department

_____ Districts submitted quarterly reports to Lea Larranaga in the Financial Management Unit at the Public Education Department.

_____ District has submitted a Cash Request Form to Lea Larranaga in the Financial Management Unit at the Public Education Department.

_____ District *funds encumbered* for the Beginning Teacher Mentoring Program by *June 30, 2005*.

_____ District *funds liquidated* for the Beginning Teacher Mentoring Program by *September 30, 2005*.

SOURCE: Public Education Department

COPY!

ATTACHMENT 5
RECEIVED
NOV 06 2007
ESC

**New Mexico Mentorship Program for Beginning Teachers
PROGRAM SELF-EVALUATION**

Mentorship plans must address all of the requirements listed in 6.61.10.8 of the Mentorship Programs for Beginning Teachers which takes effect July 1, 2002. The district plan must be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval. Once approved, the plan will be reviewed annually by district self-evaluation. Documentation of each beginning teacher's successful completion of the approved plan must be submitted to the professional licensure unit on the appropriate form provided by the professional licensure unit.

State Board of Education Objective:

To establish requirements for statewide mentorship programs to provide beginning teachers an effective transition into the teaching profession, retain capable teachers, improve the achievement of students, and improve the overall success of the school.

District:

Contact Person:

This form along with the Questions for Self-Evaluation of Mentor Programs is to be used as a worksheet for developing your District's Self-Evaluation Mentoring Plan. This will meet the requirement of the Mentoring Law which goes into effect July 1, 2002, Section 6.60.10.10.

PLAN FOR SELF-EVALUATION OF MENTOR PROGRAM

I. Evaluation criteria and procedures indicating improvement in teacher retention

II. Evaluation criteria and procedures indicating increase in student performance

III. Plans for Further Development of the Mentoring Program Based on This Year's Findings

SOURCE: Public Education Department

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-EVALUATION OF MENTOR PROGRAM

I. Improvement of Teacher Retention

1. What is the demographic information of the teachers who were involved in the Mentoring Program in this reporting year?
 - a. Number of teachers beginning program
 - b. Number of teachers completing program
 - c. Number of teachers who will continue to require support
 - d. Years of teaching experience
 - e. Ethnicity and gender
 - f. Kind of Level 1 credential or teaching preparation programs, e.g. alternative, traditional teacher education program, out of state license
 - g. Classroom teaching assignment, e.g. grade level, content area, extra duties
2. What is the actual number and percentage of teachers who were involved in the Mentoring Program in this reporting year who were offered and accepted contracts with the district for the following academic year? How do these figures compare with the district's previous retention rate for beginning teachers?
3. What Mentoring Program factors contributed to teachers' choices to stay or leave the district?
 - a. Amount of time spent between mentor and beginning teacher
 - b. Kinds of additional support beyond mentor available to beginning teacher e.g. professional development opportunities, observations of master teachers, beginning teacher support group, teaming or shared planning with other teachers, availability of curriculum materials
 - c. Flexibility of beginning teacher's schedule to participate in mentoring activities
 - d. Match between mentor teacher's expertise and beginning teacher's identified needs
 - e. Opportunities for self-assessment of professional development as described in the State Board of Education Essential Teaching Competencies
4. What data collection measures were used to determine level of teacher and mentor satisfaction with the Mentoring Program?
 - a. Exit interviews with beginning teachers leaving the district
 - b. End of program year surveys from beginning teachers
 - c. On-going program assessment records from the year
 - d. Interviews and narratives from mentors
 - e. Documentation of beginning teacher satisfaction with the district dispute resolution policy
5. Was there a relationship between the level of teacher performance, as described in the State Board of Education Essential Teaching Competencies, and teacher retention?

II. Increase in Student Performance

1. What is the demographic information of the students of beginning teachers involved in the Mentoring Program in this reporting year?
 - a. Number of students affected by the Mentoring Program
 - b. Number of students of teachers completing the mentoring program
 - c. Number of students of teachers who will continue to require support
 - d. Grade level of students affected by the Mentoring Program
 - e. Ethnicity and gender affected by the Mentoring Program
 - f. Identification of special needs of students affected by the Mentoring Program
2. What data collection measures were used to determine levels of student performance for those students affected by the Mentoring Program?
 - a. Terra Nova or other standardized test scores
 - b. Classroom performance measures, e.g. testing, portfolios, homework completion rates
 - c. Attendance rates
 - d. Discipline records
 - e. Surveys of student satisfaction with their classroom experience
 - f. Surveys of parent satisfaction with student performance and growth
 - g. Surveys of teacher satisfaction with student performance and growth
3. How do these figures compare with the district's previous records for student performance?

After the data analyses for teacher retention and student achievement are completed, how will that information be collated for dissemination? Who will be included in the dissemination process?

III. Plans for Further Development of the Mentoring Program Based on This Year's Findings (Optional implementation review not required by state regulation)

1. After examining the results from the data collected above, what adjustments must be made to the expected outcomes for student achievement and teacher growth?
2. Are there additional measures needed to better select mentors, to assign pairings of novice teachers with mentors, to nurture the support of both mentors and novice teachers?
3. Have the current compensation options for mentors been satisfactory in attracting and retaining quality mentors? Are additional options being explored?
4. Is there a way for teachers who have completed the mentoring program to contribute to the next year's novice mentoring program?
5. Will the professional development program for teachers having completed the mentorship follow through with the training, expectations, and skills developed in the mentoring program?
6. Are the current budget and resources for the mentoring program sufficient for the new goals and expectations? Are there additional collaborations, networking, and support opportunities available to strengthen the program?

TOTAL MENTORSHIP ALLOCATIONS TO DISTRICTS FY 02 TO FY 07 (actual dollars)

| Districts | TOTAL |
|-------------------|-----------|
| Alamogordo | \$111,619 |
| Albuquerque | \$985,834 |
| Animas | \$365 |
| Artesia | \$35,091 |
| Aztec | \$46,457 |
| Belen | \$125,591 |
| Bernalillo | \$51,055 |
| Bloomfield | \$48,906 |
| Capitan | \$5,643 |
| Carlsbad | \$73,916 |
| Carrizozo | \$736 |
| Central | \$96,222 |
| Chama | \$6,816 |
| Cimarron | \$3,201 |
| Clayton | \$6,105 |
| Cloudcroft | \$2,298 |
| Clovis | \$202,158 |
| Cobre | \$19,459 |
| Corona | \$368 |
| Cuba | \$6,979 |
| Deming | \$136,853 |
| Des Moines | \$2,811 |
| Dexter | \$20,750 |
| Dora | \$1,229 |
| Dulce | \$23,896 |
| Elida | \$1,582 |
| Española | \$83,740 |
| Estancia | \$12,503 |
| Eunice | \$9,701 |
| Farmington | \$135,642 |
| Floyd | \$8,009 |
| Ft. Sumner | \$368 |
| Gadsden | \$260,195 |
| Gallup - McKinley | \$352,723 |
| Grady | \$2,384 |
| Grants | \$43,498 |
| Hagerman | \$20,530 |
| Hatch | \$30,941 |
| Hobbs | \$192,343 |
| Hondo Valley | \$368 |
| House | \$4,406 |
| Jal | \$4,377 |
| Jemez Mountain | \$13,282 |
| Jemez Valley | \$9,063 |
| Lake Arthur | \$9,471 |
| Las Cruces | \$596,272 |

| Districts | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Las Vegas City | \$31,667 |
| Logan | \$3,850 |
| Lordsburg | \$19,283 |
| Los Alamos | \$31,981 |
| Los Lunas | \$164,566 |
| Loving | \$11,307 |
| Lovington | \$41,864 |
| Magdalena | \$11,840 |
| Maxwell | \$396 |
| Melrose | \$1,129 |
| Mesa Vista | \$3,043 |
| Mora | \$6,303 |
| Moriarty | \$81,255 |
| Mosquero | \$1,127 |
| Mountainair | \$9,756 |
| Pecos | \$15,080 |
| Peñasco | \$6,927 |
| Pojoaque | \$33,790 |
| Portales | \$60,227 |
| Quemado | \$4,765 |
| Questa | \$9,827 |
| Raton | \$19,247 |
| Reserve | \$3,058 |
| Rio Rancho | \$229,384 |
| Roswell | \$195,583 |
| Roy | \$1,888 |
| Ruidoso | \$3,312 |
| San Jon | \$1,976 |
| Santa Fe | \$375,089 |
| Santa Rosa | \$8,465 |
| Silver Schools | \$44,649 |
| Socorro | \$49,242 |
| Springer | \$3,470 |
| Taos | \$51,190 |
| Tatum | \$394 |
| Texico | \$4,600 |
| T or C | \$18,712 |
| Tucumcari | \$21,115 |
| Tularosa | \$6,480 |
| Vaughn | \$1,095 |
| Wagon Mound | \$3,560 |
| West LV | \$39,698 |
| Zuni | \$44,054 |
| REC #9* | \$20,640 |
| Total allocated to districts: | \$5,502,640 |

*PED reports that they do not distribute mentorship funds directly to RECs, but that districts may contract with RECs to provide mentorship services; however, REC #9 includes Tularosa, Ruidoso, Hondo, Corona, Capitan and Carrizozo.

Source: Public Education Department mentorship funding allocation spreadsheets, FY02-FY07

**TOTAL MENTORSHIP ALLOCATIONS TO CHARTER
SCHOOLS/STATE AGENCY FY 03 - FY 07
(actual dollars)**

| Charter School/State Agency | Total |
|---|---------------------|
| Academia De Lengua Y Cultura | \$1,472.00 |
| Academy for Technology & Classics | \$22,510.00 |
| Alma D'Arte Charter High | \$2,199.00 |
| Amistad Charter School | \$365.00 |
| Amy Biehl Charter | \$9,816.00 |
| Anansi Charter | \$396.00 |
| Bridge Academy Charter High | \$1,463.00 |
| Cesar Chavez | \$366.00 |
| Charter Voc-Tec Center | \$368.00 |
| Cottonwood Valley Charter | \$1,547.00 |
| East Mountain High School | \$5,721.00 |
| High Tech High | \$368.00 |
| Horizon Academies | \$1,970.00 |
| Jefferson Montessori Academy | \$2,196.00 |
| La Academia de Esperanza | \$2,190.00 |
| La Academia de Idiomas | \$365.00 |
| La Academia Dolores Huerta | \$1,472.00 |
| La Luz Del Monte Learning Center | \$736.00 |
| Lacy Simms Middle | \$366.00 |
| Los Puentes Charter School | \$3,294.00 |
| Monte Del Sol Charter School | \$1,156.00 |
| Montessori of the Rio Grande | \$733.00 |
| Moreno Valley High School | \$394.00 |
| Nuestros Valores | \$366.00 |
| Public Academy for Performing | \$793.00 |
| Red River Valley Charter | \$394.00 |
| Robert F. Kennedy Charter School | \$2,205.00 |
| Roots & Wings Community School | \$733.00 |
| San Diego Riverside School | \$1,127.00 |
| School for Integrated Academics & Technology | \$368.00 |
| South Valley Academy | \$1,580.00 |
| SW Secondary Learning Center | \$2,986.00 |
| Taos Charter School | \$7,735.00 |
| Turquoise Trail Elementary | \$133,194.00 |
| Twentyfirst Century Charter | \$394.00 |
| Walatowa Charter High | \$394.00 |
| Youth Diagnostic & Development Center | \$1,272.00 |
| Charter School/State Agency Total: | \$215,004.00 |

Source: Public Education Department mentorship funding allocation spreadsheets, FY02-FY07